

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
HISTORICAL

THE TWO EMPIRES
OR ROME AND THE U.S.A

by Alonzo Jones

Books For The Ages
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA
Version 1.0 © 1997

THE
TWO REPUBLICS
OR
ROME
AND THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY
ALONZO T. JONES

No past event has any intrinsic importance. The knowledge of it is valuable only as it leads us to form just calculations with respect to the future. —
MACAULAY

TO THE COMMON PEOPLE,

who heard our common Master gladly, and whose silent, practical experience “throughout the history of the Church, has always been truer and has led the Church in a safer path than have the public decrees of those who claim to be authoritative leaders of theological thought,” this book is respectfully dedicated

BY THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

ROME, in its different phases, occupies the largest place of any national name in history. Rome, considered with reference to government, is interesting and important. Considered with reference to religion, it is yet more interesting and more important. But when considered with reference to the interrelationship of government and religion, it is most interesting and most important. It is Rome in this last phase that is the principal subject of study in this book. As in this particular Rome occupies on extreme and the United State of America the other, the latter is considered also, though the plan and limit of the book has made it necessary to give less space to this than the subject deserves.

The principle of Rome in all its phases is that religion and government are inseparable. The principle of the government of the United States is that religion is essentially distinct and totally separate from civil government, and entirely exempt from its cognizance.

The principle of Rome is the abject slavery of the mind ; the principle of the United States of America is the absolute freedom of the mind.

As it Christianity that first and always antagonized this governmental principle of Rome, and established the governmental principle of the United States of America, the fundamental idea, the one thread-thought of the whole book, is to develop the principles of Christianity with reference to civil government, and to portray the mischievous results of the least departure from those principles.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER 1.

THE LAST DAYS OF THE REPUBLIC.

Capital and labor — Electoral corruption — Anti-monopoly legislation — The distribution of the land — Senatorial corruption and State charity — Caius Gracchus is killed — The consulship of Marius — More State charity and the social war — Revolt in the East — Bloody strifes in the city — Dictatorship of Sulla — Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar — Pompey and Crassus, consuls — Land monopoly and anti-poverty reform

CHAPTER 2.

THE TWO TRIUMVIRATES.

The Senate offends Caesar — Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar — The consulate of Caesar — Reform by law — The triumvirate dissolved — Legal government at an end — Caesar crosses the Rubicon — Caesar dictator, demi-god, and deity — Caesar's government — The murder of Caesar — Octavius presents himself — Plot, counterplot, and war — Octavius becomes consul — The triumvirs enter Rome — "The saviors of their country" — Antony and Cleopatra.

CHAPTER 3.

THE ROMAN MONARCHY.

The father of the people — The accession of Tiberius — The enemy of public liberty — A furious and crushing despotism — Accession of Caligula — Caligula imitates the gods — Caligula's

prodigality — The delirium of power — Claudius and his wives — Messalina's depravity — Agrippina the tigress — Roman society in general — Ultimate paganism.

CHAPTER 4.

THE "TEN PERSECUTIONS."

Roman law and the Jews — The persecution by Nero — Government of Domitian — Pliny and the Christians — Government of Trajan — Riotous attacks upon the Christians — Government of Commodus — Government of Septimius Severus — Government of Caracalla — Persecution by Maximum — The persecution by Decius — Christianity legalized — The ten persecutions a fable.

CHAPTER 5.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Freedom in Jesus Christ — Pagan idea of the State — Rights of individual conscience — Christians subject to civil authority — The limits of State jurisdiction — The Roman religion — The Roman laws — Sources of persecution — Superstition and selfishness — The governors of provinces — State self-preservation — State religion means persecution — Christianity victorious — Christianity means rights of conscience.

CHAPTER 6.

THE RISE OF CONSTANTINE.

The persecution under Diocletian — The attack is begun — Afflictions of the persecutors — Rome surrenders — Six emperors at once — Roman embassies to Constantine — The Edict of Milan.

CHAPTER 7.

ANCIENT SUN WORSHIP.

The secret of sun worship — The rites of sun — worship in the mysteries — Jehovah condemns sun worship — Sun worship in Judah — Sun worship destroys the kingdom — Sun worship of Augustus and Elagabalus — Aurelian's temple to the sun — Constantine a worshiper of the sun.

CHAPTER 8.

THE FALLING AWAY — THE GREAT APOSTASY.

The root of the apostasy — Heathen rites adopted — The mysteries — The forms of sun worship adopted — Rome exalts Sunday — Heathen philosophy adopted — Clement's philosophic mysticism — Origen's philosophic mysticism — Imperial aims at religious unity — Paganism and the apostasy alike — The two streams unite in Constantine

CHAPTER 9

THE EXALTATION OF THE BISHOPRIC.

A clerical aristocracy created — Bishopric of Rome asserts pre-eminence — Contentions in Rome and Carthage — The bishops usurp the place of Christ — An episcopal Punic War — the bishopric of Antioch — Disgraceful character of the bishopric

CHAPTER 10.

THE RELIGION OF CONSTANTINE.

His low utilitarianism — Pagan and apostate Christian — His perjury and cruelty — Many times a murderer — The true cross and Constantine — Is this paganism or Christianity? — A murderer even in death — Little better than a pagan.

CHAPTER 11.

CONSTANTINE AND THE BISHOPS.

The new theocracy — The new Israel delivered — Final war with Licinius — Original State chaplaincies — The bishops and the emperor — Constantine sent to heaven — The mystery of iniquity.

CHAPTER 12.

THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

A false unity — The Catholic Church established — Which is the Catholic Church? — Councils to decide the question — The Donatists appeal to the emperor — The State becomes partisan — Clergy exempt from public offices — Fruits of the exemption — The church of the masses — The church a mass of hypocrites.

CHAPTER 13.

THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

Israel rejects the Lord as king — The Lord would not forsake the people — The kingdom not of this world — The new and false theocracy — Constantine's Sunday law — Sunday legislation is religious only — The empire a "kingdom of God" — By authority

of Pontifex Maximus — Council of Nice against the Jews — Sabbath-keepers accursed from Christ — All exemption abolished — The church obtains the monopoly — Origin of the Inquisition.

CHAPTER 14.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

The Trinitarian Controversy — Homoousion or Homoiousion — The secret of the controversy — Constantine's design — Constantine's task — The Council of Nice — Character of the bishops — Constantine's place in the council — The framing of the creed — The creed and its adoption — Their own estimate of the creed — The true estimate of the council.

CHAPTER 15.

ARIANISM BECOMES ORTHODOX.

Arius returned; Athanasius banished — Athanasius is returned and again banished — Macedonius made bishop of Constantinople — General Council of Sardica — Athanasius again returned — General councils of Arles and Milan — The bishop of Rome is banished — Hosius forced to become Arian — Athanasius again removed — Liberius becomes Arian and is recalled — Double council; Rimini and Seleucia — The emperor's creed declared heretical — The world becomes Arian.

CHAPTER 16.

THE CATHOLIC FAITH RE-ESTABLISHED.

Jovian, Valentinian, and Valens — The contentions begin again — The order of the hierarchy — Gregory, bishop of Constantinople — The Meletian schism — The Council of Constantinople —

Council of Aquileia — Penalties upon heretics — The empire is “converted.”

CHAPTER 17.

MARY IS MADE THE MOTHER OF GOD.

Chrysostom deposed and banished — Chrysostom recalled and again banished — A general council demanded — Cyril of Alexandria — Nestorius of Constantinople — Cyril and Nestorius at war — The bishop of Rome joins Cyril — General Council of Ephesus — Condemnation of Nestorius — Council against council — All alike orthodox — Cyril bribes the court and wins.

CHAPTER 18.

THE EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.

The controversy begins — Eusebius in a dilemma — Forecast of the Inquisition — A general council is demanded — The second general Council of Ephesus — Eutyches is declared orthodox — The unity of the council — Peace is declared restored

CHAPTER 19.

THE POPE MADE AUTHOR OF THE FAITH.

Pretensions of the bishops of Rome — “Irrevocable” and “universal” — Leo demands another council — The general Council of Chalcedon — “A frightful storm” — Condemnation of Dioscorus — Leo’s — letter the test — Leo’s letter approved — Leo’s letter “the true faith” — Unity of the council is created — Leo’s doctrine seals the creed — The creed of Leo and Chalcedon — Royalty ratifies the creed — The council to Leo — Imperial edicts enforce the creed — Leo “confirms” the creed — The work of the four councils

CHAPTER 20.

THE CHURCH USURPS THE CIVIL AUTHORITY.

Events that favored the papacy — The bishops censors of magistrates The Bible is made the code — The bishopric a political office — The worst characters become bishops — the episcopal dictatorship — Civil government vanished.

CHAPTER 21.

THE RUIN OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

The bishopric of Rome — Pride of the bishops and clergy — Vices of clergy and people — Abominations of sun worship continued — Heathen practices in the church — Monkish virtue made prevalent — Hypocrisy and fraud made habitual — Pure, unmingled naturalism — Destruction and devastation — No remedy, and final ruin.

CHAPTER 22.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE PAPACY.

The papacy and the barbarians — The “conversion” of Clovis — The “holy” wars of Clovis — Such conversion was worse corruption — She destroys those she cannot corrupt — Destruction of the Herulian kingdom — Theodoric’s rule of Italy — Papal proceedings in Rome — The pope put above the State — Conspiracies against the Ostrogoths — The accession of Justinian — The Trisagion controversy — Justinian joins in the controversy — The Vandal kingdom uprooted — The Ostrogothic kingdom destroyed — Temporal authority of the papacy — The Lombards invade Italy — The pope appeals to France — The pope anoints Pepin king — Pepin’s gift to the papacy — The pope makes

Charlemagne emperor — The papacy made supreme — The germ of the entire papacy.

CHAPTER 23

PROTESTANTISM — TRUE AND FALSE.

The papal power and Luther's protection — The principles of Protestantism — Protestantism is Christianity — Zwingli as a Reformer — Henry VIII against Luther — Luther against the papacy — Henry divorces the pope — Religious rights in England — The Calvinistic theocracy — Calvin's Despotism — Religious despotism in Scotland — The rise of the Puritans — Puritan designs upon England — Elizabeth persecutes the Puritans — Origin of the Congregationalists — Puritan government of New England — New England Puritan principles — Roger Williams against Puritanism — Banishment of Roger Williams — John Wheelwright and his preaching — Wheelwright is banished — The Puritan inquisition — Puritan covenant of grace — Mrs. Hutchinson is condemned — the inquisition continues — Planting of Connecticut and New Haven — The theocracy is completed — Laws against the Baptists — The Baptist principles — The whipping of Elder Holmes — The persecutors justify themselves — Thomas Gould and his brethren — Another remonstrance from England — First treatment of Quakers — First law against Quakers — Rhode Island's glorious appeal — Horrible laws against the Quakers — Horrible tortures of Quakers — The people effect a rescue — Children sold as slaves — The death penalty is defeated — "A humaner policy" — The people rescue the sufferers — Laws of New Haven and Connecticut — John Wesley prosecuted — Martin Luther and Roger Williams.

CHAPTER 24.

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

Civil government wholly impersonal — It is the scriptural idea — How are the powers that be, ordained — The American doctrine is scriptural — The Declaration asserts the truth — Government and religion rightly separate — Governmental authority not religious — Daniel and the government — It is intentionally so — The Presbytery of Hanover — Their second memorial — Madison's Memorial and Remonstrance — Christianity does not need it — It undermines public authority — Virginia delivered — Ratification of the Constitution — The Christian idea.

CHAPTER 25.

THE GREAT CONSPIRACY.

The Constitution denounced — A religious amendment proposed — The National Reform Association — Proposed national hypocrisy — The new hierarchy — Moral and civil government distinct — Morality and religion inseparable — This work committed to the church alone — The two "spheres" — The National Reform theocracy — The new kingdom of God — What they propose to do — National Reform toleration — They propose union with the papacy — Religious worship in public schools — Their principles and aims are alike — The W. C. T. U. in bad company — Principles of the National W. C. T. U. — History repeats itself — Wrong ideas of the gospel — Prohibition joins the procession — Principles of national Prohibition party — Origin of the American Sabbath Union — Church and State to be united — The whole scheme is theocratical — Anti American and anti-Christian.

CHAPTER 26.

THE BOND OF UNION.

The Catholic Church accepts — What Rome means by it — What the Protestants mean by it — Compulsory religious observance — What is the church for? — Sunday practice of church members — They invade the realm of conscience — The basis of Sunday observance — The authority for Sunday observance — No obligation upon a free conscience — The people must all go to church — More, more, more, more! — Sunday work is to be treason — The modern Puritan ideal — The true National Reform religion — The rumble of the coming train — Whom Sunday laws affect — How Sunday laws are enforced — Supreme Court decisions — “A relic of the Middle Ages” — It worked “nearly perfectly” — Their object is to make it universal.

CHAPTER 27.

WILL IT SUCCEED?

Chaplaincies unconstitutional — Government chaplaincies anti-Christian — An imposition upon the people — Liquor-drinking chaplains — National Religious Proclamations — Appropriations to churches — A fallacious protest — The church raid upon the treasury — The Constitution forgotten — Church power strangles free discussion — The amendment proposed — A new Council of Nice — The proposed national theology — The Constitution disregarded — The national Sunday law — Religious legislation only — What they covet — Congress and the world to come — The State dictates to conscience — Enforced religious observance — No disturbance of worship — The Constitution protects them — The meaning of exemption — “Every-body’s attention” called — An invasion of rights — We plead for the rights of all — Why they propose exemption — “Embarrassing legislation” — They will “scoop all in” — Inalienable right.

CHAPTER 28.

CONCLUSION.

What more is needed? — International Sunday-law movement — The pope exalts himself and Sunday — The arch-mistress of sorceries — Shall papal or Christian principles rule? — The lesson of the history.

APPENDIX.

HOW SUNDAY LAWS ARE ENFORCED.

Prosecution of Elder J. W. Scoles — Allen Meeks — Joe McCoy — J. L. Schockey — James M. Pool — James A. Armstrong — William L. Gentry — Ples. A. Pannell — J. L. James — Allen Meeks, the second time — John A. Meeks — John Neusch — F. N. Elmore — William H. Fritz — Z. Swearingen — I. L. Benson — James A. Armstrong, the second time — J. L. Munson — James M. Pool — J. L. Shockey, the second time — Alexander Holt — Letters from prominent citizens of Arkansas.

CHAPTER 1.

THE LAST DAYS OF THE REPUBLIC.

WITH the exception of Britain, all the permanent conquests of Rome were made by the arms of the republic, which, though “sometimes vanquished in battle,” were “always victorious in war.” But as Roman power increased, Roman virtue declined; and of all forms of government, the stability of the republican depends most upon the integrity of the individual. The immortal Lincoln’s definition of a republic is the best that can ever be given: “A government of the people, by the people, and for the people.” A republic is a government of the people” — the people compose the government. The people are governed by “the people” — by themselves. They are governed by the people, “for the people” — they are governed by themselves, for themselves. Such a government is but self-government; each citizen governs himself, by himself, — by his own powers of self-restraint, — and he does this for himself, for his own good, for his own best interests. In proportion as this conception is not fulfilled, in proportion as the people lose the power of governing themselves, in the same proportion the true idea of a republic will fail of realization.

It is said of the early Romans that “they possessed the faculty of self-government beyond any people of whom we have historical knowledge,” with the sole exception of the Anglo-Saxons. And by virtue of this, in the very nature of the case they became the most powerful nation of all ancient times.

But their extensive conquests filled Rome with gold. With wealth came luxury; as said Juvenal, —

*“Luxury came on more cruel than our arms,
And avenged the vanquished world with her charms.”*

In the train of luxury came vice; self-restraint was broken down; the power of self-government was lost; and the Roman republic failed, as every other republic will fail, when that fails by virtue of which alone a republic is possible. The Romans ceased to govern themselves, and they had to be governed. They lost the faculty of self-government, and with that vanished

the republic, and its place was supplied by an imperial tyranny supported by a military despotism.

In the second Punic War, Rome's victories had reduced the mighty Carthage, B.C. 201, to the condition of a mere mercantile town; and within a few years afterward she had spread her conquests round the whole coasts of the Mediterranean Sea, and had made herself "the supreme tribunal in the last resort between kings and nations." "The southeast of Spain, the coast of France from the Pyrenees to Nice, the north of Italy, Illyria and Greece, Sardinia, Sicily, and the Greek islands, the southern and western shores of Asia Minor, were Roman provinces, governed directly under Roman magistrates. On the African side, Mauritania (Morocco) was still free. Numidia (the modern Algeria) retained its native dynasty, but was a Roman dependency. The Carthaginian dominions, Tunis and Tripoli, had been annexed to the empire. The interior of Asia Minor up to the Euphrates, with Syria and Egypt, was under sovereigns called allies, but, like the native princes in India, subject to a Roman protectorate. Over this enormous territory, rich with the accumulated treasures of centuries, and inhabited by thriving, industrious races, the energetic Roman men of business had spread and settled themselves, gathering into their hands the trade, the financial administration, the entire commercial control, of the Mediterranean basin. They had been trained in thrift and economy, in abhorrence of debt, in strictest habits of close and careful management. Their frugal education, their early lessons in the value of money, good and excellent as those lessons were, led them as a matter of course, to turn to account their extraordinary opportunities. Governors with their staffs, permanent officials, contractors for the revenue, negotiators, bill-brokers, bankers, merchants, were scattered everywhere in thousands. Money poured in upon them in rolling streams of gold.: — Froade.^{F1}

The actual administrative powers of the government were held by the body of the senators, who held office for life. The Senate had control of the public treasury, and into its hands went not only the regular public revenue from all sources, but also the immense spoil of plundered cities and conquered provinces. With the Senate lay also the appointment, and from its own ranks, too, of all the governors of provinces; and a governorship was the goal of wealth. A governor could go out from Rome poor, perhaps a bankrupt, hold his province for one, two, or three years, and return with millions. The inevitable result was that the senatorial families and leading commoners built up themselves into an aristocracy of wealth ever

increasing. Owing to the opportunities for the accumulation of wealth in the provinces more rapidly than at home, many of the most enterprising citizens sold their farms and left Italy. The farms were bought up by the Roman capitalists, and the small holdings were merged into vast estates. Besides this, the public lands were leased on easy terms by the Senate to persons of political influence, who by the lapse of time, had come to regard the land as their own by right of occupation. The Licinian law passed in 367 B. C., provided that no one should occupy more than three hundred and thirty-three acres of the public lands; and that every occupant should employ a certain proportion of free laborers. But at the end of two hundred years these favored holders had gone far beyond the law in both of these points: they extended their holdings beyond the limits prescribed by the law; and they employed no free laborers at all, but worked their holdings by slave labor wholly. Nor was this confined to the occupiers of the public lands; all wealthy land owners worked their land by slaves.

In the Roman conquests, where prisoners were taken in battle, or upon the capture or the unconditional surrender of a city, they were all sold as slaves. They were not slaves such as were in the Southern States of the United States in slavery times. They were Spaniards, Gauls, Greeks, Asiatics, and Carthaginians. Of course they were made up of all classes, yet many of them were intelligent, trained, and skillful; and often among them would be found those who were well educated. These were bought up by the wealthy Romans by the thousands. The skilled mechanics and artisans among them were employed in their owners' workshops established in Rome; the others were spread over the vast landed estates, covering them with vineyards, orchards, olive gardens, and the products of general agriculture; and all increasing their owners' immense incomes. "Wealth poured in more and more, and luxury grew more unbounded. Palaces sprang up in the city, castles in the country, villas at pleasant places by the sea, and parks and fish-ponds, and game preserves, and gardens, and vast retinues of servants," everywhere. The effect of all this absorbing of the land, whether public or private, into great estates worked by slaves, was to crowd the free laborers off the lands and into the large towns and into Rome above all. There they found every trade and occupation filled with slaves, whose labor only increased the wealth of the millionaire, and with which it was impossible successfully to compete. The only alternative was to fall into the train of the political agitator, become the stepping-stone to his ambition, sell their votes to the highest bidder, and perhaps have a share

in the promised more equable division of the good things which were monopolized by the rich.

For, to get money by any means lawful or unlawful, had become the universal passion. "Money was the one thought from the highest senator to the poorest wretch who sold his vote in the Comitia. For money judges gave unjust decrees, and juries gave corrupt verdicts." — Froude.^{F2} It has been well said that, "With all his wealth, there were but two things which the Roman noble could buy — political power and luxury." — Froude.^{F3} And the poor Roman had but one thing that he could sell — his vote. Consequently with the rich, able only to buy political power, and with the poor, able only to sell his vote, the elections once pure, became matters of annual bargain and sale between the candidates and the voters. "To obtain a province was the first ambition of a Roman noble. The road to it lay through the praetorship and the consulship; these offices, therefore, became the prizes of the State; and being in the gift of the people, they were sought after by means which demoralized alike the givers and the receivers. The elections were managed by clubs and coteries; and, except on occasions of national danger or political excitement, those who spent most freely were most certain of success. Under these conditions the chief powers in the commonwealth necessarily centered in the rich. There was no longer an aristocracy of birth, still less of virtue.... But the door of promotion was open to all who had the golden key. The great commoners bought their way into the magistracies. From the magistracies they passed into the Senate." — Froude.^{F4} And from the Senate they passed to the governorship of a province.

To obtain the first office in the line of promotion to the governorship, men would exhaust every resource, and plunge into what would otherwise have been hopeless indebtedness. Yet having obtained the governorship, when they returned, they were fully able to pay all their debts, and still be millionaires. "The highest offices of State were open in theory to the meanest citizen; they were confined, in fact, to those who had the longest purses, or the most ready use of the tongue on popular platforms. Distinctions of birth had been exchanged for distinctions of wealth. The struggle between plebeians and patricians for equality of privilege was over, and a new division had been formed between the party of property and a party who desired a change in the structure of society." — Froude.^{F5}

Such was the condition of things, B.C. 146, when the ruin of Carthage left Rome with no fear of a rival to her supremacy. Senatorial power was the sure road to wealth. The way to this was through the praetorship and the consulship. These offices were the gift of the populace through election by popular vote. The votes of the great body of the populace were for sale; and as only those who could control sufficient wealth were able to buy enough votes to elect, the sure result was, of course, that all the real powers of the government were held by the aristocracy of wealth. Then as these used their power to increase their own wealth and that of their favorites, and only used their wealth to perpetuate their power, another sure result was the growth of jealousy on the part of the populace, and a demand constantly growing louder and more urgent, that there should be a more equitable division of the good things of life which were monopolized by the favored few. "All orders in a society may be wise and virtuous, but all cannot be rich. Wealth which is used only for idle luxury is always envied, and envy soon curdles into hate. It is easy to persuade the masses that the good things of this world are unjustly divided, especially when it happens to be the exact truth." — Froude.^{F6}

And as these two classes were constantly growing farther apart, — the rich growing richer and the poor, poorer, — there ceased to be any middle class to maintain order in government and society by holding the balance of power. There remained only the two classes, the rich and the poor, and of these the rich despised the poor and the poor envied the rich. And there were always plenty of men to stir up the discontent of the masses, and present schemes for the reorganization of society and government. Some of these were well meaning men, men who really had in view the good of their fellow-men, but the far greater number were mere demagogues, — ambitious schemers who used the discontent of the populace only to lift themselves into the places of wealth and power which they envied others, and which, when they had secured, they used as selfishly and as oppressively as did any of those against whom they clamored. But whether they were well meaning men or demagogues, in order to hold the populace against the persuasions and bribes of the wealthy, they were compelled to make promises and concessions, which were only in the nature of larger bribes and which in the end were as destructive of free government as the worst acts of the Senate itself.

In the long contest between the people and the Senate, which ended in the establishment of an imperial form of government, the first decisive step was

taken by Tiberius Gracchus, who was elected tribune of the people in the year 133 B.C. On his way home from Spain shortly before, as he passed through Tuscany, he saw in full operation the 'large estate system carried on by the wealthy senators or their favorites, — the public lands unlawfully leased in great tracts, "the fields cultivated by the slave gangs, the free citizens of the republic thrust away into the towns, aliens and outcasts in their own country, without a foot of soil which they could call their own." He at once determined that the public lands should be restored to the people; and as soon as he was elected tribune, he set to work to put his views into law. As the government was of the people, if the people were only united they could carry any measure they pleased, in spite of the Senate. As the senators and their wealthy favorites were the offenders, it was evident that if any such law should be secured, it would have to be wholly by the people's overriding the Senate; and to the people Tiberius Gracchus directly appealed. He declared that the public land belonged to the people, demanded that the monopolists should be removed, and that the public lands should be re-distributed among the citizens of Rome. The monopolists argued that they had leased the land from the Senate, and had made their investments on the faith that the law was no longer of force. Besides this they declared that as they were then occupying the lands, and as the lands had been so occupied for ages before, with the sanction of the government, to call in question their titles now, was to strike at the very foundations of society. Tiberius and his party replied only by pointing to the statute which stood unrepealed, and showing that however long the present system had been worked, it was illegal and void from the beginning.

Yet Tiberius did not presume to be arbitrary. He proposed to pay the holders for their improvements; but as for the public land itself, it belonged to the people, and to the people it should go. The majority of the citizens stood by Tiberius. But another of the tribunes, Octavius Caecina by name, himself having large interests in the land question, went over to the side of the Senate; and, in the exercise of his constitutional right, forbade the taking of the vote. From the beginning, the functions of the tribunes were that they should be the defenders of the people and the guardians of the rights of the people, against the encroachment of the Consulate and the Senate. And now when one of their own constitutional defenders deserted them and went over to the enemy, even though in doing it he exercised only his constitutional prerogative, this the people would not bear. It was

to support an unlawful system that it was done; the people were all-powerful, and they determined to carry their measure, constitution or no constitution. ^{F7} Tiberius called upon them to declare Caecina deposed from the Tribunate; they at once complied. Then they took the vote which Caecina had forbidden, and the land law of Tiberius Gracchus was secured.

Three commissioners were appointed to carry into effect the provisions of the law. But from whatever cause, the choosing of the commissioners was unfortunate — they were Tiberius himself, his younger brother, and his father in law. Being thus apparently a family affair, the aristocrats made the most of it, and bided their time; for the tribunes were elected for only a year, and they hoped so to shape the elections when the year should expire, as to regain their power. But when the year expired, Tiberius unconstitutionally presented himself for re-election, and the prospect was that he would secure it. When the election day came, the aristocrats, with their servants and hired voters, went armed to the polls; and as soon as they saw that Tiberius would surely be chosen, they raised a prior. The people being unarmed, were driven off. Tiberius Gracchus and three hundred of his friends were killed and pitched into the Tiber. Yet though they had killed Tiberius, they did not dare to attempt at once the repeal of the law which he had secured, nor openly to interfere with the work of the commissioners in executing the law. Within two years the commissioners had settled forty thousand families upon public lands which the monopolists had been obliged to surrender.

The commissioners soon became unpopular. Those who were compelled to resign their lands were exasperated, of course. On the other hand, those to whom the land was given were not in all cases satisfied. It was certain that some would be given better pieces pieces of land than others, and that of itself created jealousy and discontent. But the greatest trouble was, that in the great majority of cases it was not land that they wanted, in fact. It was money that they wanted first of all; and although the land was virtually given to them and well improved at that, they could not get money out of it without work. It had to be personal work, too, because to hire slaves was against the very law by virtue of which they had received the land; and to hire freemen was impossible,

(1) because no freeman would work for a slave's wages — that in his estimate would be to count himself no better than a slave — and,

(2) the new landed proprietor could not afford to pay the wages demanded by free labor, because he had to meet the competition of the wealthy land owners who worked their own land with slave labor. The only alternative was for the new land-holders to work their land themselves, and do the best they could at it. But as the money did not come as fast as they wished, and as what did come was only by hard work and economical living, many of them heartily wished themselves back amid the stir and bustle of the busy towns, working for daily wages, though the wages might be small. The discontented cries soon grow loud enough to give the Senate its desired excuse to suspend the commissioners and then quietly to repeal the law, and resume its old supremacy.

Just nine years after the death of Tiberius Gracchus his brother Caius was elected a tribune, and took up the work in behalf of which Tiberius had lost his life. The Senate had been jealous of him for some time, and attacked him with petty prosecutions and false accusations; and when he was elected tribune, the Senate knew that this meant no good to it. Caius revived the land law that had been secured by his brother ten years before, but he did not stop there; he attacked the Senate itself. All important State cases, whether civil or criminal, were tried before a court composed of senators — about sixty or seventy. This privilege also the senators had turned to their own profit by selling their verdicts. It was no secret that the average senatorial jurymen was approachable with money; if not in the form of a direct bribe, there were many other ways in which a wealthy senator could make his influence felt. Governors could plunder their provinces, rob temples, sell their authority, and carry away everything they could lay hands on; yet, although in the eyes of the law these were the gravest offenses, when they returned to Rome, they could admit their fellow-senators to a share in their stealings, and rest perfectly secure. If the plundered provincials came up to Rome with charges against a governor, the charges had to be passed upon by a board of senators who had either been governors themselves or else were only waiting for the first chance to become governors, and a case had to be one of special hardship and notorious at that, before any notice would be taken of it in any effective way. The general course was only to show that the law was a mockery where the rich and influential were concerned. At this system of corruption, Caius Gracchus aimed a successful blow. He carried a law disqualifying forever any senator from sitting on a jury of any kind, and

transferring these judicial functions to the equites, or knights, an order of men below the dignity of mouators, but yet who had to be possessed of a certain amount of wealth to be eligible to the order. By this measure, Caius bound to himself the whole body of the knights.

But these attacks upon the Senate successful though they were, and these favors to the knights, were of no direct benefit to the people; therefore to maintain his position with them, Caius was obliged to do something that would be so directly in their favor that there could be no mistaking it. It was not enough that he should restore the land law that had been secured by his brother. That law, even while it was being worked at its best, was satisfactory to but few of its beneficiaries. The law was restored, it is true, but the prospect of leaving Rome and going perhaps to some distant part of Italy to engage in hard work, was not much of a temptation to men who had spent any length of time in Rome, involved in its political strifes, and whose principal desire was to obtain money and the means of subsistence with as little work as possible. It required something more than the restoration of the land law to satisfy these, and Caius granted it.

With the “enthusiastic clapping” of every pair of poor hands in Rome, he secured the passage of a law decreeing that there should be established in Rome, public granaries to be filled and maintained at the cost of the State, and that from these the wheat should be sold to the poor citizens at a merely nominal price. This law applied only to Rome, because in Rome the elections were held. “The effect was to gather into the city a mob of needy, unemployed voters, living on the charity of the State, to crowd the circus and to clamor at the elections, available no doubt immediately to strengthen the hands of the popular tribune, but certain in the long run to sell themselves to those who could bid highest for their voices.” — Froude.^{F8} We have already seen that the only stock in trade of the poor citizen was his vote and the effect of this law was greatly to increase the value of that commodity; because as now he was virtually supported by the State, he became more nearly independent, and could easily devote more time to political agitation, and could demand larger returns for his influence and his vote. But Caius carried his law, and so bound to himself, and greatly multiplied, too, the mass of voters in Rome; and having secured the support of both the knights and the populace, he carried all before him, and was even re-elected to the Tribunate, and could have been elected the third time; but he proposed a scheme that estranged the mob, and his power departed.

He proposed that in different parts of the empire, Roman colonies should be established with all the privileges of Roman citizenship, and one of these places was Carthage. That city, while it existed, had always been the greatest earthly menace to Rome, and when it had been reduced to ashes and the Roman plowshare drawn over it, it was cursed forever. And now the mere suggestion to restore it was magnified by Caius's enemies to a height that made the proposition appear but little short of treason. This of itself, however, might not have defeated him; but if this colonization scheme was carried out, many of the populace would have to leave Rome and go to some distant part of the empire: and worse than all else, they would have to work. No longer could they be fed at the public expense and spend their lives in the capital, in the whirl of political excitement and the amusements of the Roman circus. Even to contemplate such a prospect was intolerable; still more, and as though Caius deliberately designed to add insult to injury, he proposed to bestow the franchise upon all the freemen of Italy. This would be only to cut down in an unknown ratio the value of the votes of those who now possessed the franchise. Such a calamity as that never could be borne. The course of the Senate might have been one of misrule, but this of Caius Gracchus was fast developing into unbearable despotism. The election day came, riots were raised, and Caius Gracchus and three thousand of his friends were killed, as had been his brother and his friends ten years before.

The mob having now no leader, the Senate resumed its sway as before, and went on in the same old way, except that the laws actually passed by Caius had to stand. It was not long, however, before the Senate was put to a test which effectually exposed its utter incompetency to rule the Roman State. West of the Carthaginian province of Rome, lay the kingdom of Numidia, over which the Roman power extended its protectorate. Micipsa was king. He had two sons, Hiempsal and Adherbal, and an illegitimate nephew, Jugurtha. Micipsa died B.C. 118, and left his kingdom jointly to the three young men. Jugurtha at once murdered Hiempsal, and attacked Adherbal. Adherbal appealed to Rome, but Jugurtha had already made himself safe with the Senate. The Senate sent out commissioner, Jugurtha bribed them, and they went home again. Jugurtha pushed the war, Adherbal was taken, and was killed after having been tortured almost to death. After the capture of Adherbal and his forces, some Roman citizens had also been taken, and after their surrender, they too were killed. This raised such a cry at Rome that the Senate was compelled at least to

promise an investigation; but as no results were to be seen, one of the tribunes openly told the people that there were men in the Senate who were bribed. At this the popular indignation began to show itself so strongly that the Senate dared no longer to brave it, and declared war on Jugurtha. An army was sent to Africa in command of a consul. Jugurtha bribed the consul, and secured a peace on the payment of a small fine. Memmius, the same tribune who before had the courage openly to charge the Senate with taking bribes, again openly exposed in the Forum this last piece of rascality. The Senate saw the storm gathering, and once more bestirred itself to the extent of calling Jugurtha to Rome. This was only to increase the opportunities of both Jugurtha and themselves. Jugurtha came laden with gold, and in addition to the Senate which he already owned, he bribed every one of the tribunes, except Memmius, who was proof against all his blandishments. Jugurtha had been called to Rome under a safe-conduct, and he was at last ordered back home, but the cause was not yet settled. The Senate sent over another army. But Rome had as yet no standing army, and there had now been peace so long that the old military discipline of the citizens had completely run down. The men who were enlisted were wholly ignorant of military duty, and the officers, appointed mostly from among the rich young nobles, were more illy prepared for war than were the men. The army went to Africa, and in about two months the half of it was destroyed, and the other half captured, by Jugurtha. About the same time, two armies were destroyed by the Gauls up on the Rhone. ("While the great men at Rome were building palaces, inventing new dishes, and hiring cooks at unheard-of salaries, the barbarians were at the gates of Italy." — Froude.^{F9}

This combination of disgraces and dangers gave such force to the popular complaints against the Senate, that it was at last aroused to a determination really to do something, and the best man that could be found — Caecilius Metellus — was appointed to lead a new expedition against Jugurtha. Metellus having it in mind to put an end to the Jugurtha. War, chose as his second in command the ablest general that he could find, Caius Marius. Arrived in Numidia, the Roman army was successful in several battles, and Jugurtha asked for peace; but as Metellus demanded unconditional surrender, and could not be bribed, Jugurtha drew his forces into the desert, and caused the war to drag along. As the time for the election of a consul for the next drew on, Marius's name was mentioned as the candidate of the people. It was the law that the candidate must be present

at the election, and Marius obtained the consent of Metellus to go to Rome. Election day came, B.C. 107, and although the aristocracy did all they could to defeat him, Marius was elected — the first instance in a hundred years in which a consul had been chosen from the people. Metellus was recalled, and Marius was given sole command in the war with Jugurtha. He first set on foot a thorough reorganization of the military power of Rome. Up to this time, the Roman armies had been but a militia — citizens called from their various occupations for service upon emergency, and returning to their occupations as soon as the occasion was past which made their services necessary. Marius enlisted men to become professional soldiers. These he thoroughly drilled, and reduced to the strictest discipline. Thus originated the standing army of Rome, which out of the corruptions of the times at last arose to a military despotism. With such an army of well trained and well disciplined troops, Marius, before the next year was ended, had brought the Jugurthine War to a triumphant close, and Jugurtha himself was brought in chains to Rome.

Marius had barely ended the trouble in Numidia, before all his skill and all the valor of his well trained legions, were urgently demanded to turn back the tide of barbarians, — Cimbri and Teutons, — which in two mighty streams of hundreds of thousands each, was pouring into Italy. While Marius was in Africa, the largest army that Rome had ever sent against an enemy, was by these savages swept out of existence, B.C. 107. But although the generalship of Marius was now urgently needed — B.C. 104 — his consulship had expired, and there was no precedent for electing the same person consul a second time. In times of imminent danger it was in the province of the Senate to suspend the constitution, declare the State in danger, and appoint a dictator. But as Marius was the favorite of the populace, it was known by all that should the Senate exercise its prerogative, it would never appoint him as the dictator; and it was also known by all that Marius was the only man who could save the State. Therefore, the people took the power into their own hands again, and virtually suspended the constitution by electing Marius consul the second time, B.C. 104.

The barbarians, however, did not come at once into Italy. By some cause their erratic course was turned aside, and they swept through southern Gaul, across the Pyrenees into Spain, over northern Spain to the Atlantic, up the coast into Gaul again, across Gaul to the Seine and even to the Rhine; and then gathering fresh force from their brethren from the wilds of

Germany, the torrent rolled once more toward Italy. In this wild raid two years were consumed. In Rome the people still held sway, and Marius was elected consul a third time, and even a fourth time. He put the two years to good use in perfecting the efficiency of his legions, and drawing them up to the borders of Italy. He met the Teutons even beyond the Alps, and annihilated the whole host, July 20, B.C. 102. The Cimbri by another route passed the Alps and forced back as far as the Po, the legions under Catulus. Marius, in his absence, was elected consul the fifth time, and continued in command. He came to the rescue of Catulus. The Cimbri were utterly destroyed (B.C. 101, summer), and Italy was saved. Marius was the idol of the people; they prided themselves upon saving the country by him, and they elected him consul the sixth time, B.C. 100.

But Rome was no sooner free once more from the danger of a foreign foe, than by civil strife and political violence she began to prey again upon her own vitals. Besides Marius, the two favorites of the people just at this time were Saturninus, a tribune, and Glaucia, a praetor. With these Marius allied himself. They were all powerful, and passed,

- (1) another land law dividing up portions of the public domain among the veterans of Marius;
- (2) a law establishing colonies in Sicily, Achaia, and Macedonia;
- (3) a law reducing as low as two cents a peck, the price of wheat from the public granaries; and,
- (4) to cap it all, they passed a vote that all the senators should take an oath to execute these laws under penalty of fine and expulsion from the Senate.

All this was done in the midst of riot, tumult, and bloodshed. Metellus alone, of all the senators, refused to take the oath to execute these laws. Saturninus had him dragged out of the Senate house and expelled from the city. Yet there was not entire harmony in the popular party. There were rival candidates and consequent jealousies. Saturninus and Glaucia were in the full tide of success, and would brook no rivals. Memmius stood for the consulship at the same time that Glaucia was a candidate for that office. As it appeared that Memmius would be elected, he was murdered. At this, both Saturninus and Glaucia were declared public enemies. They took refuge in the capitol, and barricaded it. The aristocrats laid siege to them;

Marius interceded, and they surrendered to him. They were confined in an apartment of the Senate house to be held for trial. The aristocrats tore off the roof, and pelted them to death with stones and tiles.

It will be remembered that in the tribunate of Caius Gracchus — B.C. 123 — the corruption of justice by the senators had made it necessary to deprive them of the right to sit on juries, and that this privilege was bestowed upon the knights. Yet within about thirty years the same evil had grown to such a height among the knights as to call loudly for a reform. Accordingly, in B.C. 91 Marcus Divius Drusus, a tribune, brought forward a proposal to reform the law courts, and thereby incurred the deadly enmity of the whole Equestrian order. With this he proposed both new land laws and new corn laws, which increased the hatred of the senatorial order toward the populace. These laws were passed, but the Senate declared them null and void. Drusus had also entered into negotiations with the Italians to secure for them Roman citizenship. He was denounced in the Senate house as a traitor, and on his way home was assassinated.

The Italians seeing their last hope was gone, rose in rebellion, and set about to form a new State of their own to be called Italia. They had long borne an equal share in the burdens of the State; they had helped to subdue Jugurtha, and had borne an important part in the defeat of the barbarian host. They were now determined that if they were to bear an equal share in the burdens of the State, they would have a voice, too, in the affairs of the State; and if they could not have it in the Roman State, they would have it in one of their own. Rome was determined not to allow this if she could avoid it. But in the war which followed, the first campaigns were disastrous to the Roman arms, and although some successes were afterwards gained, they were not decisive; she soon found her treasury empty, and found disaffection springing up in districts that had not revolted. Drusus had been murdered in 91; the war for the franchise immediately followed, and Rome's dangers and distresses became so threatening that in the latter part of the year 90, a law was passed granting the franchise to all the Italian communities which should within sixty days hand in their names to the praetor in Rome; and a third law was passed shortly afterward empowering the Roman magistrates in the field to bestow the franchise upon all who would receive it. In this way the forces of the insurgents were so weakened that the war was soon closed.

The close of war in the field was only the signal for the renewal of strife in the political arena of the city. All the old quarrels were renewed with increased bitterness, and the lately enfranchised Italians were a new element in the strife. Their voting power was incorporated with that of tribes already existing, which was only to rob them of a large share of the value of their votes. This made them discontented from the very beginning. Added to all the bitterness of factions, and the rivalries of all classes who had any political power at all, there was now wide-spread distress and ruin that affected all classes. And besides all this, Mithradates, king of Pontus, taking advantage of the social war in Italy, had set out to reduce all the East in subjection to himself. The Roman governors had made such a tyrannical use of their power that all the provinces of the East were ready to revolt at the first fair opportunity that offered. The fleets of Mithradates, coming out over the Black Sea, poured through the Hellespond and the Dardanelles into the Grecian Archipelago. All the islands, and the provinces of Ionia, Caria, and Lydia, taking advantage of this, rose at once in determined revolt, and put to death many thousands of the Roman residents. Not only the governors, but the merchants, the bankers, and the farmers of the taxes, with their families, were promiscuously murdered.

Mithradates himself, with a powerful army, followed close upon the success of his fleet, crossed the Bosphorus, and penetrated into Greece, which received him as a deliverer. All this compelled Rome to declare war upon Mithradates; but this was only to deepen her own local contests; because there was bitter rivalry and contention as to who should command the armies to be sent against Mithradates. Marius was still a great favorite, but there was now a strong rival to his popularity in the person of Lucius Cornelius Sulla. Sulla had been one of Marius's best assistants in putting an end to the Jugurthine War, and also in defeating the Teutons and the Cimbri. He made himself the favorite of the soldiers by allowing them to indulge "in plundering and in all kinds of license." Before the social war he had already made one journey into the East with an army, had defeated one of the generals of Mithradates, had restored, for a time, order in the Eastern provinces, and had received an embassy from the Parthians, which was sent to solicit an alliance with Rome, B.C. 92. He returned to Rome in 91, and both he and Marius were given command in the war with the Italians. Sulla's success was more marked than that of Marius, and there were not those lacking who would stir up jealousy between the two commanders by claiming that Marius's success against Jugurtha and the

barbarians was more owing to the abilities of Sulla than to his own. Sulla was one of the aristocracy, — “a patrician of the purest blood,” — but he had made an immense bid for the favor of the populace by exhibiting in the arena a hundred African lions.

Everybody in Rome, and, for that matter, in all Italy, knew that the contest for the command of the troops in the Mithradatic War, lay between Marius and Sulla; and every one knew that the contest stood, Sulla and the Senatorial party against Marius and the people. The contest deepened, and it was more and more evident that, in the existing state of things, it could not be decided without a crisis. A tribune — Sulpicius Rufus — proposed for adoption a series of laws:

- (1) that Marius should be given command in the Mithradatic War;
- (2) that more power should be given to the newly-made citizens and more value to their votes, by increasing the number of tribes, and distributing the new citizens through all the tribes;
- (3) that any senator who was in debt more than 2000 denarii (about \$300), should lose his seat;
- (4) and that those who had been banished on suspicion of having encouraged the Italian revolt should be recalled.

These proposals only made the confusion of parties worse confounded. The proposal to give Marius the command pleased the great majority of the people; that in favor of the new citizens, secured the influence of all these, but the proposal to increase the power of their votes was bitterly opposed by the old voters, because it would lessen the value of their own votes. The proposal to unseat such of the senators as should come within the provisions of the law, was only to raise the whole Senate to war by attempting to curtail its power; and again, the proposal in favor of Marius only aroused both the Senate and Sulla to the most determined opposition. But through it all it soon became evident that Rufus would carry his whole scheme. The consuls, — Sulla was one of them, — to prevent the legislation, proclaimed the day a public holiday. Rufus armed his party and drove the consuls from the Forum, compelled them to withdraw the proclamation of a holiday, and carried his laws. But Sulla put himself at the head of his soldiers and marched them into the city, and “for the first time a Roman consul entered the city of Rome at the head of the legions of the

republic.” There was resistance, but it was utterly vain. Marius escaped to Africa, Rufus was taken and killed, and twelve others of the popular leaders put to death without a trial. Sulla, at the head of his troops and supported by the Senate, settled affairs to suit himself, and with his legions departed for the East in the beginning of the year 87 B. C.

Sulla was no sooner well out of Italy than one of the consuls — Cinna — put himself at the head of the people, and proposed to carry out the laws of Rufus. The new citizens had assembled in crowds to exercise their right of voting. The other consul, standing for Sulla and the Senate, brought out an armed force, and commanded the assembled voters to disperse; and because they refused, they were hewn down where they stood, and “the Forum was heaped high with the bodies of the slain.” “Such a scene of slaughter had never been witnessed in Rome since the first stone of the city was laid.” — Froude.^{f10} Cinna and the tribunes fled, but it was to gather together the soldiers as Sulla had done before them. Marius, too, returned with a thousand cavalry from Numidia, and he had no sooner stepped ashore in Italy than he was joined by five thousand of his veterans, and with his six thousand men he united with Cinna at the gates of Rome. The Senate had made preparations for a vigorous defense, and, in order to prevent the threatened attack, issued proclamations, making every concession, and granting every privilege that had been demanded. But all was to no purpose. They could not be trusted. Marius and Cinna pressed forward, and after a brief resistance, the city was surrendered, and the two generals entered with their troops. A fearful massacre followed. Fifty senators and a thousand knights were slain, besides great numbers of their partisans, and for many days the city was given up to a reign of terror. These were the last days of the year 87 B.C. Marius died January 13, 86. Cinna, supported by his troops, became virtually dictator, and ruled Rome for three years.

Sulla was everywhere successful against Mithradates, and in the year 84 a peace was concluded, in which Mithradates was reduced to the position of a vassal of Rome. In 83 Sulla determined to return to Italy, which under Cinna’s rule had been almost entirely turned against him. The Italians dreaded to have Sulla return, and Cinna started to go into Greece with his forces to meet Sulla there, but his troops mutinied and killed him, and Sulla was in a short time landed in Italy with 40,000 veteran troops, who had not yet known defeat. Sulla was joined by Pompey with a legion which he had raised. The defeat of Cinna had dissolved the unity of the parties in Italy,

yet it took Sulla about a year to bring all the country into subjection. As soon as he had made his position secure, he entered upon a course of continuous and systematic murder of all who had in any way given support to Cinna or Marius. He had the Senate to appoint him dictator, which made him master of everything and everybody in Italy.

“He at once outlawed every magistrate, every public servant of any kind, civil or municipal, who had held office under the rule of Cinna. Lists were drawn for him of the persons of wealth and consequence all over Italy who belonged to the liberal party. He selected agents whom he could trust, or supposed he could trust, to enter the names for each district. He selected, for instance, Oppianicus of Larino, who inscribed individuals whom he had already murdered, and their relations whose prosecution he feared. It mattered little to Sylla^{f11} who were included, if none escaped who were really dangerous to him; and an order was issued for the slaughter of the entire number, the confiscation of their property, and the division of it between the informers and Sylla’s friends and soldiers. Private interest was thus called in to assist political animosity; and to stimulate the zeal for assassination, a reward of 5001 was offered for the head of any person whose name was in the schedule.... Four thousand seven hundred persons fell in the proscription of Sylla, all men of education and fortune. The real crime of many of them was the possession of an estate or a wife which a relative or a neighbor coveted. The crime alleged against all was the opinion that the people of Rome and Italy had rights which deserved consideration as well as the senators and nobles. The liberal party were extinguished in their own blood. Their estates were partitioned into a hundred and twenty thousand allotments, which were distributed among Sylla’s friends, or soldiers, or freedmen. The land reform of the Gracchi was mockingly adopted to create a permanent aristocratic garrison. There were no trials, there were no pardons. Common report or private information was at once indictment and evidence, and accusation was in itself condemnation.” — Froude.^{f12}

Reform was popular, and Sulla must needs be a reformer; but his was a reformation which aimed to make the Senate both supreme and absolute. He had already, while consul in 88, crippled the power of both the tribunes and the people, by passing a law that no proposal should be made to the

assembly without the sanction of the Senate; and now the value of the office of tribune was lowered by the provision that any one who should become a tribune should never afterward be chosen to any other office. In another form, also, he lessened the power of the people; he enacted a law that no man should be elected consul who was not forty-three years old, and who had not already been a praetor or a quaestor, and that no one should be made consul a second time within ten years. He also took entirely away from the knights the right of sitting as the court of justice, and restored to the Senate this privilege. As in the matter of the election of tribunes and consuls he had so far deprived the people of the exercise of their power, he now went farther, and enacted a law that the assembly of the people should not even be called together without the Senate's sanction. But the heaviest stroke of all that he made against the populace was to abolish entirely the grants of grain, and to shut up the public granaries.

Thus the power of the Senate was made absolute, and to render it secure, ten thousand slaves were enfranchised and formed into a senatorial guard. But in the existing order of things, it was impossible that such power could be respected, or that it could long be exercised. The only means by which Sulla was enabled to create such a power at all, was the army which was so entirely devoted to himself.

From this time forth, in the very nature of things, it became more and more certain that the army would be the real source of power; that whosoever should have the support of the strongest body of troops would possess the power; and that just as soon as that power should be turned against the Senate instead of for it, all this system which had been so carefully built up would be scarcely more tangible than the stuff that dreams are made of. Sulla himself had set the example in 88, it had been readily followed by Cinna in 87, it was repeated here by Sulla in 81, and he himself saw in Pompey a readiness to follow it this same year.

Pompey had been sent to Sicily and Africa to reduce things to order there, and he was eminently successful. When he had completed his task, he was ordered by the Senate to disband his troops. He refused, and Sulla had to smooth the matter over by granting him a triumph, and allowing him to assume the title of "the Great," although he was only about twenty-five years of age. By this act of Pompey's Sulla saw that it would be the best thing to do, to bind Pompey securely to himself. Pompey was already

married to Antistia, a lady whose father had been murdered for standing up for Sulla, and whose mother had been driven mad, and to destroy herself, by her husband's terrible fate. But Sulla had a stepdaughter, Emilia, whom he proposed that Pompey should marry. Emilia was already married, and was pregnant at the time, yet at Sulla's invitation Pompey divorced Antistia, and married Emilia. There was just then another youth in Rome whom it was to Sulla's interest to gain also, and he proposed to secure his allegiance in much the same way that he had gained Pompey's. That youth was Julius Caesar.

Caesar was the nephew of the great Marius, and had married Cornelia, the daughter of Cinna, by whom he had a daughter named Julia. He was at this time about twenty years of age. Sulla proposed to him that he should divorce Cornelia, and marry some woman whom Sulla should choose. Caesar flatly refused. Sulla tried to compel him to it: he deprived him of his office of the priesthood, he took his wife's dowry from him, and confiscated his estate. But Caesar would not yield an inch. Next Sulla hired assassins to kill him, and he escaped only by bribing the assassins. Caesar's friends interceded, and finally obtained his pardon; but he, not willing to trust himself within Sulla's reach, left Italy, and joined the army in Asia. In 79 Sulla resigned his dictatorship, and died the following year.

The power which Sulla had given to the Senate was only used to build up itself. As no election could be had without the appointment of the Senate, the elections soon fell under the control of senatorial rings and committees, and no candidate could hope to succeed who had not the favor of the Senate; and the surest means of securing the favor of the senatorial party was the possession of wealth, and a willingness to spend it to secure an office.

The distribution of the land by Sulla had worked no better than had that by the Gracchi, nor in fact hardly as well; because since that there had been forty years of degeneracy and political violence, and a part of the time almost anarchy. Extravagance in living had increased at a rapid rate among all classes: among the really wealthy, in an ostentatious display, or the exhaustion of pleasure; among those of moderate fortunes in an effort to ape the ways of the wealthy; and even among the poor, owing to the virtually free distribution of wheat. For so long as they could get the main part of their living for nothing, they were not likely to cultivate habits of economy. It was easy enough to distribute land to those who had neither

land nor money. The difficulty was to keep it so distributed. Those to whom Sulla had distributed land, especially his soldiers, lived far beyond their means; their lands were soon mortgaged, and at last forfeited, falling once more into the hands of the wealthy land owners, to be worked by slaves, while the free citizens were again crowded into the cities. Besides the vast numbers of slaves who were put to use on farms and in shops all over Italy, there were many who were kept and trained to fight one another in the amphitheater, solely for the amusement of the populace. Nothing made a person so popular as to set forth a few pairs of gladiators in the circus to murder one another. At Capua, about seventy-five miles south of Rome, was the most famous training-school for gladiators. In the year 73 B. C., two hundred of these gladiators, led by Spartacus, broke away from their "stables" in Capua, and were soon joined by escaped slaves from all the surrounding country, in such numbers that in a little while Spartacus found himself at the head of 70,000 men ready for any sort of desperate action. For two years they spread terror from one end of Italy to the other, till Pompey and Crassus led forth an army, and annihilated the whole host, B.C. 71. Spartacus was killed, sword in hand, and 6,000 captives were crucified all along the highway from Capua to Rome.

Pompey and Crassus were made consuls for the year 70, Sulla's legislation was undone, and everything set back as it was before, except that the prerogative of sitting as a court of law was not restored entirely to the knights. This privilege the senators had again prostituted to their old purposes, and as the knights could not be fully trusted either, the court was now to be composed of two-thirds knights and one-third senators. The power of the tribunes was fully restored, also the right of the populace to assemble at their own wish. The public granaries were once more opened. The mob was happy, the Senate was embittered, and the way was again opened for the full tide of political violence which immediately followed.

Caesar was now fast becoming popular. He and Bibulus had been elected aediles for the year 65, the office of which was to take charge of the public buildings and the games and theaters. "They were expected to decorate the city with new ornaments, and to entertain the people with magnificent spectacles." Caesar acquitted himself so well in this as to make himself the favorite of the whole multitude of the people. Then as he felt his influence becoming more firmly established, he set on foot an inquiry into the proscription that had been carried on by Sulla. A committee of investigation was appointed, of which Caesar himself was made chairman.

At the time when the roof of the Senate house had been torn off, and Saturninus and Glaucia were pelted to death with tiles, in Saturninus, the father of Titus Labienus had been killed. One of those engaged in the massacre at the time was Rabirius, and although he was now a very old man, Labienus prosecuted him before Caesar's committee for the murder of his father. Rabirius was convicted, but he appealed to the people, who could not see their way clear to convict him of a guilt that was common to the whole aristocracy; and although he was acquitted, they chose to show to the senatorial party that it was out of no respect to them. The people decided to make Caesar the head of religion by electing him to the office of Pontifex Maximus, which became vacant just at this time. This was the greatest honor that could come to a Roman citizen. The office was for life, and until now had always been held by members of the aristocracy, and Sulla had sought to confine it exclusively to these by giving to the sacred college the privilege of electing its own chief. Labienus being tribune, had succeeded in carrying a vote in the assembly by which this privilege was resumed by the people. To fill the vacancy which now occurred, two of the aristocracy were presented by the senatorial party, and Caesar was nominated by the people. Immense sums of money were spent by the senatorial party to buy sufficient votes to elect one or the other of their two candidates. Caesar likewise spent money freely, although deeply in debt already. When he left home for the Forum on the morning of the election day, and his mother kissed him good-by, he told her he would either come home Pontifex Maximus or would not come home at all. Such an extreme alternative, however, was not necessary, because he was elected by a vote larger than that of both the other candidates put together. This was in the year 63, and soon afterward Caesar was elected praetor for the next year.

The land monopoly had again become as notorious as at any time before. The small proprietors had sold, out and large holdings had increased, until the land had fallen into a few hands, and Rome was crowded with a rabble of poor citizens largely fed at public expense. Against the will of the Senate, and by the unanimous voice of the people, Pompey had been sent, B.C. 72, to the East against Mithradates, who had again strongly asserted his power. Pompey was victorious everywhere, and his conquests in the East had brought to the State large quantities of land, and his honest conduct in these affairs had filled the treasury with money. Here was a grand opportunity for reform. Rullus, a tribune, brought forward a proposition that part of the territory acquired by Pompey should be sold,

and the money used to buy land in Italy upon which to settle poor citizens from Rome. Cicero, as consul, opposed it strenuously. He railed on Rullus with all the bitterness his abusive tongue could utter. Rullus had stated that the populace of Rome was become so powerful as to be dangerous, and that for the good of the State it would be proper that some should be removed from the city, and placed upon lands where they could support themselves. This was all true, as Cicero well knew; yet he hesitated not a moment to curry favor with these, by setting it before them in as objectionable a light as possible in order to defeat the aim of Rullus. Cicero hated the influence of the people as much as anybody else in Rome, but he hated Rullu's proposition more because it would lessen the power of the aristocracy, whose favor he just now longed for more than for anything else; he therefore pretended to be the friend of the people and to be defending them against the ulterior scheme of Rullus. He succeeded. Rullu's bill was defeated, and his plan came to nothing. And had his plan even succeeded it would likewise have come to nothing; because now the cry had become popular and was becoming more and more imperative — "Bread for nothing, and games forever!"

CHAPTER 2.

THE TWO TRIUMVIRATES.

THE senators held office for life, and therefore the Senate was always in possession of power; while owing to the fact that the elections were annual, the power of the people was but spasmodic at the best. Whenever some extraordinary occasion, or some leader who could carry the multitude with him, arose, the people would awake and carry everything before them. But when the particular occasion was past, or the leader fallen, the people would drop back into the old easy way, though there was scarcely ever an election without a riot, and the Senate would gradually regain all its former power; each time only using it the more despotically, in revenge for the checks which had been put upon it, and the insults which it had received. With politics, as it had universally become, it was inevitable and in fact essential, that there should arise a power constantly active, which should balance that of the Senate, and hold in check its despotic tendencies. This power, as had already appeared, lay in the army. But the army must be led. Consequently the logic of the situation was that a coalition should be formed representing the different classes of the people, but depending upon the army for support. Such a coalition was demanded by the times and events, and was actually created in B.C. 60.

Pompey's work was done in the East, and in December 62 B. C., he returned to Rome to display and enjoy such a triumph as had never before been seen on earth. A long train of captive princes of the conquered countries as trophies of his victories, and wagons laden with all manner of treasure as an offering to the State, followed the triumphant general as he returned to the capital. A triumphal column was erected in his honor, with an inscription which declared "that Pompey, 'the people's general,' had in three years captured fifteen hundred cities, and had slain, taken, or reduced to submission twelve million human beings." The offerings which he brought filled the treasury to overflowing, and the income from the countries subdued made the annual revenue of the republic double what it had been before. All this was lost upon the Senate, however, except to deepen its jealousy of Pompey. By a special vote, indeed, he "was permitted to wear his triumphal robe in the Senate as often and as long as it

might please him;” but with this the Senate proposed that favors to Pompey should cease.

At the border of Italy Pompey had disbanded his troops, and he entered Rome as a private citizen, with only his political influence to sustain him. And just here Pompey failed. Although he was every inch a general, he was no politician. He could victoriously wield an army, but he could do nothing with a crowd. He could command legions, but could not command votes. More than this, during his absence, the senatorial party had employed the time in strenuous efforts and by all means in their power, to destroy his influence in the city, and to create jealousy and distrust between Caesar and Pompey. When Pompey had departed for Asia, it was with the friendship of Caesar, whose influence had helped to secure his appointment. During Pompey’s absence, Caesar’s influence and popularity had constantly increased in Rome. He held the people’s favor, and Pompey held the military power. The senatorial party decided, if possible, to divide this power by estranging Pompey and Caesar from one another. The tale was carried to Pompey that his wife, Mucia, had been seduced by Caesar.

This accomplished its intended purpose, and Pompey divorced her. Pompey’s prompt action in disbanding his troops at the border of Italy had relieved the Senate from dread of his military power; yet Pompey’s troops, although disbanded, and of no force as a military power, were an important element in the elections, so long as Pompey could retain their sympathies.

Pompey asked that his acts in Asia might be ratified, but the Senate and its partisans, though not openly refusing to do so, raised so many questions and created so many delays as to amount in effect to a refusal. He also asked that public lands might be distributed to his soldiers, and this also was so successfully opposed as to defeat him. He then attempted to gain his wishes by political influence and action. By the free use of money he secured the election of both the consuls for the year 60 B. C.; but he was disappointed in both. One had not sense enough to be a consul, and the other, Metellus Celer, was the brother of Mucia, whom Pompey had divorced, and under pretense had only lent himself to Pompey in order to take revenge for the reproach thus cast upon his sister. Celer immediately went over to the senatorial party, and engaged in the most violent opposition to Pompey. The tribune Flavius, who had proposed Pompey’s measures, went so far as to seize Celer, and put him in prison. Celer called the senators to his cell to deliberate there. The tribune set up his tribunal at

the prison door, so that the senators might not enter; but the senators had the prison walls torn down, and went in in spite of the tribune.

The Senate, not content with estranging Pompey and Caesar from one another, and openly insulting Pompey besides, proceeded to offend Caesar. At the close of Caesar's praetorship, — at the end of 62 B. C., — the province of Further Spain had been assigned him. But he was in debt two hundred and fifty millions of sesterces — about twelve millions of dollars. To pay his debts and make the necessary preparations for his journey to Spain, he borrowed from Crassus eight hundred and thirty talents — nearly thirteen millions of dollars. The senatorial party, however, endeavored to prevent his departure from Rome, and a decree was passed to the effect that the praetors should not go to their provinces until certain important questions of State and religion had been finally settled. Caesar knew that this was aimed at him, and therefore in defiance of the decree he went at once to his province, and put himself at the head of the legions there. This was the first real opportunity that Caesar had ever had to prove his ability as a military leader, and he acquitted himself well. "He thus effected the complete subjugation of the districts of Lusitania north of the Tagus, including the wild fastnesses of the Herminian Mountains and the rapid waters of the Durius. Brigantium in Galicia, protected on the land side by the difficult character of the surrounding country, he attacked with a naval armament, and erected his victorious standard at the furthest extremity of his province." — Merivale.^{f13}

The complete conquest of his province, and the settlement of its civil administration upon a permanent basis, were all accomplished in a little more than a year. His great success entitled him to a triumph, and he desired also to stand for the consulship during the ensuing year. He addressed the Senate soliciting the award of the triumph which he had justly earned. The Senate knew that he wanted also to be a candidate for the consulship. The law was that no general to whom was granted a triumph should come into Rome until the time of triumphal entry, which time was to be fixed by the Senate; and the custom, which had the force of law, was that every candidate for the consulship must appear publicly in the Forum on three distinct occasions, and must be present personally in the Forum on the day of the election. The Senate designed to prevent Caesar's candidacy for the consulship by granting the triumph and setting the time on a day beyond the day of the election, thus keeping him out of the city, so that it would be impossible for him to be present in the Forum as a

candidate. This custom could be, and in fact had been, dispensed with on important occasions; but the Senate was very tenacious of both law and custom when they could be turned to its own advantage. Caesar applied to the Senate for a dispensation allowing him to be a candidate in his absence. The Senate would not grant it, and when Caesar's friends began to urge the matter, Cato defeated them by obtaining the floor and talking all the rest of the day. When Caesar learned of the determination of the Senate to shut him out of the consulship by granting a triumph on a day after the election, he checkmated their nicely-planned move. He renounced the triumph, went at once to Rome, went through the necessary forms, and appeared as a candidate for the consulship.

The Senate had now offended Pompey and embittered his soldiers, and had committed itself to open and determined hostility to Caesar. Pompey took in the situation, saw his opportunity, and acted upon it at once. He made overtures to Caesar, who received him willingly, and an alliance was formed. Caesar and Crassus were already firm friends, and had been working together for some time. But Crassus and Pompey were bitter enemies. Caesar's tact, however, soon tempered the feud, and reconciled the enmity. Caesar was the idol of the people; Pompey was the idol of the soldiers; and Crassus, the richest individual in the Roman world, represented the moneyed class, the farmers of the taxes, etc., who were not of the nobility. These three men covenanted together "that no proceedings should be allowed to take place in the commonwealth without the consent of each of the three contracting parties. United they constituted a power beyond all the resources of the commonwealth to cope with" — Merivale.^{f14} Thus

THE FIRST TRIUMVIRATE

became an accomplished fact, and though there were a few expiring struggles, the power of the Roman Senate was virtually gone forever.

Caesar was elected consul by acclamation; and only by the very desperation of bribery and corruption did the senatorial party succeed in electing Bibulus as his colleague. It was the custom, immediately upon the election of the consuls, to name the province which should be theirs at the expiration of the year of their office. The Senate sought to cast a slur upon Caesar by assigning to him the department of roads and forests. But he cared not for that, as he held the power of the State, and had a full year in which to use it before anything in that line was to be performed.

Caesar's consulship was for the year 59 B.C. The first act of his administration was to secure the publication of the proceedings of the Senate, that the people might know what was done therein. He next brought forward the land law for the reward of Pompey's veterans, which the Senate had already refused to allow. This measure, however, like that of Tiberius Gracchus, included thousands of the free citizens who had sold their lands and crowded into Rome. In the long interval since the repeal of the land law of Sulla, things had fallen back into the same old way. The public lands had fallen from those to whom the State had distributed them, to the great landed proprietors. Caesar's land law, like all those before it, proposed to buy the rights of these proprietors, as represented in their improvements, and distribute the lands among Pompey's veterans and several thousands of the unemployed population of the city. He showed to the Senate that there was plenty of money in the treasury, which Pompey's soldiers themselves had brought to the State, to supply all the land required under the act. The Senate would not listen. Cato took the lead in the opposition, and talked again for a whole day; he grew so violent at last that Caesar ordered the lictors to take him off to prison. Many of the senators followed Cato. As nothing could be done, however, Caesar ordered Cato to be set free, at the same time telling them that as they had refused to take part in legislation, henceforth he would present his propositions at once to the people. Bibulus, however, was owned by the Senate, and he as consul might obstruct and delay the proceeding in the assembly. Besides this, the Senate had bribed three tribunes to assist Bibulus.

Caesar did not hesitate. A day was appointed, and he presented his bill in the Forum, which before daylight the populace had filled to overflowing, to prevent the senatorial party from getting in. As Bibulus was consul, a passage was made for him through the crowd, and he took his place with Caesar on the porch of the temple of Castor and Pollux. Caesar stepped forward, and read from a tablet the proposed law, and turning to Bibulus asked if he had any fault to find with it. Bibulus answered that there should be no revolutions while he was consul, at which the assembly hissed. This made Bibulus yet more angry, and he burst out to the whole assembly, "During my year you shall not obtain your desire, not though you cried for it with one voice." Pompey and Crassus, though not officials, were both present. Caesar now signaled to them; they stepped forward, and he asked whether they would support the law. Pompey made a speech in which he declared that he spoke for his veterans and for the poor citizens, and that

he approved the law in every letter of it. Caesar then asked, "Will you then support the law if it be illegally opposed?" Pompey replied: "Since you, consul, and you, my fellow-citizens, ask aid of me, a poor individual without office and without authority, who nevertheless has done some service to the State, I say that I will bear the shield if others draw the sword."

At this, a mighty shout arose from the assembly. Crassus followed with a speech to the same purpose. He likewise was cheered to the echo. Bibulus rushed forward to forbid the vote to be taken. The bribed tribunes interposed their veto. Bibulus declared that he had consulted the auspices, — had read the sky, — and that they were unfavorable to any further proceeding that day, and declared the assembly dissolved. But the assembly had not come together to be dissolved by him, nor in any such way as that. They paid no attention. He then declared all the rest of the year to be holy time. This was met by a yell that completely drowned his voice. The assembly rushed upon the platform, pushed Bibulus off, broke his insignia of office, bandied him about with the bribed tribunes, and trampled upon them; but they were able to escape without serious injury. Then Cato took up the strain, pushed his way to the rostra, and began to rail at Caesar. He was met with a roar from the assembly that completely drowned his voice, and in a moment he was arrested and dragged away, raving and gesticulating. The law was then passed without a dissenting voice.

The next day Bibulus asked the Senate to pass a decree annulling the act of the assembly, but this failed. Cato, Celer, and Favonius openly refused to obey the law, upon which a second law was passed, making it a capital offense to refuse to swear obedience to the law. Bibulus then shut himself up in his own house, and refused to act as consul any more. This left the triumvirate absolute, with the actual power in Caesar's hands for the rest of the year. Pompey's soldiers had been provided for by the land law which had just been passed, and his acts in Asia were confirmed. In addition to this an act was passed in behalf of Crassus. The farmers of the taxes throughout the provinces had taken the contract at too high a price, and now they were not making as much as they expected. Crassus was the chief of all these, and an act was passed granting new terms. By these acts Caesar had more firmly bound to himself both Pompey and Crassus. He then proceeded more fully to gratify the people by a magnificent display of plays and games.

In legislation, the Senate was totally ignored; Caesar acted directly with the assembly of the people, and passed such laws as he pleased. Yet it must be said that he passed none that were not good enough in themselves, but they were laws which in fact meant nothing. There was no public character to sustain them, and consequently they were made only to be broken. There was a law for the punishment of adultery, when not only Caesar, but nine tenths of the people were ready to commit adultery, at the first opportunity. There were laws for the protection of citizens against violence, when every citizen was ready to commit violence at a moment's notice. There were laws to punish judges who allowed themselves to be bribed, when almost every man in Rome was ready both to offer and to receive bribes. There were laws against defrauding the revenue, when almost every person only desired an opportunity to do that very thing. There were laws against bribery at elections, when every soul in Rome from Caesar to the lowest one of the rabble that shouted in the Forum, was ready to bribe or to be bribed. "Morality and family life were treated as antiquated things among all ranks of society. To be poor was not merely the sorest disgrace and the worst crime, but the only disgrace and the only crime: for money the statemen sold the State, and the burgess sold his freedom; the post of the officer and the vote of the juryman were to be had for money; for money the lady of quality surrendered her person, as well as the common courtesan; falsifying of documents, and perjuries had become so common that in a popular poet of this age an oath is called 'the plaster for debts.' Men had forgotten what honesty was; a person who refused a bribe was regarded not as an upright man, but as a personal foe. The criminal statistics of all times and countries will hardly furnish a parallel to the dreadful picture of crimes — so varied, so horrible, and so unnatural." — Mommsen.^{F15} In this condition of affairs such laws were nothing more nor less than a legal farce.

Caesar's consulship was about to expire, and as above stated, when he was elected the Senate had named as his "province" the department of roads and forests instead of a province. As this was intended at the first to be only a slur upon Caesar, and as both he and the people fully understood it, the people set aside this appointment, and voted to Caesar for five years the command of Illyria, and Gaul within the Alps; but as there were some fears from the barbarians of Gaul beyond the Alps, a proposition was introduced to extend his province to include that. Pompey and Crassus heartily assented, and the Senate seeing that it would be voted to him any

way by the assembly, made a virtue of necessity, and bestowed this itself. Pompey now married Caesar's daughter Julia, which more firmly cemented the alliance while Caesar should be absent.

The triumvirate had been formed to continue for five years. As the term drew to a close, the triumvirate was renewed for five years more. Pompey and Crassus were made consuls for the year 55 B. C., with the understanding that while in office they should extend Caesar's command in Gaul for five years longer after the expiration of the first five; and that at the expiration of their consulate, Pompey should have Spain as his province, and Crassus should have Syria.

The first thing to be done the new consuls was to secure the assembly's indorsement of the triumvirs' arrangement of the provinces. This also the senators opposed by every means to the very last. Cato raved as usual, and when at the expiration of his allotted time he refused to sit down, he was dragged away by an officer, and the meeting adjourned. The next day the assembly came together again. When the senatorial party saw that the action of the triumvirs was to be ratified in spite of them, Cato and Atticus, a tribune, were lifted to men's shoulders, and the tribune cried out, as Bibulus on the like occasion formerly, that the skies were unfavorable, and the proceedings illegal. Other tribunes ordered the proceedings to go on, at which a riot began. Clubs and stones and swords and knives were freely used. The senatorial party were driven out, the arrangement of the provinces fully ratified, and the assembly dismissed. The people had no sooner gone out than the senatorial party came back, presented a motion for Caesar's recall, and proceeded to vote upon it. The assembly returned, and drove them out with more bloodshed, and certainly to prevent all question as to what had been done, passed a second time the motion upon Caesar's appointment.

Pompey, yet more to please the populace, dedicated a new theater, which would seat forty thousand people. It was decorated with marble and adorned with precious stones in such abundance as had never before been seen in Rome. The dedication with music, games, chariot races, and contests between men and beasts, continued five days, during which five hundred lions — one hundred each day — were turned loose in the arena only to be killed. Besides this, eighteen elephants were compelled to fight with bands of gladiators, the piteous cries of the poor creatures finding a response even in the savage sympathies of Romans.

By the strifes of parties, the election of consuls for the year 54 was prevented until the expiration of 55, and the consulates of Pompey and Crassus had expired. Crassus departed for the East. Pompey assumed command of the province of Spain, but instead of going to Spain, remained in Rome.

In 54, Pompey's wife, Caesar's daughter, died; in June 53 Crassus was killed in that memorable battle with the Parthians; and the triumvirate was dissolved. Pompey had now been so long separated from the army that his influence with the soldiery was almost gone, while Caesar's uninterrupted course of victory in Gaul had made him the idol of the army, as well as the pride of the people. The triumvirate was no sooner broken by the death of Crassus, than the Senate began earnestly to try to win Pompey, and compass Caesar's destruction. "No aristocracy was ever more short-sighted at the crisis of its fate than the once glorious patriciate of Rome. It clung desperately to its privileges, not from a fond regard to their antiquity, or their connection with any social or religious prejudices; disdained to invoke the watchwords of patriotism or utility; it took up its ground upon the enactments which Sulla had made to enhance its own wealth and power, and depress those of its rivals, and contended with its assailants upon purely selfish considerations. Without a policy and without a leader, the nobles went staggering onward in their blind conflict with the forces arrayed against them." — Merivale. ^{F16}

Pompey took his stand with the Senate. Although he was in Rome, he was really commander of the province of Spain, and was thus in possession of an army, though that army was at a distance. Under pretense of a need of troops in Syria against the Parthians who had defeated and slain Crassus, the Senate drew from Caesar two legions, and stationed them at Capua. A motion was then made in the Senate for Caesar's recall, and the appointment of his successor. But just then an obstacle presented itself which disconcerted all their plans. Scribonius Curio had been one of the most violent partisans of the senatorial party, and largely on account of this he had been elected tribune by the favor of the Senate. But Curio went over to the interests of Caesar. When the motion was made to appoint a successor to Caesar, Curio moved an amendment to the effect that Pompey be included, and that when Caesar was relieved of this command, Pompey should be relieved of his command also. This amendment met with such approval that it was accepted by an overwhelming majority, and the people were so jubilant that they strewed flowers in Curio's way as he returned

from the assembly. The adoption of this amendment completely blocked the effort of the Senate to depose Caesar.

Curio so persistently interposed his veto to all proceedings against Caesar, that at last an attempt was made to get rid of him. One of the censors pronounced him unworthy of a place in the Senate; the consul Marcellus put the question to vote, and it was defeated. Then the consul and his partisans dressed themselves in mourning, and went straight to Pompey; declared the city in danger; placed its safety in his hands; and gave him the two legions that were at Capua. Pompey refused to accept the charge unless it was sanctioned by the consuls who had been elected for the next year. These both confirmed the appointment, and promised their support when they should come into office. Caesar's enemies had now both an army and a commander. This being by the official act of the consular authority, WAS A CONFESSION THAT LEGAL GOVERNMENT WAS AT AN END, AND WAS VIRTUALLY THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GOVERNMENT ONLY BY MILITARY FORCE.

Curio's tribunate ended with the year 50, and he closed his term of office with an appeal to the people, in which he declared that justice was violated, that the reign of law was passed, and that a military domination reigned in the city. He then left the city, and went to Caesar, who was encamped at Ravenna with a legion.

The consuls for the year 49 were both avowed enemies to Caesar. Two of the tribunes for the year were Mark Antony and Cassius Longinus, — friendly to Caesar and ready to veto every proposition that appeared to be to his disadvantage. Caesar sent Curio back to Rome early in January with a letter in which he offered any one of three things:

- (1) That the agreement long before made should stand, and he be elected consul in his absence; or
- (2) that he would leave his army if Pompey would disband his troops; or
- (3) that he would surrender to a successor all Gaul beyond the Alps with eight of his ten legions, if he were allowed to retain his original province of Illyria and Northern Italy with two legions.

The consuls objected to the reading of the letter, but the demands of the tribunes prevailed. When it had been read through, the consuls prohibited

any debate upon it, and made a motion to consider the state of the republic. None of Caesar's propositions would be considered for a moment. Lentulus, one of the consuls, took the lead in urging prompt and determined action, and others followed to the same purpose. Some advised delay till they were better prepared; others advised that a deputation be sent to treat further with Caesar.

The majority supported Lentulus. It was moved that Caesar should dismiss his troops by a certain day which the Senate should name, and return to Rome as a private citizen, or be declared a public enemy. The two tribunes interposed their vetos on the ground that it had been decreed by the people that Caesar should be allowed to stand for the consulship in his absence; but their plea was totally disregarded, and the motion was passed almost unanimously. The tribunes then protested against the illegality of the proceedings, and cried aloud that they were refused the free exercise of their official prerogatives. The assembly in reply voted the State in danger; suspended the laws; ordered an immediate levy of troops; and gave the consuls sole power to provide for the public safety. The Senate next proposed to punish the two tribunes. They were given to understand that if they entered the Senate house, they would be expelled by force. They, with Curio, fled to Caesar. The consuls made Pompey commander-in-chief of the forces, and gave him the freedom of the public treasury. Pompey went to Capua to take charge of the two legions there, and organize the new levies.

When the news of these proceedings reached Caesar at Ravenna, he assembled his legions, and laid the whole matter before them. The Senate had satisfied itself with the pleasing illusion that Caesar's legions were so dissatisfied with him and discouraged by the long tedious campaigns in barbarous Gaul, that they only waited for a good opportunity to desert him in a body. But never had they been more mistaken than they were in this. The soldiers were ready to support him to the utmost. They not only offered to serve without pay, but actually offered him money for the expenses of the war. Only one officer out of the whole army failed him. This one slipped away secretly, and fled to Pompey, and Caesar sent all his baggage after him.

Caesar sent orders to Gaul beyond the Alps for two legions to follow him, and he set out toward Rome with the one legion — 5,000 men — that was with him. About twenty miles from Ravenna, a little stream called the

Rubicon formed part of the boundary between the territory of Rome proper and the provinces which had been assigned to Caesar. To cross this boundary with an armed force was to declare war; but as the Senate had already by its actions more than once openly declared war, Caesar had no hesitation in crossing the boundary. He passed it, and marched ten miles onward to Rimini. There he halted and waited for the two legions ordered from Gaul, one of which reached him about the end of January, and the other about the middle of February.

By the time that Caesar had reached Rimini, the rumor had reached Rome that he was coming, and a panic seized his enemies throughout the whole city. Their excited imaginations and guilty fears pictured him as coming with all his legions, accompanied by hosts of the terrible barbarians of Gaul, hurrying on by forced marches, nearer and yet nearer, and breathing forth fiery wrath. "Flight, instant flight, was the only safety. Up they rose, consuls, praetors, senators, leaving wives and children and property to their fate, not halting even to take the money out of the treasury, but contenting themselves with leaving it locked. On foot, on horseback, in litters, in carriages, they fled for their lives to find safety under Pompey's wing in Capua." — Froude.^{F17}

Instead of Caesar's marching toward Rome, however, he was waiting quietly at Rimini for his legions to come from Gaul, and his waiting there was working doubly to his advantage, to say nothing of the results of the panic-stricken fears of his enemies in Rome. Not only did the two legions come promptly from Gaul, but troops flocked to him from all the country around; and cities on the way to Rome began to declare for him, and were ready to open their gates as soon as he should arrive. Ahenobarbus, with a few thousand men, occupied a strong place in the mountains directly in Caesar's way. Caesar surrounded the place, and captured the whole body of them. He then let them all go. Ahenobarbus and some of his officers went away, but his troops declared for Caesar. As soon as Pompey and the nobles heard of the capture of Ahenobarbus and the desertion of these troops, they took up their flight again for Brundisium on the east coast of Italy, where they might take ships for Epirus. The greater part of them sailed away at once. Pompey remained with a portion of his army for the ships to return to take them away. Caesar hurried to Brundisium, where he arrived on the ninth of March. Pompey was there. Caesar asked for a meeting, but Pompey refused. Caesar began a siege, but the ships soon came, and Pompey and his army sailed away for Durazzo on the coast of

Epirus. Caesar had no ships, and could follow the fugitives no farther. He therefore went directly to Rome. She threw wide her gates to receive him.

The remains of the Senate was convened by the tribunes who had fled to Caesar, but it would do nothing. The assembly of the people voted him the money in the treasury. He took what he needed, and as Spain and the Mediterranean Coast of Gaul were yet subject to Pompey, he went in a few days to bring these into subjection. This was all accomplished before winter. He was made dictator in his absence. He returned to Rome in October. He appointed a day for the election of consuls for the year 48, and himself and Servilius Isauricus were chosen without opposition. Thus he was elected consul for the very year that had been promised him long before by the Senate and assembly, although the Senate had declared that he never should have it at all. The election of the other lawful magistrates soon followed, the form of legal government was restored, and he set out at once to find Pompey and the Senate. He marched to Brundisium, and sailed to Epirus. There he found that Pompey had gone to Macedonia. After much maneuvering, the armies met at Pharsalia in Thessaly, and Pompey's army was completely routed. Pompey fled to Egypt. Caesar followed closely; but Pompey had been murdered and beheaded before he had fairly landed, and only his head was preserved and rendered an unwelcome present to Caesar.

Caesar spent the time till the autumn of 47 setting things in order in Egypt and the East, then he returned to Rome. Finding that Pompey was dead, and that all hope of support from him was gone, Caesar's enemies in Rome became his most servile flatterers. Those who had plunged the State into civil war rather than allow him while absent to be even a candidate for the consulship, now in his absence made him dictator for a whole year, and were ready to heap upon him other preferences without limit.

A part of the year 46 was spent in subduing the opposing forces in Africa. This was soon accomplished, and the servile flatterers went on with their fawning adulations. Even before his return, the Senate voted in his favor a national thanksgiving to continue forty days. When he returned, they voted him not one triumph, but four, with intervals of several days between, and that his triumphal car should be drawn by white horses. They made him inspector of public morals for three years. And as though they would be as extravagant in their adulation as they had been in their condemnation, they voted him dictator for ten years, with the right to nominate the consuls and

praetors each year; that in the Senate his chair should always be between those of the two consuls; that he should preside in all the games of the circus; that his image carved in ivory should be borne in processions among the images of the gods, and be kept laid up in the capitol over against the place of Jupiter; that his name should be engraved on a tablet as the restorer of the capital; and finally that a bronze statue of him standing on a globe should be set up with the inscription, "Caesar, the Demi-god."

Caesar was not wanting in efforts to maintain the applause of the populace. He gave to each soldier about a thousand dollars, and to each citizen about twenty dollars, with house-rent free for a year; and provided a magnificent feast for the citizens, who were supported by the public grants of grain. Twenty-two thousand tables were spread with the richest viands, upon which the two hundred thousand State paupers feasted, while from hogsheads the finest wine flowed freely. Above all this he furnished the finest display of games and bloody battles of gladiators that had ever been seen. So great was it, indeed, and so bloody, and so long continued, that it fairly surfeited the savage Roman appetite; and the people began to complain that the vast sums of money spent on the shows would have been better employed in donations direct to themselves. Time and space would fail to tell of the numbers, the magnitude, and the magnificence of the buildings with which he adorned the city.

In the winter of 46-5 Caesar was compelled to go to Spain to reduce the last remains of the senatorial forces. This was accomplished before the month of April was passed, yet he did not return to Rome until September. As soon as the news of his victory reached Rome, however, the Senate, which sincerely hoped he would be killed, began once more to pour forth its fulsome flattery. It voted a national thanksgiving to continue fifty days, decreed him another triumph, conferred upon him the power to extend the bounds of the city, and erected another statue of him with the inscription, "To The Invincible Deity."

When he returned and had enjoyed his triumph, he again celebrated the occasion with games, combats, and shows no less splendid than those which he had given before, only not so long continued. After this was all over, he took up the regulation of the affairs of society and state. He gave his soldiers lands, but instead of trying to provide lands in Italy for all of them, he distributed the most of them in colonies in the provinces. He cut down the quantity of public grants of grain, and sent thousands upon

thousands of citizens away beyond the seas to establish Roman provinces. Eighty thousand were sent to rebuild Carthage. Another host was sent to rebuild Corinth, which had been destroyed by the Romans a hundred years before. To lessen the evils that had rent the State so long in the annual elections, he enacted that the elections to the lesser offices of the State should be held only once in three years. He enacted that at least one third of the hired help of farmers, vineyardists, stock raisers, etc., should be Roman citizens. He enacted that all physicians, philosophers, and men of science should be Roman citizens. This privilege was likewise bestowed upon large numbers of people in Gaul, Spain, and other places. In the early days of Rome, unions of the different trades and handicrafts had been formed for mutual benefit. In the times which we have sketched, they had become nothing but political clubs, and withal had become so dangerous that they had to be utterly abolished. In B.C. 58, Clodius, to strengthen his political influence, had restored them. Caesar now abolished them again, but allowed bona fide trades-unions to be organized upon the original plan of mutual benefit. ^{F18}

As inspector of public morals he next attempted, as he had when he was consul in 59, to create reform by law. It was a time of unbounded luxury and of corresponding license and licentiousness. He forbade the rich young nobles to be carried in litters. Sea and land were being traversed for dainties for the tables of the rich; Caesar appointed inspectors of the tables and the provision stores to regulate the fare, and any prohibited dish found on any table was picked up and carried away even though the guests were sitting at the table at the moment. The marriage relation had fallen to very loose ways. He enacted that any Roman citizen who was the father of three legitimate children born in Rome, or four in Italy, or five anywhere else, should be exempted from certain public obligations; and that the mothers in such cases should be allowed the special dignity of riding in litters, dressing in purple, and wearing necklaces of pearls. Divorces were as frequent as anybody chose to make them, and Caesar, who had divorced his own wife merely upon suspicion, essayed to regulate divorces; and he who from his youth had enjoyed the personal favors of the chief women of Rome, he who "had mistresses in every country which he visited, and liaisons with half the ladies in Rome," and who was at the time maintaining an adulterous connection with the Queen of Egypt, — he presumed to enact laws against adultery.

One thing, however, he did, which was more lasting than all his other acts put together; and, in fact, of more real benefit. This was the reform of the calendar.

All this time the Senate was heaping upon him titles and honors in the same extravagant profusion as before. One decree made him the father of his country; another liberator; another made him emperor, and commander-in-chief of the army for life with the title to be hereditary in his family. They gave him full charge of the treasury; they made him consul for ten years, and dictator for life. A triumphal robe and a crown of laurel were bestowed on him, with authority to wear them upon all occasions. A figure of his head was impressed upon the coin. His birthday was declared to be a holiday forever; and the name of the month, Quinctilius, was changed to Julius, and is still our July. Next his person was declared sacred, and any disrespect to him in word or action was made to be sacrilege. It was decreed that the oath of allegiance should be sworn by the Fortune of Caesar. The Senate itself took this oath, and by it swore sacredly to maintain his acts, and watch over the safety of his person. To complete the scale, they declared that he was no more Caius Julius, a man, but Divus Julius, a god; and that a temple should be built for the worship of him, and Antony should be the first priest.

Then, having exhausted the extremest measure of the most contemptible sycophancy, March 15, B.C. 44, THEY MURDERED HIM.

Caesar was dead; but all that had made him what he had been, still lived. Pretended patriots assassinated Caesar to save the republic from what they supposed was threatened in him; but in that act of base ingratitude and cruel "patriotism," there was accomplished that which they professed to fear from him, and which in fact they realized from those who were worse than he. It was with the Romans at this time, as it was with the Athenians when Demosthenes told them that if there were no Philip, they themselves would create a Philip. Affairs had reached that point in the Roman State where a Caesar was inevitable, and though to avoid it they had killed the greatest Roman that ever lived, the reality was only the more hastened by the very means which they had employed to prevent it. This they themselves realized as soon as they had awakened from the dream in which they had done the desperate deed. Cicero exactly defined the situation, and gave a perfect outline of the whole history of the times, when, shortly after the murder of Caesar, he bitterly exclaimed, "We have killed the king; but

the kingdom is with us still. We have taken away the tyrant; the tyranny survives." That tyranny survived in the breast of every man in Rome.

At the death of Caesar, to Mark Antony, the sole surviving consul, the reins of government fell. Lepidus, Caesar's general of cavalry, was outside the walls with a legion of troops about to depart for Spain. He took possession of the Camp of Mars, and sent to Antony assurances of support. As night came on, with a body of troops he entered the city and camped in the Forum. He and Antony at once came to a mutual understanding. Antony as consul agreed to secure for Lepidus the office of Pontifex Maximus made vacant by the murder of Caesar, and the alliance was completed by Antony's daughter being given in marriage to the son of Lepidus. Antony secured Caesar's will and all his private papers, besides a great sum of money.

As the will showed that Caesar had bequeathed his private gardens to the people of Rome forever as a pleasure ground, and to each citizen a sum of money amounting to nearly fourteen dollars, this bound the populace more firmly than ever to the memory of Caesar. And as Antony stood forth as the one to avenge Caesar's death, this brought the populace unanimously to his support. By the help of all this power and influence, Antony determined to put himself in the place which Caesar had occupied. Among Caesar's papers he found recorded many of Caesar's plans and intentions in matters of the government. These he made to serve his purpose as occasion demanded; for the Senate dared not dissent from any of Caesar's recorded wishes and designs. When the legitimate papers were exhausted, he bribed one of Caesar's clerks to forge and declare to be Caesar's purpose, such State documents as he chose to have made laws, all of which by the power of Caesar's name were carried against all opposition.

Soon, however, there came a serious check upon the success of Antony's soaring ambition. Octavius appeared upon the scene. Caius Octavius was the grandson of one of Caesar's sisters, and by Caesar's will was left his heir and adopted son. He was then in the nineteenth year of his age. He was in Apollonia when Caesar was killed; and upon learning of the murder he immediately set out for Rome, not knowing the particulars, nor yet that Caesar had left a will in his favor. These he learned when he reached the coast of Italy. Without delay, he incorporated Caesar's name with his own, — Caius Julius Caesar Octavius, — and presented himself to the nearest body of troops as the heir of the great general. When he reached Rome,

Antony received him coldly; refused to give him any of the money that had been left by Caesar; and caused him all the trouble he possibly could in securing possession of the inheritance. Notwithstanding all this, the young Octavius succeeded at every step, and checked Antony at every move. Antony had lost much of his own influence with the populace by failing to fulfill or even to promise to fulfill to them the provisions of Caesar's will. And by refusing to Octavius any of Caesar's money, he hoped so to cripple him that he could not do it.

Octavius promptly assumed all the obligations of the will. He raised money on that portion of the estate which fell to him; he persuaded the other heirs to surrender to his use their shares in the inheritance; he borrowed from Caesar's friends; and altogether succeeded in raising sufficient funds to discharge every obligation. By paying to the people the money that Caesar had left them, he bound the populace to himself. At the time of Caesar's funeral, one of the tribunes, a fast friend to Caesar, but who unfortunately bore the same name as one of Caesar's enemies, was mistaken by the populace for the other man, and in spite of his cries and protestations, was literally torn to pieces. The time came for the vacant tribunate to be filled. Octavius strongly favored a certain candidate. The people proposed to elect Octavius himself, though he was not yet of legal age to hold office. Antony, as consul, interfered to stop the proceedings. This roused the spirit of the people, and as they could not elect Octavius, they stubbornly refused to elect anybody.

Antony, seeing his power with the people was gone, next tried to secure the support of the army. The six best legions of the republic were stationed in Macedonia, destined for service in Parthia. Five of these legions Antony wheedled the Senate into transferring to him. Next he intrigued to have the province of Gaul within the Alps bestowed on him instead of the province of Macedonia which had already been given him. This the Senate hesitated to do, and interposed so many objections that Antony found his purpose about to be frustrated, and he made overtures to Octavius. Octavius received him favorably; a pretended reconciliation was accomplished between them; and by the support of Octavius, Antony secured the change of provinces which he desired. Antony called four of his legions from Macedonia to Brundisium, and went to that place to assume command. As soon as Antony went to Brundisium, Octavius went to Campania, to the colonies of veterans who had been settled there upon the public lands, and by the offer of about a hundred dollars to each one who would join him, he

soon secured a force of ten thousand men. These he took to the north of Italy, to the border of Antony's province, and put them in camp there.

When Antony met his legions at Brundisium, he found them sullen, and instead of their greeting him with acclamations they demanded explanations. They declared that they wanted vengeance for Caesar's death, and that instead of punishing the assassins, Antony had dallied with them. They called upon him to mount the tribunal, and explain his conduct. He replied that it was not the place of a Roman commander to explain his conduct, but to enforce obedience. Yet he betrayed his fear of them by mingling promises with his threats and pledges with his commands. He offered them about twenty dollars apiece, and drew a contrast between the hard service in Parthia, and the easy time that was before them in the province to which he was to take them. This did not satisfy them. He put some to death, yet the others would not be quiet. The agents of Octavius were among them contrasting the hundred dollars to each man, that he was paying, with the paltry twenty dollars that Antony was offering. Antony was obliged to increase his bid, but it was not yet near the price Octavius was offering. He broke up the command into small bodies, and ordered them to march separately thus along the coast of the Adriatic, and unite again at Rimini, and he himself returned to Rome. He had barely time to reach his home, when a messenger arrived with the word that one of his legions had gone over bodily to Octavius. This message had scarcely been delivered when another came saying that another legion had done likewise. He went with all haste to where they were, hoping to win them back, but they shut against him the gates of the city where they were, and shot at him from the walls. By raising his bid to the same amount that Octavius was paying, he succeeded in holding the other two legions in allegiance to himself.

War could be the only result of such counterplotting as this, and other circumstances hastened it. Antony now had four legions; Lepidus had six; three were in Gaul under the command of Plancus; and Octavius had five. When Antony had obtained the exchange of provinces, the one which he secured — Gaul within the Alps — was already under the command of a pro-consul, Decimus Brutus. But with the command of the province Antony had received authority to drive out of it any pretender to the government. He commanded Decimus to leave the province. Decimus refused, and Antony declared war. Decimus shut himself up in a stronghold, and Antony laid siege to him there. Octavius saw now an

opportunity to humble Antony, and strengthen himself — he offered his service to the Senate.

The two consuls whose term of office had expired came up, January 43, B. C., and Octavius joined his forces to theirs. Two battles were fought in April, in both of which Antony was worsted, though both the pro-consuls were slain. Antony left the field of battle, and marched across the Alps and joined Lepidus. Decimus desired to follow with all the forces present; but as he was one of the murderers of Caesar, Octavius would not obey him. Also the troops of Octavius declared that Caesar's heir was their leader, and Decimus their enemy. Decimus then marched also across the Alps, and joined his forces to those of Plancus. This left Italy wholly to Octavius, and he made the most of the opportunity. He demanded that the Senate grant him a triumph. His demand was only treated with contempt. The Senate in turn sent to him a peremptory command to lead his army against "the parricides and brigands" that had joined their forces in Gaul. He replied by sending to Rome four hundred of his soldiers to demand for him the consulship for the year 42.

The soldiers presented their demand in the Senate house. It was refused. One of them then laid his hand upon his sword and declared with an oath, "If you do not grant it, this shall obtain it for him." Cicero replied, "If this is the way that you sue for the consulship, doubtless your chief will acquire it." The soldiers returned to Octavius, and reported upon their embassy. Octavius with his legions immediately crossed the Rubicon and started for Rome, giving up to the license of his soldiers all the country as he passed.

As soon as the Senate learned that Octavius was coming with his army, they sent an embassy to meet him, and to tell him that if he would only turn back they would grant everything he asked, and add yet above all about five hundred dollars for each of his soldiers. But he, knowing that he had the Senate in his power, determined to make his own terms after he should get possession of the city. The Senate turned brave again, put on a blustering air, and forbade the legions to come nearer than ninety miles to the city. As two legions had just come from Africa, the Senate supposed they had a military power of their own. They threw up fortifications and gave the praetors military command of the city. By this time Octavius and his army had reached Rome. The senators again suddenly lost all their bravery. Such of them as had least hope of favor fled from the city or hid themselves. Of the others, each one for himself decided to go over to

Octavius; and when each one with great secrecy had made his way to the camp of the legions, he soon found that all the others had done the same thing. The legions and the praetors who had been set to defend the city went over bodily to Octavius. The gates were thrown open; Octavius with his legions entered the city; the Senate nominated him for consul; the assembly was convened, and he was elected — September 22, 43 B.C. — with his own cousin, Pedius, chosen as his colleague, and with the right to name the prefect of the city. Octavius became twenty years old the next day.

An inquiry was at once instituted upon the murder of Caesar, and all the conspirators were declared outlaws; but as Brutus and Caassius, the two chief assassins, were in command of the twenty legions in Macedonia and Asia Minor, Octavius needed more power. This he obtained by forming an alliance with Antony and Lepidus. These two commanders crossed the Alps, and the three met on a small island in the River Reno, near Bologna. There, as a result of their deliberation for three days,

THE SECOND TRIUMVIRATE

was formed, and the tripartition of the Roman world was made.

They assumed the right to dispose of all the offices of the government; and all their decrees were to have the force of law, without any question, confirmation, or revision by either the Senate or the people. In short, they proposed that their power should be absolute — they would do what they pleased. Yet they were compelled to consider the army. To secure the support of the legions, they pledged to them eighteen of the finest districts in Italy, with an addition of about a thousand dollars to each soldier. The conditions of the compact were put into writing, and when each of the triumvirs had taken an oath faithfully to observe them, they were read to the troops. The soldiers signified their approval upon condition that Octavius should marry the daughter of Antony's wife Fulvia.^{F19}

When the powers of the triumvirate had thus been made firm, the triumvirs sat down “with a list of the noblest citizens before them, and each in turn pricked [with a pin] the name of him whom he destined to perish. Each claimed to be ridded of his personal enemies, and to save his own friends. But when they found their wishes to clash, they resorted without compunction to mutual concessions.” Above all other men Cicero was the one upon whom Antony desired to execute vengeance; and in return for

this boon, he surrendered to Octavius his own uncle on his mother's side. Lepidus gave up his own brothers. "As they proceeded, their views expanded. They signed death warrants to gratify their friends. As the list slowly lengthened, new motives were discovered for appending to it additional names. The mere possession of riches was fatal to many; for the masters of so many legions were always poor: the occupation of pleasant houses and estates sealed the fate of others; for the triumvirs were voluptuous as well as cruel. Lastly, the mutual jealousy of the proscribers augmented the number of their victims, each seeking the destruction of those who conspicuously favored his colleagues, and each exacting a similar compensation in return. The whole number extended, we are told, to three hundred senators and two thousand knights; among them were brothers, uncles, and favorite officers of the triumvirs themselves." — Merivale.^{F20}

When this list had been arranged, the triumvirs with their legions started to Rome. Before they reached the city, they sent to the consuls the names of seventeen of the most prominent citizens, with an order to put them all to death at once. Cicero was one of the seventeen. The executioners "attacked the houses of the appointed victims in the middle of the night: some they seized and slew unresisting; others struggled to the last, and shed blood in their own defense; others escaping from their hands raised the alarm throughout the city, and the general terror of all classes, not knowing what to expect, or who might feel himself safe, caused a violent commotion." — Merivale.^{F21} Cicero had left the city, but he was overtaken by the messengers of blood, his head and his hands were cut off and carried to Antony, who exulted over the ghastly trophies; and Fulvia in a rage of gloating anger took the bloody head and held it upon her knees, and looking into the face poured forth a torrent of bitter invective against him whose face it was, and then in a perfect abandon of fury seized from her hair her golden bodkin, and pierced and through the tongue that had so often, so exultantly, and so vilely abused both her husbands.

The triumvirs reached Rome one after another. "Octavius entered first; on the following day Antony appeared; Lepidus came third. Each man was surrounded by a legion and his praetorian cohort. The inhabitants beheld with terror these silent soldiers taking possession of every point commanding the city. Rome seemed like a place conquered and given over to the sword." — Duruy.^{F22} A tribune called an assembly of the people; a few came, and the three commanders "were now formally invested with the

title of triumvirs, and all the powers they claimed were conferred upon them” November 27, B.C. 43. The following night there was posted throughout the city this edict: —

“M. Lepidus, Marcus Antonius, and Octavius Caesar, chosen triumvirs for the reconstitution of the republic, thus declare: Had not the perfidy of the wicked answered benefits by hatred; had not those whom Caesar in his clemency spread after their defeat, enriched and loaded with honors, become his murderers, we too should disregard those who have declared us public enemies. But perceiving that their malignity can be conquered by no benefits, we have chosen to forestall our enemies rather than be taken unawares by them. Some have already been punished; with the help of the gods we shall bring the rest to justice. Being ready to undertake an expedition against the parricides beyond the seas, it has seemed to us and will appear to you necessary that we should not leave other enemies behind us. Yet we will be more merciful than a former emperor, who also restored the ruined republic, and whom you hailed with the name of Felix. Not all the wealthy, not all who have held office, will perish, but only the most dangerous evil-doers. These offenders we might have seized unawares; but for your sakes we have preferred to draw up a list of proscribed persons rather than to order an executing by the troops, in which harm might have come to the innocent. This then is our order: Let no one hide any of those whose names follow; whosoever shall aid in the escape of a proscribed man shall be himself proscribed. Let the heads be brought to us. As a reward, a man of free condition shall receive twenty-five thousand Attic drachmae, a slave ten thousand, together with freedom and the name of citizen. The names of persons receiving these rewards shall be kept secret.” — Duruy. ^{F23}

Attached to this document were one hundred and thirty names of senators and knights who were devoted to death. Another list of one hundred and fifty was almost immediately added, and yet others followed in quick succession. Guards had been placed at all the gates, all places of refuge had been occupied, and all means of escape had been cut off. The slaughter began. “The executioners, armed with the prostituted forms of authority, rushed unresisted and unhindered in pursuit of their victims. They found many to aid them in the search, and to stimulate their activity. The contagious thirst of blood spread from the hired assassins to all who had an

ancient grudge to requite, a future favor to obtain. Many fell in the confusion whose names were not included in the list of the proscribed. Many a private debt was wiped out in the blood of the creditor. Robbers and cut-throats mingled with the bitter partisan and the private enemy. While the murderer carried the head of his victim to fix it on a spike before the rostra, and claim the proffered reward, the jackals of massacre entered the tenantless house, and glutted themselves with plunder.” Merivale.^{f24}

When the names of the published lists had been exhausted, and all their political enemies had been slain, the triumvirs published yet another list, not of more to be put to death, but of those whose property should be confiscated. When this list was exhausted, then “all the inhabitants of Rome and Italy, — citizens and foreigners, priests and freedmen,” — who had possessions amounting to more than twenty thousand dollars, were obliged to “lend” to the triumvirs one-tenth of all their possessions, and “give” one year’s income besides. Then, “glutted with blood and rapine,” Lepidus, for the triumvirate, announced to the Senate that the proscription was at an end. Octavius, however, reserved the right to kill some more, and “declared that the only limit he had fixed to the proscription was that he should be free to act as he pleased.” — Suetonius.^{f25} Then the fawning Senate voted to the triumvirs civic crowns as “the saviors of their country.”

In the beginning of the year 42 B. C., Antony and Octavius, leaving Lepidus in command of Rome and Italy, started to the East to destroy Brutus and Cassius, the murderers of Caesar; but it was summer before they got all their troops together in Macedonia. Brutus and Cassius, with their united forces, had returned from Asia Minor into Europe. The two armies met at Philippi in Macedonia. The forces of Brutus and Cassius numbered about one hundred thousand, and those of Antony and Octavius about one hundred and twenty thousand. Two battles, twenty days apart, were fought on the same ground. In the first Cassius lost his life; in the second the army of Brutus was annihilated, and Brutus himself committed suicide.

It became necessary now to pay the soldiers the money and put them in possession of the land which had been promised them when the triumvirate was formed. A sum equal to a thousand dollars had been promised to each soldier, and as there were now one hundred and seventy thousand soldiers, a sum equal to one hundred and seventy million dollars was required. Antony assumed the task of raising the money from the wealth of Asia, and

Octavius the task of dispossessing the inhabitants of Italy and distributing their lands and cities among the soldiers. Antony's word to the people of Pergamos describes the situation both in Italy and all the countries of Asia. To them he said: —

“You deserve death for rebellion; this penalty I will remit; but I want money, for I have twenty-eight legions, which with their auxiliary battalions amount to 170,000 men, besides cavalry and detachments in other quarters. I leave you to conceive what a mass of money must be required to maintain such armaments. My colleague has gone to Italy to divide its soil among these soldiers, and to expel, so to speak, the Italians from their won country. Your lands we do not demand; but instead thereof we will have money. And when you hear how easily, after all, we shall be contented, you will, we conceive, be satisfied to pay and be quit of us. We demand only the same sum which you have contributed during the last two years to our adversaries; that is to say, the tribute of ten years; but our necessities compel us to insist upon receiving this sum within twelve months.” — Merivale. ^{F26}

As the tribute was much reduced by the time it reached the coffers of Antony, the levy was doubled, and the command given that it should be paid in two installments the same year. To this the people replied, “If you force us to pay the tribute twice in one year, give us two summers and two harvests. No doubt you have also the power to do so.” But instead of considering the distress of the people caused by these most burdensome exactions, “Antony surrounded himself with flute-players, mountebanks, and dancing-girls. He entered Ephesus, preceded by women dressed as Bacchantes, and youths in the garb of Fauns and Satyrs. Already he assumed the ATTRIBUTES of Bacchus, and set himself to play the part by continual orgies.” — Duruy. ^{F27}

While Cassius was in Asia Minor, he had compelled Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, to supply him with troops and money. As these had been used against the triumvirs, Antony sent from Tarsus in Cilicia, and called her to account for her conduct. She came, representing Venus, to render her account in person. And “when she first met Mark Antony, she pursed up is heart on the river of Cydnus.”

“The barge she sat in, like a burnished throne,
Burned on the water: the poop was beaten gold;

Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
 The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver,
 Which to the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
 The water, which they beat, to follow faster,
 As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
 It beggared all description: she did lie
 In her pavilion (cloth of gold and tissue),
 O'er-picturing that Venus, where we see
 The fancy out-work nature: on each side her,
 Stood pretty dimpled boys, like smiling cupids,
 With divers colored fans, whose wind did seem
 To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool,
 And what they undid, did....

“Her gentlewomen, like the Nereides,
 So many mermaids, tended her i' the eyes,
 And made their bends adornings: at the helm
 A seeming mermaid steers; the silken tackle
 Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands,
 That yarely frame the office. From the barge
 A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
 Of the adjacent wharfs. The city cast
 Her people out upon her; and Antony,
 Enthroned in the market-place, did sit alone,
 Whistling to the air; which, but for vacancy,
 Had gone to gaze on Cleopatra, too,
 And made a gap in nature....

“Upon her landing, Antony sent to her,
 Invited her to supper: she replied,
 It should be better, he became her guest;
 Which she entreated: Our courteous Antony,
 Whom ne'er the word of 'No,' woman heard speak,

Being barbered ten times o'er, goes to the feast;
 And, for his ordinary, pays his heart,
 For what his eyes eat only.” ^{F28}
 — Shakespeare.

Antony went with Cleopatra to Alexandria, B.C. 41. Fulvia died in the spring of 40. Antony's giddy infatuation with the voluptuous queen of Egypt was fast estranging him from Octavius and the Roman people. The matter was patched up for a little while, by the marriage of Antony and Octavia, the sister of Octavius, B.C. 40; but within two years Antony was again swallowed up in the charms of Cleopatra, from whom he never again separated. Two children whom he had by her he named respectively the

Sun and the Moon, and when Cleopatra assumed the dress and professed the ATTRIBUTES of Isis, Antony played the part of Osiris. He publicly rejected Octavia in 35, divorced her in 32, and war was declared the same year. The war began and ended with the naval battle of Actium, September 2, B.C. 31.

In the midst of the battle Cleopatra hoisted sail and fled. Antony left everything and followed her. They sailed home to Alexandria, and there committed suicide. In the meantime Lepidus had been set aside, and now, just thirteen and one-half years from the murder of Caesar, the State, having again gone through the same course precisely, came again to the exact point where it had been then, only in worse hands, and Octavius was the head of one hundred and twenty millions of people, and SOLE MASTER OF THE ROMAN WORLD.

CHAPTER 3.

THE ROMAN MONARCHY.

THE “mask of hypocrisy” which Octavius had assumed at the age of nineteen, and “which he never afterwards laid aside,” was now at the age of thirty-four made to tell to the utmost in firmly establishing himself in the place of supreme power which he had attained. Having before him the important lesson of the fate of Caesar in the same position, when the Senate bestowed upon him the flatteries, the titles, and the dignities which it had before bestowed upon Caesar, he pretended to throw them all back upon the Senate and people, and obliged the Senate to go through the form of absolutely forcing them upon him. For he “was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the Senate and people would submit to slavery provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom.” He therefore “wished to deceive the people by an image of civil liberty, and the armies by an image of civil government.” — Gibbon.^{f31}

In this way he finally merged in himself the prerogatives of all the regular officers of the State — tribune, consul, prince of the Senate, pro-counsul, imperator, censor, Pontifex Maximus — with all the titles and dignities which had been given by the Senate to him, as before to Caesar. In short, he himself became virtually the State; his will was absolute. Having thus drawn to himself “the functions of the Senate and the magistrate, and the framing of the laws, in which he was thwarted by no man,” the title of “Father of his Country” meant much more than ever it had before. The State was “the common parent” of the people. The State being now merged in one man, when that man became the father of his country, he likewise became the father of the people. And “the system by which every citizen shared in the government being thrown aside, all men regarded the orders of the prince as the only rule of conduct and obedience.” — Tacitus.^{f32} Nor was this so merely in civic things: it was equally so in religious affairs. In fact there was in the Roman system no such distinction know as civil and religious. The State was divine, therefore that which was civil was in itself religious. One man now having become the State, it became necessary that some title should be found which would fit this new dignity and express this new power.

The Senate had exhausted the vocabulary of flattering titles in those which it had given to Caesar. Although all these were now given to Octavius, there was none amongst them which could properly define the new dignity which he possessed. Much anxious thought was given to this great question. "At last he fixed upon the epithet 'Augustus,' a name which no man had borne before, and which, on the contrary, had been applied to things the most noble, the most venerable, and the most sacred. The rites of the gods were called august; their temples were august. The word itself was derived from the holy auguries; it was connected in meaning with the abstract term "authority," and with all that increases and flourishes upon earth. The use of this glorious title could not fail to smooth the way to the general acceptance of the divine character of the mortal who was deemed worthy to bear it. The Senate had just decreed the divinity of the defunct Caesar; the courtiers were beginning now to insinuate that his successor, while yet alive, enjoyed an effluence from deity; the poets were even suggesting that altars should be raised to him; and in the provinces, among the subjects of the State at least, temples to his divinity were actually rising, and the cult of Augustus was beginning to assume a name, a ritual, and a priesthood. — "Encyclopedia Britannica." ^{F33}

He tyrannized over the nobles by his power, and held the affections of the populace by his munificence. "In the number, variety, and magnificence of his public spectacles, he surpassed all former example. Four and twenty times, he says, he treated the people with games upon his own account, and three and twenty times for such magistrates as were either absent or not able to afford the expense.... He entertained the people with wrestlers in the Campus Martius, where wooden seats were erected for the purpose; and also with a naval fight, for which he excavated the ground near the Tiber." In order that the people might all go to these special shows, he stationed guards through the streets to keep the houses from being robbed while the dwellers were absent. "He displayed his munificence to all ranks of the people on various occasions. Moreover, upon his bringing the treasure belonging to the kings of Egypt into the city, in his Alexandrian triumph, he made money so plentiful that interest fell, and the price of land rose considerably. And afterwards, as often as large sums of money came into his possession by means of confiscations, he would lend it free of interest, for a fixed term, to such as could give security for the double of what was borrowed. The estate necessary to qualify a senator, instead of eight hundred thousand sesterces, the former standard, he ordered, for the

future, to be twelve hundred thousand; and to those who had not so much, he made good the deficiency. He often made donations to the people, but generally of different sums; sometimes four hundred, sometimes three hundred, or two hundred and fifty sesterces: upon which occasions, he extended his bounty even to young boys, who before were not used to receive anything, until they arrived at eleven years of age. In a scarcity of corn, he would frequently let them have it at a very low price, or none at all, and doubled the number of the money tickets.” — Suetonius.^{F34}

It occurred to him that he ought to abolish the distribution of grain at public expense, as he declared that it was “working unmitigated evil, retarding the advance of agriculture, and cutting the sinews of industry.” But he was afraid to do it, lest some one would take advantage of the opportunity and ascend to power by restoring it. His own words are these: “I was much inclined to abolish forever the practice of allowing the people corn at the public expense, because they trust so much to it, that they are too lazy to till their lands; but I did not persevere in my design, as I felt sure that the practice would sometime or other be revived by some one ambitious of popular favor.” — Suetonius.^{F35}

In public and political life a confirmed and constant hypocrite, in private and domestic life he was no less. He was so absolutely calculating that he actually wrote out beforehand what he wished to say to his friends, and even to his wife. He married Clodia merely for political advantage, although at that time she was scarcely of marriageable age. He soon put her away, and married Scribonia. Her, too, he soon put away, “for resenting too freely the excessive influence which one of his mistresses had gained over him” (Suetonius^{F36}) and immediately took Livia Drusilla from her wedded husband. Her he kept all the rest of his days; for, instead of resenting any of his lascivious excesses, she connived at them.

By Scribonia he had a daughter — Julia. Her he gave first to his sister’s son, who soon died; and then he gave her to her brother-in-law, Marcus Agrippa, who was already married to her cousin by whom he had children. Nevertheless Agrippa was obliged to put away his wife and children, and take Julia. Agrippa likewise soon died; then Tiberius was obliged to put away his wife, by whom he already had a son and who was soon to become a mother again, in order that he might be the step-son of the emperor by becoming Julia’s third husband. By this time, however, Julia had copied so much of her father’s wickedness that Tiberius could not live with her; and

her daughter had copied so much of hers, that “the two Julias, his daughter and grand-daughter, abandoned themselves to such courses of lewdness and debauchery, that he banished them both” (Suetonius ^{f37}), and even had thoughts of putting to death the elder Julia.

Yet Augustus, setting such an example of wickedness as this, presumed to enact laws punishing in others the same things which were habitually practiced by himself. But all these evil practices were so generally followed, that laws would have done no good by whomsoever enacted, much less would they avail when issued by such a person as he.

Augustus died at the age of seventy-six, August 19, A.D. 14, and was succeeded by —

TIBERIUS.

Forty-three years of the sole authority of Augustus had established the principle of absolutism in government, but “the critical moment for a government is that of its founder’s death.” It was now to be discovered whether that principle was firmly fixed; but Tiberius was fifty-six years old, and had been a careful student of Augustus, and though at his accession the new principle of government was put to its severest test, Tiberius made Augustus his model in all things; “continued his hypocritical moderation, and made it, so to speak, the rule of the imperial government.” — Duruy. ^{f38}

Though he immediately assumed the imperial authority, like his model, “He affected by a most impudent piece of acting to refuse it for a long time; one while sharply reprehending his friends who entreated him to accept it, as little knowing what a monster the government was; another while keeping in suspense the Senate when they implored him and threw themselves at his feet, by ambiguous answers and a crafty kind of dissimulation; in so much that some were out of patience and one cried out during the confusion, ‘Either let him accept it or decline it at once;’ and a second told him to his face: ‘Others are slow to perform what they promise, but you are slow to promise what you actually perform.’ At last as if forced to it, and complaining of the miserable and burdensome service imposed upon him, he accepted the government.” — Suetonius. ^{F39}

The purpose of all this was, as with Augustus, to cause the Senate by fairly forcing imperial honors upon him, firmly to ally itself to the imperial authority by making itself the guardian of that power; so that when any

danger should threaten the emperor, the Senate would thus stand pledged to defend him. And dangers were at this time so thick about Tiberius that he declared he had “a wolf by the ears.”

The principle thing that had marked his accession was the murder of Agrippa Posthumus, the son of Agrippa the minister of Augustus; and now a slave of Agrippa’s had got together a considerable force to avenge his master’s death. “Lucius Scribonius Libo, a senator of the first distinction, was secretly fomenting a rebellion, and the troops both in Illyricum and Germany were mutinous. Both armies insisted upon high demands, particularly that their pay should be made equal to that of the praetorian guards. The army in Germany absolutely refused to acknowledge a prince who was not their own choice, and urged with all possible importunity Germanicus, who commanded them, to take the government on himself, though he obstinately refused it.” — Suetonius.^{F40}

All these dangers were soon passed, and Tiberius pretending to be the servant of the Senate, “assumed the sovereignty by slow degrees,” and the Senate allowed nothing to check its extravagance in bestowing titles, honors, and powers, for “such was the pestilential character of those times, so contaminated with adulation, that not only the first nobles, whose obnoxious splendor found protection only in obsequiousness, but all who had been consuls, a great part of such as had been praetors, and even many of the inferior senators, strove for priority in the fulsomeness and extravagance of their votes. There is a tradition that Tiberius, as often as he went out of the Senate, was wont to cry out in Greek, ‘How fitted for slavery are these men!’ Yes, even Tiberius, the enemy of public liberty, nauseated the crouching tameness of his slaves.” — Tacitus.^{F41}

This course of conduct he continued through nine years, and his reign was perhaps as mild during this time as that of any other Roman would have been; but when at last he felt himself secure in the position where he was placed above all law, there was no enormity that he did not commit.

One man being now the State, and that one man being “divine,” high treason — violated majesty — became the most common crime, and the “universal resource in accusations.” In former times, “If any one impaired the majesty of the Roman people by betraying an army, by exciting sedition among the Commons, in short, by any maladministration of the public affairs, the actions were matter of trial, but words were free.” — Tacitus.^{F42}

But now the law embraced “not words only, but a gesture, an involuntary forgetfulness, an indiscreet curiosity.” — Duruy.^{F43} More than this, as the emperor was the embodiment of the divinity of the Roman State, this divinity was likewise supposed to be reflected in the statues and images of him. Any disrespect, any slight, any indifference, any carelessness intentional or otherwise, shown toward any such statue, or image, or picture, was considered as referring to him; was violative of his majesty; and was high treason. If any one counted as sold, a statue of the emperor with the field in which it stood, even though he had made and set up the statue himself; any one who should throw a stone at it; any one who should take away its head; any one who should melt the bronze or use for any profane purpose the stone, even of a broken or mutilated image or statue, — all were alike guilty of high treason.

Yet more than this, in all cases of high treason when the accused was found guilty, one fourth of his estate was by law made sure to the informer. “Thus the informers, a description of men called into existence to prey upon the vitals of society and never sufficiently restrained even by penalties, were now encouraged by rewards.” — Tacitus.^{F44}

Bearing these facts in mind, it is easy to understand the force of that political turn which the priests and Pharisees of Jerusalem took upon Pilate in their charges against Christ: “If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar’s friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar.” ~~6912~~ John 19:12. On account of the furious jealousy of Tiberius and his readiness to welcome the reports of informers, the priests and Pharisees knew full well, and so did Pilate, that if a deputation should be sent to Rome accusing him of high treason in sanctioning the kingship of a Jew, Pilate would be called to Rome and crucified.

Thus in Tiberius the government of Rome became “a furious and crushing despotism.” The emperor being above all law, forgot all restraint, and “abandoned himself to every species of cruelty, never wanting occasions of one kind or another, to serve as a pretext. He first fell upon the friends and acquaintances of his mother, then those of his grandsons and his daughter-in-law, and lastly those of Sejanus, after whose death he became cruel in the extreme.” Sejanus was his chief minister of State and his special friend and favorite — a worthy favorite, too. Tiberius, at his particular solicitation, retired to the island of Capri, where he attempted to imitate the lascivious ways of all the gods and goddesses at once.

Sejanus, left in command of the empire, aspired to possess it in full. He had already put away his own wife, and poisoned the son of Tiberius that he might marry his widow. His scheme was discovered; he was strangled by the public executioner, and torn to pieces by the populace. Then, under the accusation of being friends of Sejanus, a great number of people were first imprisoned, and shortly afterward, without even the form of a trial, Tiberius “ordered all who were in prison under accusation of attachment to Sejanus, to be put to death. There lay the countless mass of slain — of every sex and age — the illustrious and the mean; some dispersed, other collected in heaps; nor was it permitted to their friends or kindred to be present, or to shed a tear over them, or any longer even to go and see them; but guards were placed around, who marked signs of sorrow in each, and attended the putrid bodies till they were dragged to the Tiber; where, floating in the stream, or driven upon the banks, none dared to burn them, none to touch them. Even the ordinary intercourse of humanity was intercepted by the violence of fear; and in proportion as cruelty prevailed, commiseration was stifled.” — Tacitus.^{F45}

After the example of Augustus, and to satisfy the clamors of the people, he loaned money without interest for three years to all who wanted to borrow. He first compelled “all money-lenders to advance two thirds of their capital on land, and the debtors to pay off at once the same proportion of their debts.” This was found insufficient to meet all the demands, and he loaned from the public treasury about five millions, of dollars. In order to obtain money to meet this and other drafts on the public treasury, “he turned his mind to sheer robbery. It is certain that Cneius Lentulus, the augur, a man of vast estate, was so terrified and worried by his threats and importunities, that he was obliged to make him his heir.... Several persons, likewise of the first distinction in Gaul, Spain, Syria, and Greece, had their estates confiscated upon such despicably trifling and shameless pretenses, that against some of them no other charge was preferred than that they held large sums of ready money as part of their property. Old immunities, the rights of mining, and of levying tolls, were taken from several cities and private persons.” — Suetonius.^{F46}

As for anything more about “this monster of his species,” we shall only say in the words of Suetonius, “It would be tedious to relate all the numerous instances of his cruelty; suffice it to give a few examples, in their different kinds. Not a day passed without the punishment of some person or other, not excepting holidays, or those appropriated to the worship of the gods.

Some were tried even on New Year's Day. Of many who were condemned, their wives and children shared the same fate; and for those who were sentenced to death, the relations were forbid to put on mourning.

“Considerable rewards were voted for the prosecutors, and sometimes for the witnesses also. The information of any person, without exception, was taken, and all offenses were capital, even speaking a few words, though without any ill intention. A poet was charged with abusing Agamemnon; and a historian, for calling Brutus and Cassius ‘the last of the Romans.’ The two authors were immediately called to account, and their writings suppressed, though they had been well received some years before, and read in the hearing of Augustus. Some who were thrown into prison, were not only denied the solace of study, but debarred from all company and conversation. Many persons, when summoned to trial, stabbed themselves at home, to avoid the distress and ignominy of a public condemnation, which they were certain would ensue. Others took poison in the Senate house. The wounds were bound up, and all who had not expired, were carried, half dead, and panting for life, to prison. Those who were put to death, were thrown down the Gemonian stairs, and then dragged into the Tiber. In one day, twenty were treated in this manner, and amongst them women and boys. Because, according to an ancient custom, it was not lawful to strangle virgins, the young girls were first deflowered by the executioner, and afterwards strangled.

“Those who were desirous to die, were forced to live. For he thought death so slight a punishment, that upon hearing that Carnulius, one of the accused, who was under prosecution, had killed himself, he exclaimed, ‘Carnulius has escaped me.’ In calling over his prisoners, when one of them requested the favor of a speedy death, he replied, ‘You are not yet restored to favor.’ A man of consular rank writes in his annals that at table, where he himself was present with a large company, he was suddenly asked aloud by a dwarf who stood by amongst the buffoons, why Paconius, who was under a prosecution for treason, lived so long. Tiberius immediately reprimanded him for his pertness, but wrote to the Senate a few days after, to proceed without delay to the punishment of Paconius.” — Suetonius^{f47}

Tiberius died March 16, A.D. 37, in the seventy-eighth year of his age and the twenty-third year of his reign, and was succeeded by —

CALIGULA.

Caligula was the son of Germanicus, who was the adopted son of Tiberius. He was born and brought up in the camp. When he grew large enough to run about, the soldiers made him a pair of boots — Caliga after the pattern of their own, and from that he got his name of “Caligula,” that is, Little Boots. His real name was Caius. He was now twenty-five years old, and had been with Tiberius for the last five years. “Closely aping Tiberius, he put on the same dress as he did from day to day, and in his language differed little from him. Whence the shrewd observation of Passienus the orator, afterward so famous, ‘that never was a better slave nor a worse master.’” — Tacitus.^{F48} He imitated Tiberius in his savage disposition, and the exercise of his vicious propensities, as closely as he did in his dress and language. If he were not worse than Tiberius, it was only because it was impossible to be worse.

Like his pattern, he began his reign with such an appearance of gentleness and genuine ability, that there was universal rejoicing among the people out of grateful remembrance of Germanicus, and among the soldiers and provincials who had known him in his childhood. As he followed the corpse of Tiberius to its burning. “He had to walk amidst altars, victims, and lighted torches, with prodigious crowds of people everywhere attending him, in transports of joy, and calling him, besides other auspicious names, by those of ‘their star,’ ‘their chick,’ ‘their pretty puppet,’ and ‘bantling.’... Caligula himself inflamed this devotion, by practising all the arts of popularity.” — Suetonius.^{F49} This appearance of propriety he kept up for eight months, and then, having become giddy with the height at which he stood, and drunken with the possession of absolute power, he ran wildly and greedily into all manner of excesses.

He gave himself the titles of “Dutiful,” “The Pious,” “The Child of the Camp, the Father of the Armies,” “The Greatest and Best Caesar.” — Suetonius.^{F50} He caused himself to be worshiped, not only in his images, but in his own person. Among the gods, Castor and Pollux were twin brothers representing the sun, and were the sons of Jupiter. Caligula would place himself between the statues of the twin brothers there to be worshiped by all votaries. And they worshiped him, too; some saluting him

as Jupiter Latialis that is, the Roman Jupiter, the guardian of the Roman people. He caused all the images of the gods that were famous either for beauty or popularity, to be brought from Greece, and their heads taken off and his put on instead, and then sent them back to be worshiped. He set up a temple, and established a priesthood in honor of his own divinity; and in the temple he set up a statue of gold the exact image of himself, which he caused to be dressed every day exactly as he was. The sacrifices which were to be offered in the temple, were flamingos, peacocks, bustards, guineas, turkeys, and pheasants, each kind offered on successive days. “The most opulent persons in the city offered themselves as candidates for the honor of being his priests, and purchased it successively at an immense price.” — Suetonius.^{F51}

Castor and Pollux had a sister who corresponded to the moon. Caligula therefore on nights when the moon was full, would invite her to come and stay with him. This Jupiter Latialis placed himself on full and familiar equality with Jupiter Capitolinus. He would walk up to the other Jupiter and whisper in his ear, and then turn his own ear, as if listening for a reply. Not only had Augustus and Romulus taken other men’s wives, but Castor and Pollux, in the myth, had gone to a double wedding, and after the marriage had carried off both the brides with them. Caligula did the same thing. He went to the wedding of Caius Piso, and from the wedding supper carried off the bride with himself, and the next day issued a proclamation “that he had got a wife as Romulus and Augustus had done;” but in a few days he put her away, and two years afterward he banished her.

Lollia Paulina was the wife of a proconsul. She was with her husband in one of the provinces where he was in command of an army. Caligula heard somebody say that her grandmother had been a very beautiful woman. He immediately sent and had Lollia Paulina brought from her husband, and made her his wife; and her also soon afterwards he put away. But he found a perfect wanton, by the name of Caesonia, who was neither handsome nor young, and her he kept constantly. He lived in incest with all three of his sisters, but one of them, Drusilla, was a special favorite. Her he took from her husband, a man of consular rank, and made her his wife and kept her so as long as she lived, and when she died, he ordered a public mourning for her, during which time he made it a capital offense for anybody to laugh, or bathe, or eat with his parents or his own family; and ever afterwards his most solemn oath was to swear by the divinity of Drusilla.

He was so prodigal that in less than a year, besides the regular revenue of the empire, he spent the sum of about one hundred millions of dollars. He built a bridge of boats across the Gulf of Balae, from Balae to Puteoli, a distance of three and a half miles. He twice distributed to the people nearly fifteen dollars apiece, and often gave splendid feasts to the Senate and to the knights with their families, at which he presented official garments to the men, and purple scarfs to the women and children. He exhibited a large number of games continuing all day. Sometimes he would throw large sums of money and other valuables to the crowd to be scrambled for. He likewise made public feasts at which, to every man, he would give a basket of bread with other victuals. He would exhibit stage plays in different parts of the city at night time, and cause the whole city to be illuminated; he exhibited these games and public plays not only in Rome, but in Sicily, Syracuse, and Gaul.

As for himself, in his feasts he exerted himself to set the grandest suppers and the strangest dishes, at which he would drink pearls of immense value, dissolved in vinegar, and serve up loaves of bread and other victuals modeled in gold. He built two ships each of ten banks of oars, the poops of which were made to blaze with jewels, with sails of various parti-colors, with baths, galleries, and saloons; in which he would sail along the coast feasting and reveling, with the accompaniments of dancing and concerts of music. At one of these revels he made a present of nearly one hundred thousand dollars to a favorite charioteer. His favorite horse he called Incitatus, — go ahead, — and on the day before the celebration of the games of the circus, he would set a guard of soldiers to keep perfect quiet in the neighborhood, that the repose of Go-ahead might not be disturbed. This horse he arrayed in purple and jewels, and built for him a marble stable with an ivory manger. He would occasionally have the horse eat at the imperial table, and at such times would feed him on gilded grain in a golden basin of the finest workmanship. He proposed at last to make the horse consul of the empire.

Having spent all the money, though an enormous sum, that had been laid up by Tiberius, it became necessary to raise funds sufficient for his extravagance, and to raise it he employed “every mode of false accusation, confiscation, and taxation that could be invented.” He commanded that the people should make their wills in his favor. He even caused this rule to date back as far as the beginning of the reign of Tiberius, and from that time forward any centurion of the first rank who had not made Tiberius or

Caligula his heir, his will was annulled, and all his property confiscated. The wills of all others were set aside if any person would say that the maker had intended to make the emperor his heir. This caused those who were yet living to make him joint heir with their friends or with their children. If he found that such wills had been made and the maker did not die soon, he declared that they were only making game of him, and sent them poisoned cakes.

The remains of the paraphernalia of his spectacles, the furniture of the palace occupied by Augustus and Tiberius, and all the clothes, slaves, and even freedmen belonging to his sisters whom he banished, were put up at auction, and the prices were run up so high as to ruin the purchasers. At one of these sales a certain Aponius Saturninus, sitting on a bench, became sleepy and fell to nodding; the emperor noticed it, and told the auctioneer not to overlook the bids of the man who was nodding so often. Every nod was taken as a new bid, and when the sale was over, the dozing bidder found himself in possession of thirteen gladiatorial slaves, for which he was in debt nearly half a million dollars. If the bidding was not prompt enough nor high enough to suit him, he would rail at the bidders for being stingy, and demand if they were not ashamed to be richer than he was.

He levied taxes of every kind that he could invent, and no kind of property or person was exempt from some sort of taxation. Much complaint was made that the law for imposing this taxation had never been published, and that much grievance was caused from want of sufficient knowledge of the law. He then published the law, but had it written in very small characters and posted up in a corner so that nobody could obtain a copy of it. His wife Caesonia gave birth to a daughter, upon which Caligula complained of his poverty, caused by the burdens to which he was subjected, not only as an emperor but as a father, and therefore made a general collection for the support of the child, and gave public notice that he would receive New Year's gifts the first of the following January. At the appointed time he took his station in the vestibule of his palace, and the people of all ranks came and threw to him their presents "by the handfuls and lapfuls. At last, being seized with an invincible desire of feeling money, taking off his slippers he repeatedly walked over great heaps of gold coin spread upon the spacious floor, and then laying himself down, rolled his whole body in gold over and over again." — Suetonius. ^{F52}

His cruelty was as deadly as his lust and prodigality were extravagant. At the dedication of that bridge of boats which he built he spent two days reveling and parading over the bridge. Before his departure, he invited a number of people to come to him on the bridge, all of whom without distinction of age, or sex, or rank, or character, he caused to be thrown headlong into the sea, "thrusting down with poles and oars those who, to save themselves, had got hold of the rudders of the ship." At one time when meat had risen to very high prices, he commanded that the wild beasts that were kept for the arena, should be fed on criminals, who, without distinction as to degrees of crime, were given to be devoured.

During his revels he would cause criminals, and even innocent persons, to be racked and beheaded. He seemed to gloat over the thought that the lives of mankind were in his hands, and that at a word he could do what he would. Once at a grand entertainment, at which both the consuls were seated next to him, he suddenly burst out into violent laughter, and when the consuls asked him what he was laughing about, he replied, "Nothing, but that upon a single word of mine you might both have your throats cut." Often, as he kissed or fondled the neck of his wife or mistress, he would exclaim, "So beautiful a throat must be cut whenever I please."

All these are but parts of his ways, but the rest are either too indecent or too horrible to relate. At last, after indulging more than three years of his savage rage, he was killed by a company of conspirators, with the tribune of the praetorian guards at their head, having reigned three years, ten months, and eight days, and lived twenty-nine years. He was succeeded by

CLAUDIUS.

The soldiers not only killed an emperor, but they made another one. There was at that time, living in the palace, an uncle to Caligula, named Claudius, now fifty years old. Though he seems to have had as much sense as any of them, he was slighted and counted as a fool by those around him. Even his mother, when she would remark upon any one's dullness, would use the comparison, "He is a greater fool than my son Claudius." About the palace he was made the butt of the jests and practical jokes of the courtiers and even of the buffoons. At supper he would cram himself full of victuals, and drink till he was drunk; and then go to sleep at the table. At this, the company would pelt him with olive stones or scraps of victuals; and the

buffoons would prod him with a cane, or snip him with to wake him. And when he had gone to sleep, while he lay snoring, they would put slippers on his hands, that when he should wake and attempt to rub his eyes open, he would rub his face with the slippers.

The night that Caligula was killed, Claudius, fearing for his own life, crept into a balcony, and hid himself behind the curtains of the door. The soldiers, rushing through the palace, happened to see his feet sticking out, and one of them grabbed him by the heels and demanding to know who owned them, dragged forth Caludius; and when he discovered who he was, exclaimed, "Why, this is Germanicus; let's make him emperor!" The other soldiers in the band immediately adopted the idea, saluted him as emperor, set him on a litter, and carried him on their shoulders to the camp of the praetorian guards. The next day while the Senate deliberated, the people cried out that they would have one master, and that he should be Claudius. The soldiers assembled under arms, and took the oath of allegiance to him; upon which he promised them about seven hundred dollars apiece.

By the mildness and correctness of his administration, he soon secured the favor and affection of the whole people. Having once gone a short distance out of the city, a report was spread that he had been waylaid and killed. "The people never ceased cursing the soldiers for traitors, and the Senate as parricides, until or two persons, and presently after several others, were brought by the magistrates upon the rostra, who assured them that he was alive, and not far from the city, on his way home." — Suetonius.^{F53}

As he sat to judge causes, the lawyers would openly reprove him and make fun of him. One of these one day, making excuses why a witness did not appear, stated that it was impossible for him to appear, but did not tell why. Claudius insisted upon knowing, and after several questions had been evaded, the statement was brought forth that the man was dead, upon which Claudius replied, "I think that is a sufficient excuse." When he would start away from the tribunal, they would call him back. If he insisted upon going, they would seize hold of his dress or take him by the heels, and make him stay until they were ready for him to go. A Greek once having a case before him, got into a dispute with him, and called out loud, "You are an old fool;" and a Roman knight once being prosecuted upon a false charge, being provoked at the character of the witnesses brought against him, upbraided Claudius with folly and cruelty, and threw some books and a writing pencil in his face. He pleased the populace with

distributions of grain and money, and displays of magnificent games and spectacles.

This is the Claudius mentioned in ~~<HRT>~~ Acts 18:2, who commanded all Jews to depart from Rome. This he did, says Suetonius, because they “were continually making disturbances at the instigation of one Chrestus.” These disturbances arose from contentions of the Jews against the Christians about Christ. As the Christians were not yet distinguished from the Jews, the decree of banishment likewise made no distinction, and when he commanded all Jews to depart from Rome, Christians were among them. One of his principal favorites was that Felix, governor of Judea, mentioned in ~~<HRT>~~ Acts 23:24, before whom Paul pleaded, and who trembled as the apostle “reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.”

Claudius was not as bad as either Tiberius or Caligula, but what he himself lacked in this respect was amply made up by his wives. “In his marriage, as in all else, Claudius had been pre-eminent in misfortune. He lived in an age of which the most frightful sign of depravity was that its women were, if possible, a shade worse than its men, and it was the misery of Claudius, as it finally proved his ruin, to have been united by marriage to the very worst among them all. Princesses like the Bernice, and the Drusilla, and the Salome, and the Herodias of the sacred historians, were in this age a familiar spectacle; but none of them were so wicked as two at least of Claudius’s wives. He was betrothed or married no less than five times. The lady first destined for his bride had been repudiated because her parents had offended Augustus; the next died on the very day intended for her nuptials. By his first actual wife, Urgulania whom he had married in early youth, he had two children, Drusus and Claudia; Drusus was accidentally choked in boyhood while trying to swallow a pear which had been thrown up into the air. Very shortly after the birth of Claudia, discovering the unfaithfulness of Urgulania, Claudius divorced her, and ordered the child to be stripped naked and exposed to die. His second wife, AElia Petina, seems to have been an unsuitable person, and her also he divorced. His third and fourth wives lived to earn a colossal infamy — Valeria Messalina for her shameless character, Agrippina the younger for her unscrupulous ambition.

“Messalina, when she married, could scarcely have been fifteen years old, yet she at once assumed a dominant position, and secured it by means of the most unblushing wickedness. But she did not reign so absolutely undisturbed as to be without her own

jealousies and apprehensions; and these were mainly kindled by Julia and Agrippina, the two nieces of the emperor. They were, no less than herself, beautiful, brilliant, and evil-hearted women, quite ready to make their own coteries, and to dispute, as far as they dared, the supremacy of a bold but reckless rival. They, too, used their arts, their wealth, their rank, their political influence, their personal fascinations, to secure for themselves a band of adherents, ready, when the proper moment arrived, for any conspiracy....

“The life of this beautiful princess, short as it was, — for she died at a very early age, — enough to make her name a proverb of everlasting infamy. For a time she appeared irresistible. Her personal fascination had won for her an unlimited sway over the facile mind of Claudius, and she had either won over by her intrigues, or terrified by her pitiless severity, the noblest of the Romans and the most powerful of the freedmen.” — Farrar. ^{F54}

She became “so vehemently enamored of Caius Silius, the handsomest of the Roman youth, that she obliged him to divorce his wife, Julia Silana, a lady of high quality,” that she might have him to herself. “Nor was Silius blind to the danger and malignity of his crime; but, as it was certain destruction to decline her suit, and there were some hopes of beguiling Claudius, while great rewards were held out to him, he was content to take the chance of what might happen thereafter, and enjoy the present advantages. The empress proceeded not stealthily, but went to his house frequently, with a numerous train, accompanied him incessantly abroad, loaded him with presents and honors; and at last, as if the fortune of the empire had been transferred with the emperor’s wife, at the house of her adulterer were now seen the slaves, freedmen, and equipage of the prince.” — Tacitus. ^{F55}

Claudius made a journey to Ostia, and while he was gone, Messalina publicly celebrated her marriage with Silius, with royal ceremony. “I am aware that it will appear fabulous that any human beings should have exhibited such recklessness of consequences; and that, in a city where everything was known and talked of, any one, much more a consul elect, should have met the emperor’s wife, on a stated day, in the presence of persons called in, to seal the deeds, as for the purpose of procreation, and that she should have heard the words of the augurs, entered the house of the husband, sacrificed to the gods, sat down among the guests at the

nuptial banquet, exchanged kisses and embraces, and in fine passed the night in unrestrained conjugal intercourse. But I would not dress up my narrative with fictions to give it an air of marvel, rather than relate what has been stated to me or written by my seniors.” — Tacitus. ^{F56}

The report of all this was carried to Claudius, which so terrified him that but for his favorites, he would undoubtedly have surrendered the empire to Silius. Several of these, however, rallied him with the assurance that they would stand by him and help him through, and they persuaded him to start for Rome; but fearing that even then, if Messalina should meet him, she would persuade him to pardon her, they took him in the same carriage with themselves, and all the way as they went, one of them kept continually exclaiming, “O the villainy, O the treason!” As for Messalina, “she never wallowed in greater voluptuousness; it was then the middle of autumn, and in her house she exhibited a representation of the vintage: the winepresses were plied, the wine vats flowed, and round them danced women begirt with skins like Bacchanalians at their sacrifices, or under the maddening inspiration of their deity: she herself, with her hair loose and flowing, waved a thyrsus; by her side Silius, crowned with ivy, and wearing buskins, tossed his head about; while around them danced the wanton choir in obstreperous revelry. It is reported that Vectius Valens, having in a frolic climbed to an exceeding high tree, when asked what he saw, answered, ‘a terrible storm from Ostia.’” — Tacitus. ^{F57}

That storm was coming swiftly, and when it came, Messalina was given the privilege of killing herself. She plied the dagger twice but failed, and then a tribune ran her through with his sword. Word was carried to Claudius while he was sitting at a feast, that Messalina was no more, to which he made neither reply nor inquiry, “but called for a cup of wine and proceeded in the usual ceremonies of the feast, nor did he, indeed, during the following days, manifest any symptom of disgust or joy, of resentment or sorrow, nor, in short, of any human affection; not when he beheld the accusers of his wife exulting at her death; not when he looked upon her mourning children.” — Tacitus. ^{F58}

Messalina was dead; but bad as she had been, a worse woman took her place. This was Agrippina, sister of Caligula, niece of Claudius, and the mother of Nero. “Whatever there was of possible affection in the tigress nature of Agrippina was now absorbed in the person of her child. For that child, from its cradle to her own death by his means, she toiled and sinned.

The fury of her own ambition, inextricably linked with the uncontrollable fierceness of her love for this only son, henceforth directed every action of her life. Destiny had made her the sister of one emperor; intrigue elevated her into the wife of another: her own crimes made her the mother of a third. And at first sight her career might have seemed unusually successful; for while still in the prime of life she was wielding, first in the name of her husband, and then in that of her son, no mean share in the absolute government of the Roman world. But meanwhile that same unerring retribution, whose stealthy footsteps in the rear of the triumphant criminal we can track through page after page of history, was stealing nearer and nearer to her with uplifted hand. When she had reached the dizzy pinnacle of gratified love and pride to which she had waded through so many a deed of sin and blood, she was struck down into terrible ruin and violent, shameful death by the hand of that very son for whose sake she had so often violated the laws of virtue and integrity, and spurned so often the pure and tender obligation which even the heathen had been taught by the voice of God within their conscience to recognize and to adore.

“Intending that her son should marry Octavia, the daughter of Claudius, her first step was to drive to death Silanus, a young nobleman to whom Octavia had already been betrothed. Her next care was to get rid of all rivals possible or actual. Among the former were the beautiful Calpurnia and her own sister-in-law, Domitia Lepida. Among the latter was the wealthy Lollia Paulina, against whom she trumped up an accusation of sorcery and treason, upon which her wealth was confiscated, but her life spared by the emperor, who banished her from Italy. This half vengeance was not enough for the mother of Nero. Like the daughter of Herodias in sacred history, she dispatched a tribune with orders to bring her the head of her enemy; and when it was brought to her, and she found a difficulty in recognizing those withered and ghastly features of a once celebrated beauty, she is said with her own hand to have lifted one of the lips, and to have satisfied herself that this was indeed the head of Lollia.... Well may Adolf Stahr observe that Shakespeare’s Lady Macbeth and husband-murdering Gertrude are mere children by the side of this awful giant-shape of steely feminine cruelty.” — Farrar. ^{F59}

By the horrible crimes and fearful sinning of Agrippina, Nero became emperor of Rome, A.D. 57, at the age of seventeen. As in the account

already given, there is enough to show what the Roman monarchy really was; and as that is the purpose of this chapter, it is not necessary any further to portray the frightful enormities of individual emperors. It is sufficient to say of Nero, that, in degrading vices, shameful licentiousness, and horrid cruelty, he transcended all who had been before him.

It is evident that for the production of such men as Antony and Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula, Claudius and Nero, with such women as their mothers and wives — to say nothing of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Domitian, who quickly followed — in direct succession and in so short a time, there must of necessity have been a condition of society in general which corresponded to the nature of the product. Such was in fact the case.

“An evil day is approaching when it becomes recognized in a community that the only standard of social distinction is wealth. That day was soon followed in Rome by its unavoidable consequence, a government founded upon two domestic elements, corruption and terrorism. No language can describe the state of that capital after the civil wars. The accumulation of power and wealth gave rise to a universal depravity. Law ceased to be of any value. A suitor must deposit a bribe before a trial could be had. The social fabric was a festering mass of rotteness. The people had become a populace; the aristocracy was demoniac; the city was a hell. No crime that the annals of human wickedness can show was left unperpetrated; — remorseless murders; the betrayal of parents, husbands, wives, friends; poisoning reduced to a system; adultery degenerating into incests and crimes that cannot be written.

“Women of the higher class were so lascivious, depraved, and dangerous, that men could not be compelled to contract matrimony with them; marriage was displaced by concubinage; even virgins were guilty of inconceivable immodesties; great officers of state and ladies of the court, of promiscuous bathings and naked exhibitions. In the time of Caesar it had become necessary for the government to interfere and actually put a premium on marriage. He gave rewards to women who had many children; prohibited those who were under forty-five years of age, and who had no children, from wearing jewels and riding in litters, hoping by such social disabilities to correct the evil. It went on from bad to worse,

so that Augustus, in view of the general avoidance of legal marriage and resort to concubinage with slaves, was compelled to impose penalties on the unmarried — to enact that they should not inherit by will except from relations. Not that the Roman women refrained from the gratification of their desires; their depravity impelled them to such wicked practices as cannot be named in a modern book. They actually reckoned the years, not by the consuls, but by the men they had lived with. To be childless and therefore without the natural restraint of a family, was looked upon as a singular felicity. Plutarch correctly touched the point when he said that the Romans married to be heirs and not to have heirs.

“Of offenses that do not rise to the dignity of atrocity, but which excite our loathing, such as gluttony and the most debauched luxury, the annals of the times furnish disgusting proofs. It was said, ‘They eat that they may vomit, and vomit that they may eat.’ At the taking of Perusium, three hundred of the most distinguished citizens were solemnly sacrificed at the altar of Divius Julius by Octavian. Are these the deeds of civilized men, or the riotings of cannibals drunk with blood?

“The higher classes on all sides exhibited a total extinction of moral principle; the lower were practical atheists. Who can peruse the annals of the emperors without being shocked at the manner in which men died, meeting their fate with the obtuse tranquillity that characterizes beasts? A centurion with a private mandate appears, and forthwith the victim opens his veins, and dies in a warm bath. At the best, all that was done was to strike at the tyrant. Men despairingly acknowledged that the system itself was utterly past cure.

“That in these statements I do not exaggerate, hear what Tacitus says: ‘The holy ceremonies of religion were violated; adultery reigning without control; the adjacent islands filled with exiles; rocks and desert places stained with clandestine murders, and Rome itself a theater of horrors, where nobility of descent and splendor of fortune marked men out for destruction; where the vigor of mind that aimed at civil dignities, and the modesty that declined them, were offenses without distinction; where virtue was a crime that led to certain ruin; where the guilt of informers and the

wages of their iniquity were alike detestable; where the sacerdotal order, the consular dignity, the government of provinces, and even the cabinet of the prince, were seized by that execrable race as their lawful prey; where nothing was sacred, nothing safe from the hand of rapacity; where slaves were suborned, or by their own malevolence excited against their masters; where freemen betrayed their patrons, and he who had lived without an enemy died by the treachery of a friend.” — Draper. ^{F60}

To complete this dreadful picture requires but the touch of Inspiration. “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections. For even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient: being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: who, knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death; not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.” ^{F61}

When this scripture was read by the Christians in Rome, they knew from daily observation that it was but a faithful description of Roman society as it was. And Roman society as it was, was but the resultant of pagan civilization, and the logic, in its last analysis, of the pagan religion. Roman society as it was, was **ULTIMATE PAGANISM**.

CHAPTER 4.

THE “TEN PERSECUTIONS.”

THAT which Rome was in its supreme place, the other cities of the empire, — Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, etc. — were in their narrower spheres; for it was the licentiousness of Greece and the East which had given to the corruption of Rome a deeper dye. Into that world of iniquity, Jesus Christ sent, as sheep among wolves, a little band of disciples carrying hope to the despairing, joy to the sorrowing, comfort to the afflicted, relief to the distressed, peace to the perplexed, and to all a message of merciful forgiveness of sins, of the gift of the righteousness of God, and of a purity and power which would cleanse the soul from all unrighteousness of heart and life, and plant there instead the perfect purity of the life of the Son of God and the courage of an everlasting joy. This gospel of peace and of the power of God unto salvation they were commanded to go into all the world and preach to every creature.

The disciples went everywhere preaching the word, and before the death of men who were then in the prime of life this good news of the grace of God had actually been preached in all the then known world. ~~<500>~~ Romans 1:8 and ~~<500>~~ Romans 10:18; ~~<500>~~ Colossians 1:6, 23. And by it many were brought to the knowledge of the peace and power of God, revealed in the gospel of Jesus Christ. “In every congregation there were prayers to God that he would listen to the sighing of the prisoner and captive, and have mercy on those who were ready to die. For the slave and his master there was one law and one hope, one baptism, one Saviour, one Judge. In times of domestic bereavement the Christian slave doubtless often consoled his pagan mistress with the suggestion that our present separations are only for a little while, and revealed to her willing ear that there is another world — a land in which we rejoin our dead. How is it possible to arrest the spread of a faith which can make the broken heart leap why with joy?” — Draper.

f71

Yet to arrest the spread of that faith there were many long, earnest, and persistent efforts by the Roman empire. Before entering, however, upon the examination of this subject as it is, it is necessary to notice a point that

has been much misunderstood or else much misrepresented; that is the imperial or “Ten Persecutions.”

In the Church and State scheme of the fourth century, the theory of the bishops was that the kingdom of God was come; and to maintain the theory it became necessary to pervert the meaning of both Scripture history and Scripture prophecy. Accordingly, as the antitype of the ten plagues of Egypt, and as the fulfillment of the prophecy of the ten horns which made war with the Lamb (~~61712~~ Revelation 17:12-14), there was invented the theory of ten persecutions of the Christians inflicted by the ten emperors, Nero, Domitian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Septimius Severus, Maximin, Decius, Valerian, Aurelian, and Diocletian. Some of these persecuted the Christians, as Nero, Marcus Aurelius, Decius, and Diocletian; others were as gentle toward the Christians as toward anybody else; and yet others not named in the list, persecuted everybody but the Christians. The truth is that so far as the emperors were concerned, taken one with another, from Nero to Diocletian, the Christians fared as well as anybody else.

In this discussion and in the study of this subject everywhere, it must ever be borne in mind that Christianity was wholly outlawed in the Roman empire, and that every one who professed it became by the very fact of his profession an outlaw — an enemy to the emperor and people of Rome, and guilty of high treason.

So long as the Christians were confounded with the Jews, no persecution befell them from the Roman State, because the Roman empire had recognized the Jewish religion as lawful; consequently when the Emperor Claudius commanded all Jews to depart from Rome, Christians were included among them, as for instance Aquila and Priscilla. ~~41801~~ Acts 18:1, 2. And when in Corinth, under Gallio the Roman governor of the province of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection against Paul upon the charge that “this fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law,” Gallio replied: “If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you: but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters.” And with this, “he drave them from the judgment seat.” ~~41812~~ Acts 18:12-16. Also when the centurion Lysias had rescued Paul from the murderous Jews in Jerusalem, and would send him for protection to Felix the governor, he wrote to Felix thus: “When I would have known the cause wherefore they accused him, I brought him forth into their council: whom I

perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds.” ~~4238~~ Acts 23:28, 29.

To please the Jews, Felix left Paul in prison. When Festus came in and had given him a hearing, and would bring his case before King Agrippa, he spoke thus of the matter: “There is a certain man left in bonds by Felix: about whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and the elders of the Jews informed me, desiring to have judgment against him. To whom I answered, It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him.

Therefore, when they were come hither without any delay on the morrow, I sat on the judgment seat, and commanded the man to be brought forth. Against whom, when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And because I doubted of such manner of questions, I asked him whether he would go to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these matters. But when Paul had appealed to be reserved unto the hearing of Augustus, I commanded him to be kept till I might send him to Caesar.”

And when Agrippa had heard him, the unanimous decision was, “This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds,” and Agrippa declared, “This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar.”

~~4234~~ Acts 25:14-21; ~~4235~~ Acts 26:31, 32.

And even when he had been heard twice by Caesar — Nero — as it was still but a controversy between Jews concerning questions of their own, the Roman power refused to take cognizance of the case, and Paul, a Christian, was released. But when Christianity had spread among the Gentiles and a clear distinction was made and recognized between the Christians and the Jews, by all parties, and Christianity appeared as a new religion not recognized by the Roman law, then came the persecution of Christians by the Roman State.

The first persecution of the Christians was that which was inflicted by —

Nero, n A.D. 64, although it was only the horrid cruelty inflicted that made his punishment of the Christians conspicuous above that of many others upon whom the rage of that tyrant fell. For, “Except that his murders were commonly prompted by need or fear, and therefore fell oftenest on the rich

and powerful, it can hardly be said that one class suffered from them more terribly than another. His family, his friends, the senators, the knights, philosophers and

THE PERSECUTION BY NERO.

Christians, Romans and provincials, were all decimated by them.” — Merivale.^{f72}

July 19, A.D. 64, the tenth year of Nero’s reign, a fire broke out in the city of Rome, which raged unchecked for six days. The stricken people had barely begun to collect their thoughts after the fire had subsided, when flames burst out a second time, in another quarter of the city, and raged for three days. Taken together, the two conflagrations destroyed nearly the whole of the city. Of the fourteen districts into which the city was divided, only four remained uninjured. Nero was universally hated for his desperate tyranny. A rumor was soon spread and readily believed, that while the city was burning, he stood watching it, and chanting the “Sack of Troy” to an accompaniment which he played upon his lyre. From this the rumor grew into a report, and it was also believed, that Nero himself had ordered the fires to be kindled. It was further insinuated that his object in burning the city was to build it anew upon a much more magnificent scale, and bestow upon it his own name.

Whether any of these rumors or suspicions were certainly true, cannot be positively stated; but whether true or not, they were certainly believed, and the hatred of the people was intensified to such fierceness that Nero soon discovered that the ruin of the city was universally laid to his charge. He endeavored to allay the rising storm: he provided shelter, and supplied other urgent necessities for the multitude. Vows and great numbers of burnt offerings to the gods were made, but all to no purpose. The signs of public dissatisfaction only became more significant. It became essential that the emperor should turn their suspicion from him, or forfeit the throne and his life. The crisis was a desperate one, and desperately did he meet it. There was a little band of Christians known in the city. They were already hated by the populace. These were accused, condemned, and tortured as the destroyers of the city. Tacitus tells of the fate of those to whom he says “the vulgar gave the name of Christians”: —

“He [Nero] inflicted the most exquisite tortures on those men who, under the vulgar appellation of Christians, were already branded

with deserved infamy. They derived their name and origin from Christ, who in the reign of Tiberius had suffered death by the sentence of the procurator, Pontius Pilate. For awhile this dire superstition was checked; but it again burst forth; and not only spread itself over Judea, the first seat of this mischievous sect, but was even introduced into Rome, the common asylum which receives and protects whatever is impure, whatever is atrocious. The confessions of those who were seized, discovered a great multitude of their accomplices, and they were all convicted, not so much for the crime of setting fire to the city, as for their hatred of human kind. They died in torments, and their torments were embittered by insult and derision. Some were nailed on crosses; others sewn in the skins of wild beasts, and exposed to the fury of dogs; others again, smeared over with combustible materials, were used as torches to illuminate the darkness of the night. The gardens of Nero were destined for the melancholy spectacle, which was accompanied with a horse race. and honored with the presence of the emperor, who mingled with the populace in the dress and attitude of a charioteer. The guilt of the Christians deserved indeed the most exemplary punishment, but the public abhorrence was changed into commiseration, from the opinion that those unhappy wretches were sacrificed, not so much to the public welfare as to the cruelty of a jealous tyrant.” — Tacitus. ^{f73}

This cruel subterfuge accomplished the purpose intended by the emperor, to deliver him from the angry suspicion of the populace. This persecution, however, as directed by Nero, did not extend beyond the city, and ceased with that one effort. And from that time, for the space of nearly two hundred years — till the reign of Decius, A.D. 249-251 — there was no imperial persecution in the city of Rome “During that period, the Christians were in general as free and secure as other inhabitants of Rome. Their assemblies were no more disturbed than the synagogues of the Jews, or the rights of other foreign religions.” — Milman. ^{f74}

DOMITIAN,

who is next named in the list of persecutors, was so jealous of his imperial power and withal such a downright coward, that he was afraid of every man who was, or might become, popular or from any cause conspicuous. His suspicions were constantly creating imaginary plots against his throne

and his life, and his fears welcomed any tale of treason or of plot. There was an ample number of flatterers and sycophants who voluntarily assumed the vile office of informers, to have satisfied perhaps any man in the world but Domitian. He, however, was not content with this.

He deliberately hired every man in the empire who was willing to sell himself to such service. And there were multitudes who were willing so to sell themselves. This system had been employed by others, but “Domitian seems, of all the emperors, to have carried it furthest, and adopted it most systematically. It was an aggravation rather than an extenuation of his crime that he seduced into his service men of high rank and character, and turned the Senate into a mob of rivals for the disgrace of thus basely serving him. The instruments of his jealous precaution rose in a graduated hierarchy. The knights and senators trembled before a Massa Baebius, a Carus, and a Latinus; but these delators trembled in their turn before the prince of delators, Memminus Regulus, and courted him, not always successfully, by the surrender of their estates or their mistresses.... The best and noblest of the citizens were still marked out as the prey of delators whose patron connived at enormities which bound their agents more closely to himself, and made his protection more necessary to them. The haughty nobles quailed in silence under a system in which every act, every word, every sigh, was noted against them, and disgrace, exile, and death followed upon secret whispers. The fears of Domitian increased with his severities. He listened to the tales not of senators and consulars only, but of the humblest officials and even of private soldiers. Often, says Epictetus, was the citizen, sitting in the theater, entrapped by a disguised legionary beside him, who pretended to murmur against the emperor, till he had led his unsuspecting neighbor to confide to him his own complaints, and then skulked away to denounce him.” — Merivale.^{f75}

Such a system gave full and perfect freedom to vent every kind of petty spite; and not only was freedom given to it, but by the informers’ receiving a share of the property of the accused, a premium was put upon it. Many were put to death to allay Domitian’s fears. Large numbers of others were either put to death or banished for the sake of their property, and yet many others were executed or banished upon charges invented by the informers to satisfy their personal hatred or to maintain with the emperor their standing of loyalty. Among the victims of this universal treachery, some Christians were numbered. Hated as they were, it would have been strange indeed had there been none. Among these was the apostle John, who was

banished to the Isle of Patmos. There were two others whose names we know — Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla. Clemens was the cousin, and Domitilla was the niece, of Domitian. Clemens had enjoyed the favor of the emperor for a long time, and attained the honor of the consulship. The term of his office, however, had hardly more than expired when he was accused, condemned, and executed; and Domitilla was banished to a desolate island on the western coast of Italy. The charge against them was “atheism and Jewish manners,” “which cannot with any propriety be applied except to the Christians, as they were obscurely and imperfectly viewed by the magistrates and by the writers of that period.” — Gibbon. ^{f76}

A great number of other persons were involved in the same accusation as were Clemens and Domitilla, and likewise met the same fate with them — confiscation of goods and banishment or death. Yet it is with no manner of justice or propriety that this has been singled out as a persecution against the church, or of Christians as such; because at the same time there were thousands of people of all classes who suffered the same things and from the same source. This is granting that Clemens was killed and Domitilla banished really on account of their religion. Considering their kinship to the emperor, and the standing of Clemens, it is fairly questionable whether it was not for political reasons that they were dealt with, and whether their religion was not the pretext rather than the cause, of their punishment. And for political crimes especially it was no unusual thing for all of a man's friends and relations to be included in the same proscription with himself. “This proscription took place about eight months before Domitian's death, at a period when he was tormented by the utmost jealousy of all around, and when his heart was hardened to acts of unparalleled barbarity; and it seems more likely that it was counseled by abject fear for his own person or power, than by concern for the religious interests of the State.” — Merivale. ^{f77}

In September, A.D. 96, Domitian was succeeded by —

Nerva, whose temper and administration were directly contrary to those of Domitian. He reversed the cruel decrees of Domitian, recalled the banished, and prosecuted instead of encouraged the informers. Nerva was succeeded in A.D. 98 by —

Trajan, under whom Pliny the Younger was governor of the province of Bithynia. In that province he found Christianity so prevalent that the

worship of the gods was almost deserted. He undertook to correct this irregularity; but this being a new sort of business with him, he was soon involved in questions that he could not easily decide to his own satisfaction, and he concluded to address the emperor for the necessary instructions. He therefore wrote to Trajan as follows: —

“Sir: It is my constant method to apply myself to you for the resolution of all my doubts; for who can better govern my dilatory way of proceeding or instruct my ignorance? I have never been present at the examination of the Christians [by others], on which account I am unacquainted with what uses to be inquired into, and what and how far they used to be punished; nor are my doubts small, whether there be not a distinction to be made between the ages [of the accused], and whether tender youth ought to have the same punishment with strong men? whether there be not room for pardon upon repentance? or whether it may not be an advantage to one that had been a Christian, that he has forsaken Christianity? whether the bare name, without any crimes besides, or the crimes adhering to that name, be to be punished? In the meantime I have taken this course about those who have been brought before me as Christians: I asked them whether they were Christians or not. If they confessed that they were Christians, I asked them again, and a third time, intermixing threatenings with the questions. If they persevered in their confessions, I ordered them to be executed; for I did not doubt but, let their confessions be of any sort whatsoever, this positiveness and inflexible obstinacy deserved to be punished. There have been some of this mad sect whom I took notice of in particular as Roman citizens, that they might be sent to that city. After some time, as is usual in such examinations, the crime spread itself, and many more cases came before me. A libel was sent to me, though without an author, containing many names [of persons accused]. These denied that they were Christians now, or ever had been. They called upon the gods, and supplicated to your image, which I caused to be brought to me for that purpose, with frankincense and wine; they also cursed Christ; none of which things, it is said, can any of those that are really Christians be compelled to do, so I thought fit to let them go. Others of them that were named in the libel, said they were Christians, but presently denied it again; that indeed they had been Christians, but

had ceased to be so, some three years, some many more; and one there was that said he had not been so these twenty years. All these worshiped your image and the images of our gods; these also cursed Christ. However, they assured me that the main of their fault, or of their mistake, was this: That they were wont, on a stated day, to meet together before it was light, and to sing a hymn to Christ, as to a god, alternately; and to oblige themselves by a sacrament [or oath] not to do anything that was ill; but that they would commit no theft, or pilfering, or adultery; that they would not break promises, or deny what was deposited with them, when it was required back again; after which it was their custom to depart, and to meet again at a common but innocent meal, which they had left off upon that edict which I published at your command, and wherein I had forbidden any such conventicles. These examinations made me think it necessary to inquire by torments what the truth was; which I did of two servant-maids, who were called “deaconesses;” but still I discovered no more than that they were addicted to a bad and to an extravagant superstition. Hereupon I have put off any further examinations, and have recourse to you; for the affair seems to be well worth consultation, especially on account of the number of those that are in danger; for there are many of every age, of every rank, and of both sexes, who are now and hereafter likely to be called to account, and to be in danger; for this superstition is spread like a contagion, not only into cities and towns, but into country villages also, which yet there is reason to hope may be stopped and corrected. To be sure the temples, which were almost forsaken, begin already to be frequented; and the holy solemnities, which were long intermitted, begin to be revived. The sacrifices begin to sell well everywhere, of which very few purchasers had of late appeared; whereby it is easy to suppose how great a multitude of men may be amended, if place for repentance be admitted.”

To this letter Trajan replied: —

“My Pliny: You have taken the method which you ought, in examining the causes of those that had been accused as Christians; for indeed no certain and general form of judging can be ordained in this case. These people are not to be sought for; but if they be accused and convicted, they are to be punished: but with this

caution, that he who denies himself to be a Christian, and makes it plain that he is not so, by supplicating to our gods, although he had been so formerly, may be allowed pardon, upon his repentance. As for libels sent without an author, they ought to have no place in any accusation whatsoever, for that would be a thing of very ill example, and not agreeable to my reign.”^{f78}

These are the facts in the case in regard to the persecution by Trajan. As a matter of fact Trajan had little to do with it. Pliny found the laws being violated. As governor of a province, he took judicial and executive cognizance of it. In his enforcing of the laws there were questions raised which he submitted to the emperor for decision. The emperor informed him that the proper course had been pursued. As a lover of justice, he directed that no regard should be paid to anonymous communications, but that all accusations should be made in due and legal form. He even goes so far as to limit to the regular form of judicial process the Christians’ disregard of the law — they were not to be sought after; but when accused in regular form, if they refused to yield, they were to be punished. In all this it is easy to see the emperor, who was the representative of the law; the just judge, refusing everything but the strictest conformity to the regular legal proceedings; and the humane man, willing rather to forego opportunity, than to hunt for occasion, to prosecute. It is difficult, therefore, to see how Trajan could fairly be charged with persecuting the Christians.

Trajan died in A.D. 117, and was succeeded by —

HADRIAN.

The fanatical populace being forbidden by Trajan’s orders to proceed against the Christians in any but the legal way, had in many places taken to raising riots and wreaking their vengeance upon the Christians in this disorderly way. In A.D. 124, Hadrian made a tour through the Eastern provinces. The proconsul of Asia Minor complained to him of these riotous proceedings. The emperor issued a rescript commanding that the Christians should not be harassed, nor should informers be allowed to ply their trade in malicious prosecutions. If those who desired to prosecute the Christians could clearly prove their charges before the tribunal, “let them pursue this course only, but not by mere petitions and mere outcries against the Christians.” “If any one bring an accusation and can show that they have done anything contrary to the laws,” the magistrate was to judge of the

matter “according to the heinousness of the crime;” but if any one should undertake a prosecution of the Christians “with a view to slander,” the matter was to be investigated “according to its criminality,” and if it was found that the prosecution had been made on false accusation, the false accusers were to be severely punished.

This rescript is as follows: —

“To Minucius Fundanus: I have received an epistle, written to me by the most illustrious Serenius Granianus whom you have succeeded. I do not wish, therefore, that the matter should be passed by without examination, so that these men may neither be harassed, nor opportunity of malicious proceedings be offered to informers. If, therefore, the provincials can clearly evince their charges against the Christians, so as to answer before the tribunal, let them pursue this course only, but not by mere petitions, and mere outcries against the Christians. For it is far more proper, if any one would bring an accusation, that you should examine it. If any one, therefore, bring an accusation, and can show that they have done anything contrary to the laws, determine it thus according to the heinousness of the crime. So that indeed, if any one should purpose this with a view to slander, investigate it according to its criminality, and see to it that you inflict the punishment.”^{f79}

Hadrian’s leniency was not from any respect to the Christians as such, but from his own native respect for justice and fairness. He died A.D. 138, and was succeeded by —

ANTONINUS PIUS.

As soon as Hadrian’s death was known, the restraints imposed by his edicts were cast off, and the sufferings of the Christians from popular tumult and riot were renewed. The bitterness of the popular clamor was deepened by serious disasters. Disastrous floods, earthquakes, and fires occurred about this time, all of which the superstitious pagans interpreted as the evidence of the anger of the gods poured upon the empire as punishment for the disrespect shown to the gods by the Christians, and which was so lightly dealt with by the imperial power. Antoninus, however, being doubtless the mildest-mannered man that ever held the imperial power of Rome, renewed and rather extended the protective edicts of Hadrian. Antoninus was succeeded in A.D. 161, by —

MARCUS AURELIUS.

Public calamities still continued. A terrible pestilence swept over the whole Roman empire from Ethiopia to Gaul, and the fury of the populace again fell severely upon the devoted Christians. Marcus Aurelius saw this matter in much the same light as the great mass of the people, and looked upon the pestilence that then raged, as a warning to restore the ancient religion in its minutest particulars. He summoned priests from all quarters to Rome, and even put off his expedition against the Marcomannians for the purpose of celebrating the religious solemnities, by which he hoped that the evil might be averted. He therefore sanctioned the popular rage against the Christians, and followed it up with an edict in which he commanded that search should be made for the Christians; and when brought to trial, they were to be forced by tortures to deny the faith and do homage to the Roman gods. Marcus Aurelius died, March 17, A.D. 180, and was succeeded by his son —

COMMODUS.

This emperor, instead of being a persecutor of the Christians, was rather a friend to them, if such a man could be counted the friend of anybody. Commodus, for the first three years of his reign, was a monster in vice, and after that a monster in cruelty as well as in vice. One evening in the third year of his reign, as he was returning from the amphitheater through the dark passage to the imperial palace, he was attacked by an assassin who felt so certain of accomplishing his bloody purpose that with a drawn sword he exclaimed, "The Senate sends you this." The attempt failed, however. The guards protected the emperor and captured the assassin. He confessed that his act was the culmination of a conspiracy which had originated with the emperor's sister Lucilla, who hoped to become empress by the death of Commodus. The conspirators were punished, Lucilla being first banished and afterwards put to death. But the words which the assassin had uttered — "the Senate sends you this" — still rung in the emperor's ears; and by it he was caused to think that the Senate was in some way connected with the attempt upon his life. The whole body of the Senate became subject to his bitter and abiding enmity. But as he had nothing more tangible than suspicion to guide him, his course was necessarily uncertain, until a horde of informers had arisen and turned his suspicions into facts.

This event, however, was not long delayed; because as soon as it was learned that the emperor desired to detect treason in the senators, the informers, whose trade had been abolished in the mild and just reign of Antoninus Pius, readily reappeared in numbers sufficient to satisfy the desire of the emperor. "Distinction of every kind soon became criminal. The possession of wealth stimulated the diligence of the informers; rigid virtue implied a tacit censure of the irregularities of Commodus; important services implied a dangerous superiority of merit; and the friendship of the father always insured the aversion of the son. Suspicion was equivalent to proof; trial to condemnation. The execution of a considerable senator was attended with the death of all who might lament or revenge his fate; and when Commodus had once tasted human blood, he became incapable of pity or remorse.... Every sentiment of virtue and humanity was extinct in the mind of Commodus. Whilst he thus abandoned the reins of empire to these unworthy favorites, he valued nothing in sovereign power, except the unbounded license of indulging his sensual appetites. His hours were spent in a seraglio of three hundred beautiful women, and as many boys of every rank and of every province; and wherever the arts of seduction proved ineffectual, the brutal lover had recourse to violence.... The intervals of lust were filled up with the basest amusements." — Gibbon. ^{f80}

Wild beasts were brought from far countries that the emperor might have the honor of slaying them with his own hand. The African lion, in his native haunts, men were forbidden under heavy penalty to kill even in self-defense, that he might be reserved for the sport of the emperor. At last he entered the arena in the character of a gladiator, armed with a helmet, a sword, and a buckler, and obliged gladiators to fight with him, armed only with a net and a leaden trident. He thus fought (?) seven hundred and thirty-five times, and each contest meant the death of his antagonist. The list of senators sacrificed to his suspicions continued still to lengthen. His cruelty at last arrived at that pitch where nobody within his reach could feel secure for an hour; and that they might certainly escape his furious caprice, Marcia his favorite concubine, Eclectus his chamberlain, and Laetus his praetorian prefect, formed a conspiracy to kill him. Marcia gave him a drink of poisoned wine, and the poison was assisted in its work by a professional wrestler who strangled him. Yet Commodus was not a persecutor of the Christians; but with this exception, there were few people in all the empire whom he did not persecute. For some reason Marcia was friendly to the Christians, and her influence with Commodus, as well as his

disposition to be as unlike his father as possible, inclined him to be favorable to them.

SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS,

the fifth of the “ten persecutors,” was emperor from A.D. 193 to 211. He was at first the friend of the Christians. There were Christians among the domestics of his household. Both the nurse and the teacher of his son Caracalla were Christians, and “he always treated with peculiar distinction several persons of both sexes who had embraced the new religion.” — Gibbon.^{f81} It must not be supposed, however, that Severus himself was inclined to become a Christian. Finding that the number of Christians was rapidly increasing, he issued an edict in A.D. 202 forbidding anybody thereafter to adopt the new religion. This, however, did not prohibit those who were already Christians from remaining so. The purpose being to check the spread of the new religion, he forbade any further changing from the old to the new. Yet the result of the edict was indirectly to increase the hardships of the Christians under the already existing laws. This was the measure of the persecution by Septimius Severus. But there is another side to the story of Severus which, when compared with this, shows that it is only by a severe stretch of language, if not of imagination, that the Christians could be counted as persecuted by him.

It was through a triangular civil war that Septimius Severus secured the imperial power. He was commander of the troops on the Illyrian frontier, and was in Pannonia. Pescennius Niger was commander of the troops in Syria. Clodius Albinus was governor of Britain. The troops of Niger proclaimed him emperor; and the troops of Severus did the same for him. Severus had the advantage of being nearest to Rome. He hastened into Italy with his army, and was acknowledged by the Senate as lawful emperor. War immediately followed between Severus and Niger. Niger was defeated in two engagements, and slain. As long as the contest with Niger was uncertain, Severus pretended the utmost friendship for Albinus; bestowed upon him the title of Caesar; sent him a letter in which he called him the brother of his soul and empire; and charged the messengers who carried the letter that when they delivered it, they should secure a private audience with Albinus and assassinate him.

Albinus, however, detected the conspiracy, and by it discovered that if he were to live, it would have to be as emperor. He crossed into Gaul; the

armies met at Lyons; Albinus was defeated, captured, and beheaded. Severus discovered that the Senate had encouraged Albinus. He therefore sent to the Romans the head of Albinus with a letter declaring that none of the adherents of either Albinus or Niger should be spared. He did, however, pardon thirty-five senators who were accused of having favored Albinus, while forty-one other senators with their wives, their children, and their friends were put to death. The same punishment was inflicted upon the most prominent characters of Spain, Gaul, and Syria, while many others were sent into exile, or suffered the confiscation of all their property, merely because they had obeyed the governor under whose authority they had happened to fall in the triangular conflict. Niger had been a popular governor, and many cities of the East contributed to him considerable sums of money when he was proclaimed emperor. All these cities were deprived of their honors, and were compelled to pay to Severus four times the amount that they had contributed to Niger. To elevate to the dignity of a persecution the treatment of the Christians by Septimius Severus in view of his treatment of the Roman Senate and whole cities and provinces of the empire, bears too much evidence of an attempt to make out a case, to be counted worthy of any weight.

Severus was succeeded in A.D. 211, by his two sons,

CARACALLA AND GETA.

A little more than a year afterward, Caracalla murdered Geta in his mother's arms, who in the struggle to protect him, was wounded in the hand and covered with blood: and immediately following, "under the vague appellation of the friends of Geta, above twenty thousand persons of both sexes suffered death." This, however, was but the beginning; for "Caracalla was the common enemy of mankind." He left the city of Rome in A.D. 213, and spent the rest of his reign, about four years, in the several provinces of the empire, particularly those of the East, "and every province was by turn the scene of his rapine and cruelty." — Gibbon.^{f82} The senators were compelled to accompany him wherever he went and to furnish daily entertainment at immense expense, which he gave over to his soldiers. They were likewise required to build in every city where he would come, magnificent palaces and splendid theaters which he would either not visit at all or else visit and order at once to be torn down.

The property of the most wealthy was confiscated at once, while that of the great mass of the people was taken under the form of taxes heavily increased. In the city of Alexandria in Egypt, simply because they had indulged in a bit of raillery at his expense, he took his station on top of the temple of Serapis, and commanded a general massacre of the citizens, which he directed and enjoyed from his elevated station. Thousands upon thousands of people were thus inhumanly slaughtered. And these are but parts of his wicked ways. Yet Caracalla is not numbered among the persecutors of the Christians, nor did he, in fact, molest the Christians as such. Yet it would be difficult to find an emperor, from Nero to Diocletian, who caused as much suffering to the Christians, as Caracalla did to almost everybody but the Christians. It would not be correct, however, to suppose that the Christians were exempt from his ravages: they of course shared the common lot in his desperate attentions.

The next in the list of the “Ten Persecutors” is —

MAXIMIN.

In the year 235 A. D., Maximin became emperor by the murder of the emperor Alexander Severus. Of him and the persecution of the Christians inflicted by him, the ecclesiastical historian says: —

“The emperor Alexander being carried off after a reign of thirteen years, was succeeded by Maximinus, who, inflamed with hatred against the house of Alexander, consisting of many believers, raised a persecution, and commanded at first only the heads of the churches to be slain, as the abettors and agents of evangelical truth.’ — Eusebius. ^{f83}

Alexander Severus had not only been a friend to the Christians, but had gone so far as to place an image of Christ among his household gods. The church in Rome had appropriated a piece of land in that city which was claimed by the Cooks’ Union. A dispute arose about it, and the case was brought to the emperor for settlement. He decided in favor of the church, saying that it was better that God should be worshiped on that ground than that it should be given up to the cooks. Through such pronounced favor of the emperor, many Christians became connected with the imperial household, and bishops were received at court. When Maximin murdered the emperor Alexander, the Christians and the bishops to whom Eusebius

refers were involved in the massacre. And this is the extent of Maximin's persecution of the Christians.

Maximin was a barbarian who had risen from the condition of a Thracian peasant to the highest military command. When he was in humble circumstances, he had been slighted by the Roman nobles, and treated with insolence by their slaves; others had befriended him in his poverty, and had encouraged him in adversity. When he became emperor, he took vengeance on all alike, for all "were guilty of the same crime — the knowledge of his original obscurity. For this crime many were put to death; and by the execution of several of his benefactors, Maximin published, in characters of blood, the indelible history of his baseness and ingratitude." — Gibbon. ^{f84}

Maximin was but little less than a wild beast in the shape of a man. Knowing full well his own shameful inferiority, he was supremely suspicious of everybody else. Being so treacherous and so cruel himself, he was ready to believe that every distinguished person was guilty of treason. "Italy and the whole empire were infested with innumerable spies and informers." Magnus, a principal senator, was accused of conspiracy. "Without a witness, without a trial, and without an opportunity of defense, Magnus with four thousand of his supposed accomplices, was put to death.... Confiscation, exile, or simple death were esteemed uncommon instances of his lenity. Some of the unfortunate sufferers he ordered to be sewed up in the hides of slaughtered animals, others to be exposed to wild beasts, others again to be beaten to death with clubs." — Gibbon. ^{f85}

Such was the conduct of Maximin toward the Roman nobles. He next, at one single stroke, confiscated all the treasure and all the revenue of all the cities of the empire, and turned them to his own use. The temples everywhere were robbed of all the gold and silver offerings; "and the statues of gods, heroes, and emperors were melted down, and coined into money." In many places these robberies and exactions were resisted, the people defending the rights of their cities and the sacredness of their temples. In such cases massacres accompanied the robbery of the temples and the confiscation of the cities' treasures.

Of Maximin's treatment of the Christians, as of that of Domitian and Septimius Severus, it is but proper to remark that to separate this from all the other evidences of his cruelty, which were so wide-spread and continuous, magnifying this while ignoring all the rest — in order to bestow upon it the distinction of a "persecution" — bears too much

evidence of an effort to make out a case, to be worthy of indorsement in any sober or exact history.

The next one in the list of the “Ten Persecutions” is that by the emperor —

DECIUS,

whose reign was but a little more than two years in length, from A.D. 249-251. Decius was somewhat after the model of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius — devoted to Rome, her laws, and her institutions. His serious endeavor was to bring back the Roman discipline, and the Roman virtue of earlier times. Therefore, one of the earliest acts of his reign was to revive the office of censor. The choosing of the censor was left to the Senate, and as the result, Valerian was unanimously chosen. The speech which Decius made upon the investiture of Valerian with the insignia of his office, will enable the reader to form some estimate of the ideal which this emperor had formed for himself in the matter of government. He said: —

“Happy Valerian, — happy in the general approbation of the Senate and of the Roman republic! Accept the censorship of mankind: and judge of our manners. You will select those who deserve to continue members of the Senate; you will restore the equestrian order to its ancient splendor; you will improve the revenue, yet moderate the public burdens. You will distinguish into regular classes the various and infinite multitude of citizens; and accurately review the military strength, the wealth, the virtue, and the resources of Rome. Your decisions shall obtain the force of laws. The army, the palace, the ministers of justice, and the great officers of the empire, are all subject to your tribunal. None are exempted excepting only the ordinary consuls, the prefect of the city, the king of the sacrifices, and (as long as she preserves her chastity inviolate) the eldest of the vestal virgins. Even these few, who may not dread the severity, will anxiously solicit the esteem of the Roman censor.” — Gibbon.^{f86}

With such views of the public needs and of his duty as emperor to restore the purity of the old Roman discipline, it could only be that the effects of his efforts would be first felt by the Christians, because by their denial of the gods and repudiation of the Roman religion and their denial of the right of the State to interfere with their religious exercise or profession, they were placed as the first of the enemies of the Roman people. In the year

250 the persecution began. Rigorous search was ordered for all the people who were suspected of refusing to conform to the Roman worship, with the object of compelling them to return to the exercise of the ceremonies of the Roman religion. When they were found, if they refused, threats were first to be used, and if that failed, torture was to be applied, and if that failed, death was to be inflicted.

The persecution began in Rome, and as there had been a long period of peace, many of the professed Christians had become worldly, and thought more of increasing their earthly possessions than of cultivating the Christian virtues. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who lived at the time and was put to death only a few years afterward, says: —

“Forgetful of what believers had either done before in the times of the apostles, or always ought to do, with the insatiable ardor of covetousness, devoted themselves to the increase of their property.” ^{f87}

Immediately upon the issuing of this edict, large numbers of these gave up their profession, whose ready compliance encouraged the emperor to suppose that it would be but an easy task entirely to suppress the Christian faith. Bishops themselves had set the people an example in worldly degeneracy, for says Cyprian of them: —

“Among the priests there was no devotedness of religion; among the ministers there was no sound faith: in their works there was no mercy; in their manners there was no discipline. In men, their beards were defaced; in women, their complexion was dyed: the eyes were falsified from what God’s hand had made them; their hair was stained with a falsehood. Crafty frauds were used to deceive the hearts of the simple, subtle meanings for circumventing the brethren. They united in the bond of marriage with unbelievers; they prostituted the members of Christ to the Gentiles. They would swear not only rashly, but even more, would swear falsely; would despise those set over them with haughty swelling, would speak evil of one another with envenomed tongue, would quarrel with one another with obstinate hatred. Not a few bishops who ought to furnish both exhortation and example to others, despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their throne deserted their people, wandered about over foreign

provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise, while brethren were starving in the church. They sought to possess money in hoards, they seized estates by crafty deceits, they increased their gains by multiplying usuries. — Cyprian.^{f88}

Seeing then, that so many of the people had so readily renounced their profession, and believing that the influence of the bishops was to a large extent the cause of the existence and spread of Christianity, and seeing the character of many of them thus displayed, the efforts of Decius were first directed at these with the hope that if their influence was checked, it would be easy to restore the Roman worship. But it could not be made to succeed. If a bishop was imprisoned or banished, it only bound his flock closer to him; if he was put to death, by his example others were only encouraged to be the more faithful to their profession; and thus, although the persecution began with the bishops, it soon embraced the people; and although it had its beginning in Rome, it soon extended throughout the empire.

Thus began the first imperial persecution that there had been in the city of Rome since that of Nero, and the first one which really spread over the whole empire. Wherever the edict was published, the idea was always by mild measures first, if possible, to restore the Roman worship everywhere; and it was only when the milder measures failed, that the severer were employed, even to death. Being so wide-spread, the Decian persecution was thus the severest that had ever yet been inflicted upon the Christians by any emperor; yet it continued only about two years, for the emperor lost his life in a battle with the Goths in December, 251.

The author of the next of the “Ten Persecutions” was —

VALERIAN,

who became emperor in August, 253. At first he was favorable to the Christians. Indeed, Dionysius, as quoted by Eusebius, says that “never was there any of the emperors before him so favorably and benevolently disposed toward them;” that, “in the commencement of his reign” he “plainly received them with excessive civility and friendship;” and that the emperor’s house “was filled with pious persons, and was, indeed, a congregation of the Lord.”^{f89} This is probably somewhat extravagant, but that the emperor was friendly to the Christians at the beginning of his reign, is very evident.

This leniency continued till the year 257, when his conduct toward them was reversed; but, like Decius, he hoped to put an end to Christianity without the employment of violent measures. He endeavored first to compel the church leaders, — the bishops, the presbyters, and the deacons, — to renounce Christianity, expecting that the people would follow their example. This failing, he next forbade their holding meetings; likewise failing in this, an edict was issued in 258 commanding them to be put to death at once. The senators and knights who were Christians, were to be deprived of their rank and property, and if they still persevered, they were to be beheaded. Women of rank who were Christians, were to be deprived of their property and banished. Sixtus, the Roman bishop, and four deacons of the church in Rome were put to death under this edict in August. This persecution came to an end in 260, when Valerian was taken prisoner by the king of Persia. He was succeeded in the empire by his son —

GALLIENUS,

who not only immediately put a stop to the persecution, but issued an edict which in effect recognized Christianity as among the lawful religions of the Roman empire, by commanding that the church property should be restored; for none but legally existing bodies could legally hold common property.

Yet this man who showed himself to be such a friend to the Christians as to make their religion legal, was very little behind Maximin in his cruelty to every one but the Christians. During his reign there arose nineteen usurpers in different parts of the empire, of whom there was not one “who enjoyed a life of peace or died a natural death.” Gallienus was so fortunate as to be successful over them all, yet their efforts kept the empire in a state of constant ferment, and the disposition of Gallienus toward all be gathered from a command that he issued with respect to one Ingenuus, who assumed the office of emperor in the province of Illyricum. When the revolt had been quelled, Gallienus wrote to his minister there these words:

—

“It is not enough that you exterminate such as have appeared in arms: the chance of battle might have served me as effectually. The male sex of every age must be extirpated; provided that, in the execution of the children and old men, you can contrive means to save our reputation. Let every one die who has dropped an

expression, who has entertained a thought, against me, against me — the son of Valerian, the father and brother of so many princes. Remember that Ingenuus was made emperor: tear, kill, hew in pieces. I write to you with my own hand, and would inspire you with my own feelings.” — Gibbon.^{f90}

This being a sample of things in nineteen different parts of the empire, it will be seen that under Gallienus as under some of the others whom we have named, although the Christians were unmolested, they were about the only people in the empire who were so.

The next one in the list of the ten persecutors is —

AURELIAN,

who became emperor in A.D. 270. His persecution, like that of some of the others in the list, is a myth. So far from Aurelian's being a persecutor or an enemy of the Christians, or one whom they dreaded, the bishops themselves appealed to him in one of their intestine controversies.

Paul of Samosata was Bishop of Antioch, and like many other bishops of his day, he assumed a style and an arrogance becoming an emperor of Rome rather than a servant of Christ. He was accused of heresy and tried by a council of bishops, who pronounced him deposed, and named another to be seated in his place. But, although they could easily enough pronounce him deposed, it was another thing to unseat him in fact. Paul held his bishopric in spite of them. The council then appealed to Aurelian to enforce their decree and compel Paul to vacate the bishopric. Aurelian refused to decide the question himself, but referred them to the Bishop of Rome, saying that whoever the bishops of Rome and Italy should decide to be the proper person, should have the office. They decided against Paul, and Aurelian compelled him to relinquish his seat. Afterward, however, in the last year of his reign, as it proved to be, Eusebius says that Aurelian was persuaded to raise persecution against the Christians, and the rumor was spread abroad everywhere; yet before any decree was issued, death overtook him. This is the history of Aurelian as one of the “Persecutors”, and this is the history of “the ninth persecution.”

The tenth persecution, that of Diocletian, was a persecution indeed. We shall not dwell upon it here, because it will have to be noticed fully in another place.

The evidence here presented, however, is sufficient to show that the story of the Ten Persecutions is a fable. That both events and names have been forced into service to make up the list of ten persecutions and to find among the Roman emperors ten persecutors, the history plainly shows.

The history shows that only five of the so-called ten persecutors can by any fair construction be counted such. These five were Nero, Marcus Aurelius, Valerian, Decius, and Diocletian. Of the other five Trajan not only added nothing to the laws already existing, but gave very mild directions for the enforcement of these, which abated rather than intensified the troubles of the Christians. It would be difficult to see how any directions could have been more mild without abrogating the laws altogether, which to Trajan would have been only equivalent to subverting the empire itself. Domitian was not a persecutor of the Christians as such, but was cruel to all people; and in common with others, some Christians suffered, and suffered only as did others who were not Christians. Septimius Severus only forbade any more people to become Christians without particularly interfering with such as were already Christians. The cruelty of Maximin, more bitter even than that of Domitian, involved all classes, and where it overtook Christians, that which befell them was but the common lot of thousands and thousands of people who were not Christians. Aurelian was not in any sense a persecutor of the Christians in fact. At the utmost stretch, he only contemplated it. Had he lived longer, he might have been a persecutor; but it is not honest to count a man a persecutor who at the most only intended to persecute. It is not fair in such a case to turn an intention into a fact.

Looking again at the record of the five who really were persecutors, it is found that from Nero to Marcus Aurelius was ninety-three years; that from Marcus Aurelius to Decius was eighty years; that from Decius to Valerian's edict was six years; and that from the edict of Gallienus to Diocletian's edict of persecution was forty-three years. From the record of this period, on the other hand, it is found that between Nero and Marcus Aurelius, Domitian and Vitellius raged; that between Marcus and Decius, the savage Commodus and Caracalla, and Elagabalus and Maximin, all ravaged the empire like wild boars a forest; and that next after Valerian came Gallienus.

From these facts it must be admitted that if the persecution of the Christians by Pagan Rome depended upon the action of the emperors, and if it is to be attributed to them, Christians had not much more to bear than

had the generality of people throughout the empire. In short, the story of the “Ten Persecutions” is a myth.

CHAPTER 5.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

ALTHOUGH the tale of the “Ten Persecutions” is a myth, this is not by any means to pronounce as myths all stories of the persecution of Christians by Pagan Rome. Though there were not ten persecutions as such, there was one continuous persecution, only with variations, for two hundred and fifty years.

Nor is it strictly correct to speak of this as the persecution of Christians by the Romans. It was all this, it is true, but it was much more. The controversy between the Christians and the Romans was not a dispute between individuals, or a contention between sects or parties. It was a contest between antagonistic principles. It was, therefore, a contest between Christianity and Rome, rather than between Christians and Romans. On the part of Christianity it was the proclamation of the principle of genuine liberty; on the part of Rome it was the assertion of the principle of genuine despotism. On the part of Christianity it was the assertion of the principle of the rights of conscience and of the individual; on the part of Rome it was the assertion of the principle of the absolute absorption of the individual, and his total enslavement to the State in all things, divine as well as human, religious as well as civil

This is detected by a mere glance again at the actions of the emperors whom we have named in the previous chapter. With the exception of Nero, the emperors who persecuted the Christians most, were among the best that Rome ever had; while those emperors who were the very worst, persecuted the Christians, as such, the least or not at all. Marcus Aurelius, indeed, is acknowledged not only to have been one of the best of the Roman emperors, but one of the best men of all pagan times; while on the other hand, Domitian, and Vitellius, and Commodus, and Caracalla, and Elagabalus, and Maximin, were not only the worst of Roman emperors, but among the worst of all men. While on the part of those emperors who persecuted the Christians it was not cruelty that caused them to do so; on the part of the others named who did not persecute the Christians as such, but who persecuted everybody indiscriminately, it was nothing but cruelty that caused them to do so. With the exception of Nero, it was invariably

the best of the emperors who persecuted the Christians; and they invariably did it, not because they were cruel and delighted to see people suffer, but only by the enforcement of the laws which were already extant; by way of respect to institutions long established; and to preserve a system the fall of which, to them, meant the fall of the empire itself.

The best men naturally cared most for the Roman institutions and held as most sacred the majesty of Rome and the dignity of Roman law as the expression of that majesty. Being thus the most jealous of the Roman integrity and Roman institutions, any disregard of the majesty of Rome, or any infraction of the laws, would not be suffered by them to go unnoticed. Christians, caring nothing for the majesty of Rome in view of the awful majesty of Jesus Christ, not only disregarded the Roman laws on the subject of religion, but asserted the right to disregard them; and held it to be the most sacred and heaven-enjoined duty to spread abroad these views to all people. Consequently, in the very nature of things, these would be the first ones to incur the displeasure of those emperors who held sacred the Roman institutions. On the other hand, those emperors who cared little or nothing for anything but the gratification of their appetites and passions, and the indulgence of their cruel propensities, cared little or nothing whether the Christians obeyed the laws or not. They themselves cared nothing for the laws, the manners, or the institutions of Rome, and they cared little whether other people cared for these things or not.

Jesus Christ came into the world to set men free, and to plant in their souls the genuine principle of liberty, — liberty actuated by love, — liberty too honorable to allow itself to be used as an occasion to the flesh, or for a cloak of maliciousness, — liberty led by a conscience enlightened by the Spirit of God, — liberty in which man may be free from all men, yet made so gentle by love that he would willingly become the servant of all, in order to bring them to the enjoyment of this same liberty. This is freedom indeed. This is the freedom which Christ gave to man; for, whom the Son makes free is free indeed. In giving to men this freedom, such an infinite gift could have no other result than that which Christ intended; namely, to bind them in everlasting, unquestioning, unswerving allegiance to him as the royal benefactor of the race. He thus reveals himself to men as the highest good, and brings them to himself as the manifestation of that highest good, and to obedience to his will as the perfection of conduct. Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh. Thus God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, that they might know him, the only true God, and Jesus Christ

whom he sent. He gathered to himself disciples, instructed them in his heavenly doctrine, endued them with power from on high, sent them forth into all the world to preach this gospel of freedom to every creature, and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them.

The Roman empire then filled the world, — “the sublimest incarnation of power, and a monument the mightiest of greatness built by human hands, which has upon this planet been suffered to appear.” That empire, proud of its conquests, and exceedingly jealous of its claims, asserted its right to rule in all things, human and divine. In the Roman view, the State took precedence of everything. It was entirely out of respect to the State and wholly to preserve the State, that either the emperors or the laws ever forbade the exercise of the Christian religion. According to Roman principles, the State was the highest idea of good. “The idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics; and within that was included all actual realization of the highest good; hence the development of all other goods pertaining to humanity, was made dependent on this.” — Neander.^{f91}

Man with all that he had was subordinated to the State; he must have no higher aim than to be a servant of the State; he must seek no higher good than that which the State could bestow. Thus every Roman citizen was a subject, and every Roman subject was a slave. “The more distinguished a Roman became, the less was he a free man. The omnipotence of the law, the despotism of the rule, drove him into a narrow circle of thought and action, and his credit and influence depended on the sad austerity of his life. The whole duty of man, with the humblest and greatest of the Romans, was to keep his house in order, and be the obedient servant of the State.” — Mommsen.^{f92}

It will be seen at once that for any man to profess the principles and the name of Christ, was virtually to set himself against the Roman empire; for him to recognize God as revealed in Jesus Christ as the highest good, was but treason against the Roman State. It was not looked upon by Rome as anything else than high treason; because as the Roman State represented to the Roman the highest idea of good, for any man to assert that there was a higher good, was to make Rome itself subordinate. And this would not be looked upon in any other light by Roman pride than as a direct blow at the dignity of Rome, and subversive of the Roman State. Consequently the Christians were not only called “atheists,” because they denied the gods, but the accusation against them before the tribunals was of the crime of

“high treason,” because they denied the right of the State to interfere with men’s relations to God. The common accusation against them was that they were “irreverent to the Caesars, and enemies of the Caesars and of the Roman people.”

To the Christian, the word of God asserted with absolute authority: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.”

²¹²¹³ Ecclesiastes 12:13. To him, obedience to this word through faith in Christ, was eternal life. This to him was the conduct which showed his allegiance to God as the highest good, — a good as much higher than that of the Roman State as the government of God is greater than was the government of Rome.

This idea of the State, was not merely the State as a civil institution, but as a divine institution, and the highest conception of divinity itself. The genius of Rome was the supreme deity. Thus the idea of the State as the highest good was the religious idea, and consequently religion was inseparable from the State. All religious views were to be held subordinate to the State, and all religion was only the servant of the State.

The Roman State being the chief deity, the gods of Rome derived their dignity from the State rather than the State deriving any honor from them. And the genius of the Roman State being to the Roman mind the chief deity, as Rome had conquered all nations, it was demonstrated to the Roman mind that Rome was superior to all the gods that were known. And though Rome allowed conquered nations to maintain the worship of their national gods, these as well as the conquered people were considered only as servants of the Roman State. Every religion was held subordinate to the religion of Rome, and though “all forms of religion might come to Rome and take their places in its pantheon, they must come as the servants of the State.”

The State being the Roman’s conception of the highest good, Rome’s own gods derived all their dignity from the fact that they were recognized as such by the State. It was counted by the Romans an act of the greatest condescension and an evidence of the greatest possible favor to bestow State recognition upon any foreign gods, or to allow any Roman subject to worship any other gods than those which were recognized as such by the Roman State. A fundamental maxim of Roman legislation was, —

“No man shall have for himself particular gods of his own; no man shall worship by himself any new or foreign gods, unless they are recognized by the public laws.” — Cicero.^{f93}

Again: the Roman State being the supreme deity, the Senate and people were but the organs through which its ideas were expressed; hence the maxim, *Vox populi, vox dei*, — the voice of the people is the voice of god. As this voice gave expression to the will of the supreme deity, and consequently of the highest good; and as this will was expressed in the form of laws; hence again the Roman maxim, “What the law says is right.”

It is very evident that in such a system there was no place for individuality. The State was everything, and the majority was in fact the State. What the majority said should be, that was the voice of the State, that was the voice of God, that was the expression of the highest good, that was the expression of the highest conception of right; and everybody must assent to that or be considered a traitor to the State. The individual was but a part of the State.

There was therefore no such thing as the rights of the people; the right of the State only was to be considered, and that was to be considered absolute. “The first principle of their law was the paramount right of the State over the citizen. Whether as head of a family, or as proprietor, he had no natural rights of his own; his privileges were created by the law as well as defined by it. The State in the plenitude of her power, delegated a portion of her own irresponsibility to the citizen, who satisfied the conditions she required, in order to become the parent of her children; but at the same time she demanded of him the sacrifice of his free agency to her own rude ideas of political expediency.” — Mericale.^{f94}

It is also evident that in such a system, there was no such thing as the rights of conscience; because as the State was supreme also in the realm of religion, all things religious were to be subordinated to the will of the State, which was but the will of the majority. And where the majority presumes to decide in matters of religion, there is no such thing as rights of religion or conscience. Against this whole system Christianity was diametrically opposed, —

First, In its assertion of the supremacy of God; in the idea of God as manifested in Jesus Christ as the highest idea of good; in the will of God as expressed in his law as the highest conception of right; and in the fear of

God and the keeping of his commandments as the whole duty of man. Christ had set himself before his disciples as the one possessing all power in heaven and in earth. He had told them to go into all the world and teach to every creature all things whatsoever he had commanded them. Christ had said that the first of all the commandments, that which inculcates the highest and first of all duties, is “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.” This put Jesus Christ above the State, and put allegiance to him above allegiance to the State; this denied the supremacy of Rome, and likewise denied that either the Roman gods were gods at all, or that the genius of Rome itself was in any sense a god.

Secondly, When the republic as represented by the Senate and people of Rome was merged in the imperial power, and the emperor became the embodiment of the State, he represented the dignity, the majesty, and the power of the State, and likewise, in that, represented the divinity of the State. Hence divinity attached to the Caesars.

Christianity was directly opposed to this, as shown by the word of Christ, who, when asked by the Pharisees and the Herodians whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not, answered: “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.” In this Christ established a clear distinction between Caesar and God, and between religion and the State. He separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to the State. Only that which was Caesar’s was to be rendered to Caesar, while that which is God’s was to be rendered to God and with no reference whatever to Caesar.

The State being divine and the Caesar reflecting this divinity, whatever was God’s was Caesar’s. Therefore when Christ made this distinction between God and Caesar, separated that which pertains to God from that which pertains to Caesar, and commanded men to render to God that which is God’s, and to Caesar only that which is Caesar’s, he at once stripped Caesar — the State — of every attribute of divinity. And in doing this he declared the supremacy of the individual conscience; because it is left with the individual to decide what things they are which pertain to God.

Thus Christianity proclaimed the right of the individual to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, while Rome asserted the

duty of every man to worship according to the dictates of the State. Christianity asserted the supremacy of God; Rome asserted the supremacy of the State. Christianity set forth God as manifested in Jesus Christ as the chief good; Rome held the State to be the highest good. Christianity set forth the law of God as the expression of the highest conception of right; Rome held the law of the State to be the expression of the highest idea of right. Christianity taught that the fear of God and the keeping of his commandments is the whole duty of man; Rome taught that to be the obedient servant of the State is the whole duty of man. Christianity preached Christ as the sole possessor of power in heaven and in earth; Rome asserted the State to be the highest power. Christianity separated that which is God's from that which is Caesar's; Rome maintained that that which is God's is Caesar's.

This was the contest, and these were the reasons of it, between Christianity and the Roman empire.

Yet in all this Christianity did not deny to Caesar a place; it did not propose to undo the State. It only taught the State its proper place; and proposed to have the State take that place and keep it. Christianity did not dispute the right of the Roman State to be; it only denied the right of that State to be in the place of God. In the very words in which he separated between that which is Caesar's and that which is God's, Christ recognized the rightfulness of Caesar to be; and that there were things that rightfully belong to Caesar, and which were to be rendered to him by Christians. He said, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." In these words he certainly recognized that Caesar had jurisdiction in certain things, and that within that jurisdiction he was to be respected. As Caesar represented the State, in this scripture the phrase represents the State, whether it be the State of Rome or any other State on earth. This is simply the statement of the right of civil government to be; that there are certain things over which civil government has jurisdiction; and that in these things the authority of civil government is to be respected.

This jurisdiction is more clearly defined in Paul's letter to the ~~the~~ Romans 13:1-10. There it is commanded, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." In this is asserted the right of the higher powers — that is, the right of the State — to exercise authority, and that Christians must be subject to that authority. Further it is given as a reason for this, that "there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." This not

only asserts the right of the State to be and to exercise authority, but it also asserts the truth that the State is an ordinance of God, and the power which it exercises is ordained of God. Yet in this very assertion Christianity was held to be antagonistic to Rome, because it put the God of the Christians above the Roman State, and made the State to be only an ordinance of the God of the Christians. For the Roman empire, or for any of the Roman emperors, to have recognized the truth of this statement would have been at once to revolutionize the whole system of civil and religious economy of the Romans, and to deny at once the value of the accumulated wisdom of all the generations of the Roman ages. Yet that was the only proper alternative of the Roman State, and that is what ought to have been done.

Civil government being thus declared to be of God, and its authority ordained of God, the instruction proceeds: "Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.... Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." Governments being of God, and their authority being ordained of God, Christians in respecting God will necessarily respect in its place, the exercise of the authority ordained by him; but this authority, according to the words of Christ, is to be exercised only in those things which are Caesar's and not in things which pertain to God. Accordingly, the letter to the Romans proceeds, "For this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." This connects Paul's argument directly with that of Christ above referred to, and shows that this is but a comment on that statement, and an extension of the argument therein contained.

The scripture proceeds: "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Let it be borne in mind that the apostle is here writing to Christians concerning the respect and duty which they are to render to the powers that be, that is, to the State in fact. He knew full well, and so did those to

whom he wrote, that there are other commandments in the very law of which a part is here quoted. But he and they likewise knew that these other commandments do not in any way relate to any man's duty or respect to the powers that be. Those other commandments of the law which is here partly quoted, relate to God and to man's duty to him. One of them is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" another, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," etc.; another, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;" and another, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," etc.: and these are briefly comprehended in that saying, namely, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." According to the words of Christ, all these obligations, pertaining solely to God, are to be rendered to him only, and with man in this realm, Caesar can never of right have anything to do in any way whatever.

As, therefore, the instruction in ~~5101~~ Romans 13:1-10 is given to Christians concerning their duty and respect to the powers that be; and as this instruction is confined absolutely to man's relationship to his fellow-men, it is evident that when Christians have paid their taxes, and have shown proper respect to their fellow-men, then their obligation, their duty, and their respect, to the powers that be, have been fully discharged, and those powers never can rightly have any further jurisdiction over their conduct. This is not to say that the State has jurisdiction of the last six commandments as such. It is only to say that the jurisdiction of the State is confined solely to man's conduct toward man, and never can touch his relationship to God, even under the second table of the law. This will be more fully discussed in a subsequent chapter.

This doctrine asserts the right of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, as he pleases, and when he pleases. Just this, however, was the subject of the whole controversy between Christianity and the Roman empire. There was never any honest charge made that the Christians did violence to any man, or refused to pay tribute. The direct and positive instruction was not only that they should do no evil, but that they should speak no evil of any man; and that they practiced accordingly is shown by Pliny's letter to Trajan concerning the Christians, in which he says that when they met and partook of that harmless meal, before they separated they pledged one another not to steal, not to commit

adultery, not to do violence to any man. The Roman State never had any just charge to bring against the Christians in any of these respects. The charge was atheism, because they denied the gods, and high treason, because they denied the right of the State to rule in things pertaining to God. Therefore as a matter of fact the whole controversy between Christianity and the Roman empire was upon the simple question of the rights of conscience, — the question whether it is the right of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, or whether it is his duty to worship according to the dictates of the State.

This question was then as it always has been, very far-reaching. When the right was claimed to worship according to the dictates of conscience, in that was claimed the right to disregard all the Roman laws on the subject of religion, and to deny the right of the State to have anything whatever to do with the question of religion. But this, according to the Roman estimate, was only to bid defiance to the State and to the interests of society altogether. The Roman State, so intimately and intricately connected with religion, was but the reflection of the character of the Roman people, who prided themselves upon being the most religious of all nations, and Cicero commended them for this, because their religion was carried into all the details of life. “The Roman ceremonial worship was very elaborate and minute, applying to every part of daily life. It consisted in sacrifices, prayers, festivals, and the investigations, by auguries and haruspices, of the will of the gods and the course of future events. The Romans accounted themselves an exceedingly religious people, because their religion was so intimately connected with the affairs of home and State.... Thus religion everywhere met the public life of the Roman by its festivals, and laid an equal yoke on his private life by its requisition of sacrifices, prayers, and auguries. All pursuits must be conducted according to a system carefully laid down by the College of Pontiffs.... If a man went out to walk, there was a form to be recited; if he mounted his chariot, another.” — James Freeman Clarke.¹⁹⁵

But this whole system of religion was false. The gods which they worshiped were false gods. Their gods, in short were but reflections of themselves, and the ceremonies of worship were but the exercise of their own passions and lusts. Neither in their gods nor their worship was there a single element of good. Therefore upon it all Christianity taught the people to turn their backs. The Christian doctrine declared all these gods to be no gods, and all the forms of worship of the gods to be only idolatry, and a

denial of the only true God — the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The games and all the festival days were affairs of state, and “were an essential part of the cheerful devotion of the pagans, and the gods were supposed to accept, as the most grateful offering, the games that the prince and people celebrated in honor of their peculiar festivals.” — Gibbon.^{f96}

The festivities of the wedding and the ceremonies of the funeral were all conducted under the protection of the gods. More than this, “the number of the gods was as great as the number of the incidents in earthly life.” — Mommsen.^{f97} The “pagan’s domestic hearth was guarded by the penates, or by the ancestral gods of his family or tribe. By land he traveled under the protection of one tutelar divinity, by sea of another; the birth, the bridal, the funeral, had each its presiding deity; the very commonest household utensils and implements were cast in mythological forms; he could scarcely drink without being reminded of making a libation to the gods.” — Milman.^{f98} All this heathen ceremony Christianity taught the people to renounce, and every one did renounce it who became a Christian. But so intricately was the idolatry interwoven into all the associations of both public and private life, of both State and social action, that “it seemed impossible to escape the observance of them without at the same time renouncing the commerce of mankind and all the offices and amusements of society.” Yet with any of it true Christianity did not compromise.

Every Christian, merely by the profession of Christianity, severed himself from all the gods of Rome and everything that was done in their honor. He could not attend a wedding or a funeral of his nearest relatives, because every ceremony was performed with reference to the gods. He could not attend the public festival, for the same reason. Nor could he escape by absenting himself on such occasions, because on days of public festivity, the doors of the houses, and the lamps about them, and the heads of the dwellers therein, must all be adorned with laurel and garlands of flowers in honor of the licentious gods and goddesses of Rome. If the Christian took part in these services, he paid honor to the gods as did the other heathen. If he refused to do so, which he must do if he would obey God and honor Christ, he made himself conspicuous before the eyes of the people, all of whom were intensely jealous of the respect they thought due to the gods; and also in so refusing the Christians disobeyed the Roman law which commanded these things to be done.

All this subjected the Christian to universal hatred, and as the lawpositively forbade everything that the Christians taught both with reference to the gods and to the State, the forms of law furnished a ready channel through which this hatred found vent. This was the open way for the fury of the populace to spend itself upon the “deniers of the gods, and enemies of the Caesars and of the Roman people;” and this was the source of the persecution of Christianity by pagan Rome.

Before Christ was born into the world, Maecenas, one of the two chief ministers of Augustus, had given to that first of Roman emperors the following counsel, as embodying the principle which should characterize the imperial government: —

“Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same; but hate and punish those who would introduce anything whatever, alien to our customs in this particular; not alone for the sake of the gods, because whoever despises them is incapable of reverence for anything else; but because such persons, by introducing new divinities, mislead many to adopt also foreign laws.” ^{f99}

The Christians did refuse to worship the gods according to the laws, or in any other way; they did introduce that which was pre-eminently alien to all the Roman customs in this particular; they did despise the gods. In the presence of the purity, the goodness, and the inherent holiness of Jesus Christ, the Christians could have no other feeling than that of abhorrence for the wicked, cruel, and licentious gods of the heathen. And when from love for Christ they shrank in abhorrence from this idolatry, it only excited to bitter hatred the lovers of the licentious worship of the insensate gods; and, as above stated, there was the law, and there the machinery of the State, ready to be used in giving force to the religious enmity thus excited.

One of the ruling principles of law in the Roman State was this: —

“Whoever introduces new religions, the tendency and character of which are unknown, whereby the minds of men may be disturbed, shall, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death.” ^{f100}

Nothing could be more directly condemned by this law than was Christianity.

1. It was wholly a new religion, one never before heard of; it was not in any sense a national religion, but was ever announced as that which should be universal. Being so entirely new, in the nature of the case its tendency and character were unknown to the Roman mind.

2. Of all religions the world has ever known, Christianity appeals most directly to the minds of men. The first of all the commandments demanding the obedience of men declares, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind." The law of God was set forth as the highest conception of right, and the letter to all the Christians in Rome said, "With the mind I myself serve the law of God." ~~<B17>~~ Romans 7:25. Again that same letter said, "Be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind." ~~<B12>~~ Romans 12:2. Again and again in the Christian writings this same idea was set forth, and it was all summed up in the saying of Christ to the woman of Samaria, "God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit;" thus setting God before the mind to be discerned only by the mind, and worshiped in a mental and spiritual conception only.

3. The Christians were almost wholly from the lower ranks. The common people heard Christ gladly; so also did they hear his gracious gospel from his disciples. There was yet a further disadvantage, however, in the position of the Christians. Christianity had sprung from among the Jews. It had been despised by the Jews. The Jews were viewed by the Romans as the most despicable of all people. Therefore, as the Christians were despised by the Jews, who were despised by the Romans, it followed that to the Romans the Christians were the despised of the despised. It was but the record of a literal fact which Paul wrote: "We are made as the filth of the world, and are the off scouring of all things unto this day." ~~<B13>~~ 1 Corinthians 4:13. The law declared that if those who did what the statute forbade belonged to the lower ranks, they were to be punished with death; and as the Christians were mostly from the lower ranks, death became the most common penalty incurred by the profession of Christianity.

There was yet another disadvantage. These laws had all been framed, and the system had been established, long before there were any Christians in the world. Therefore the teaching of the Christians, their practice, and their disregard of the Roman laws, appeared to the Romans in no other light than as an open insurrection against the government, and an attempt at the dissolution of society itself.

The persecution of the Christians, having its foundation principle in the system of laws and government of Rome, proceeded from four distinct causes and from four distinct sources.

First, from the populace. The Christians refused to pay any respect or honor whatever to the gods to whom the people were devoted in every act and relationship of life. They were charged at once with being atheists and enemies of the gods, and therefore of being the direct cause of all the calamities and misfortunes that might befall anybody from any source. Everything in nature, as well as in the life of the individual, was presided over by some particular deity, and therefore whatever, out of the natural order, might happen in the course of the seasons or in the life of the individual, was held to be a token of the anger of the insulted gods, which was only to be appeased by the punishment of the Christians.

If the fall of rain was long delayed so that crops and pastures suffered, it was laid to the charge of the Christians. If when rain did come, there was too much so that the rivers overflowed and did damage, they charged this likewise to the Christians. If there was an earthquake or a famine, the Christians' disrespect to the gods was held to be the cause of it. If an epidemic broke out, if there was an invasion by the barbarians, or if any public calamity occurred, it was all attributed to the anger of the gods, which was visited upon the State and the people on account of the spread of Christianity. For instance; Esculapius was the god of healing, and as late as the time of Diocletian, when a plague had spread far through the empire and continued a long time, Porphyry, who made strong pretensions to being a philosopher, actually argued that the reason why the plague could not be checked was that the spread of Christianity had destroyed the influence of Esculapius. When such things as this were soberly announced as the opinion of the wise, it can readily be understood how strong a hold the same superstition had upon the minds of the common heathen.

The turning away of individuals from the worship of the gods and their renouncing all respect for them, and holding as idolaters only those who would show respect to them, excited the most bitter feelings in the great mass of the people. When there was added to this the calamities and misfortunes that might befall, which were held to be but a manifestation of the anger of the gods, and their sympathy with the people in their antagonism to Christianity, — all these things tended only to deepen that feeling of bitterness and to inspire the populace with the idea that they

were doing the will of the gods, and performing the most acceptable service, when they executed vengeance upon the offending Christians. And “when superstition has once found out victims, to whose guilt or impiety it may ascribe the divine anger, human revenge mingles itself with the relentless determination to propitiate offended heaven, and contributes still more to blind the judgment and exasperate the passions.” — Milman.^{f101a}

Nor was this resentment always confined to respect for the gods, but often private spite and personal animosities were indulged under cover of allegiance to the gods and respect to the laws. This was shown not only by prosecution before the magistrates, but by open riot and mob violence; and there was no lack of individuals to work upon the riotous propensities of the superstitiously enraged people. For instance, one Alexander of Abonoteichus, a magician, when he found that his tricks failed to excite the wonder that he desired, declared that the Pontus was filled with atheists and Christians, and called on the people to stone them if they did not want to draw down on themselves the anger of the gods. He went so far at last as never to attempt to give an exhibition until he had first proclaimed, “If any atheist, Christian, or Epicurean has slipped in here as a spy, let him be gone.”

The second source from which proceeded the persecution of the Christians was the priests and artisans. The priests had charge of the temples and sacrifices, by which they received their living and considerable profit besides. Pliny’s testimony, before quoted, plainly says that in his province “the temples were almost forsaken,” and of the sacrifices “very few purchasers had of late appeared.” The influence of Christianity reached much farther than to those who openly professed it. Many, seeing the Christians openly forsaking the gods, and refusing to offer sacrifices, would likewise, merely upon economical principles, stop making sacrifices in the temples. The priests and the traffickers in sacrificial offerings, seeing their gains falling off, were not slow in charging to the Christians the delinquency, were prompt to prosecute them before the tribunals, and were very diligent to secure the most rigid enforcement of the laws commanding sacrifice to the gods. From the same cause the artisans found their gains vanishing, through the diminished sale of carved and engraved images, amulets, etc. Upon which, like that Demetrius of the Scriptures who made silver shrines for Diana (~~442b~~ Acts 19:21-29), they became very zealous for the honor of the gods, and raised persecution against the disciples in order to restore the worship of the gods — and their own accustomed income.

A third source from which persecution arose was the governors of provinces. Some of these were of cruel and splenetic disposition, and, holding a personal animosity against the Christians, were glad of the opportunity to be the ministers of such laws as were of force against them. Others who were totally indifferent to the merits of the question, yet who earnestly desired to be popular, were ready to take part with the people in their fanatical rage, and to lend their power and use their official influence against the Christians. Yet others who had no particular care for the worship of the gods, could not understand the Christians' refusal to obey the laws.

The governors could see nothing in such a refusal to obey the law and perform the ceremonies therein prescribed, but what appeared to them to be blind, willful obstinacy and downright stubbornness. They regarded such willful disobedience to the law to be much more worthy of condemnation than even the disrespect to the gods. Such a one was Pliny, who said, "Let their confessions be of any sort whatever, this positiveness in inflexible obstinacy deserved to be punished." Many of the governors "would sooner pardon in the Christians their defection from the worship of the gods, than their want of reverence for the emperors, in declining to take any part in those idolatrous demonstrations of homage which pagan flattery had invented, such as sprinkling their images with incense, and swearing by their genius." — Neander. ^{f102a}

Still others were disposed to be favorable to the Christians, to sympathize with them in their difficult positions, and to temper as far as possible the severity of the laws against them. And when the Christians were prosecuted before their tribunals, they would make personal appeals to induce them to make some concession, however slight, that would justify the governor in certifying that they had conformed to the law, so that he might release them, — not only from that particular accusation, but from any other that might be made.

Such governors would plead with the Christians to this effect, "I do not wish to see you suffer; I know you have done no real harm, but there stands the law. I am here as the representative of the empire to see that the laws are enforced. I have no personal interest whatever in this matter; therefore I ask you for my own sake that you will do some honor to the gods, however slight, whereby I may be relieved from executing this penalty and causing you to suffer. All that is required is that you shall

worship the gods. Now your God is one of the gods; therefore what harm is there in obeying the law which commands to worship the gods without reference to any particular one? Why not say, 'The Emperor our lord,' and sprinkle a bit of incense toward his image? Merely do either of these two simple things, then I can certify that you have conformed to the law, and release you from this and all future prosecutions of the kind."

When the Christian replied that he could not under any form or pretense whatever worship any other God than the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ; nor honor any other by any manner of offering; nor call the emperor lord in the meaning of the statute, then the governor, understanding nothing of what the Christian called conscience, and seeing all of what he considered the kindest possible offers counted not only as of no worth but even as a reproach, his proffered mercy was often turned into wrath. He considered such a refusal only an evidence of open ingratitude and obstinacy, and that therefore such a person was unworthy of the slightest consideration. He held it then to be only a proper regard for both the gods and the State to execute to the utmost the penalty which the law prescribed.

Another thing that made the action of the Christians more obnoxious to the Roman magistrates, was not only their persistent disregard for the laws touching religion, but their assertion of the right to disregard them. And this plea seemed the more impertinent from the fact that it was made by the despised of the despised.

The fourth source from which persecution came to the Christians was the emperors. Yet until Christianity had become so wide-spread as to attract the attention of the emperor, there was no general persecution from this source. The first persecution by the direct instigation of the emperors was that inflicted by Nero. With this exception, the persecution of the Christians by the emperors was solely as the representatives of the State, to maintain the authority of the State and the dignity of her laws; and to preserve the State from the certain ruin which they supposed to be threatened from Christianity. This explains why it was that only the best of the emperors persecuted the Christians, as such.

In the emperor was merged the State. He alone represented the divinity of the Roman State. The Christians' refusal to recognize in him that divinity or to pay respect to it in any way, was held to be open disrespect to the State. The Christians' denial of the right of the State to make or enforce

any laws touching religion or men's relationship to God, was counted as an undermining of the authority of government. As it was held that religion was essential to the very existence of the State, and that the State for its own sake, for its own self-preservation, must maintain proper respect for religion; when Christianity denied the right of the State to exercise any authority or jurisdiction whatever in religious things, it was held to be but a denial of the right of the State to preserve itself.

Therefore when Christianity had become quite generally spread throughout the empire, it seemed to such emperors as Marcus Aurelius, Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian — emperors who most respected Roman institutions — that the very existence of the empire was at stake.

Consequently their opposition to Christianity was but an effort to save the State, and was considered by them as the most reasonable and laudable thing in the world. And it was only as a matter of State policy that they issued edicts or emphasized those already issued for the suppression of Christianity. In making or enforcing laws against the Christians it was invariably the purpose of these emperors to restore and to preserve the ancient dignity and glory of the Roman State. In an inscription by Diocletian, it is distinctly charged that by Christianity the State was being overturned, and his views on this subject are seen in the following extract from one of his edicts: —

“The immortal gods have, by their providence, arranged and established what is right. Many wise and good men are agreed that this should be maintained unaltered. They ought not to be opposed. No new religion must presume to censure the old, since it is the greatest of crimes to overturn what has been once established by our ancestors, and what has supremacy in the State.” ^{F102aa}

This is further shown by the following words from the edict of Galerius putting a stop to the persecution of Christianity: —

“Among other matters which we have devised for the benefit and common advantage of our people, we have first determined to restore all things according to the ancient laws and the public institutions of the Romans. And to make provision for this, that also the Christians, who have left the religion of their fathers, should return again to a good purpose and resolution.” ^{f103a}

With persecution proceeding from these four sources, it is evident that from the day that Christ sent forth his disciples to preach the gospel, the Christians were not certain of a moment's peace. It might be that they could live a considerable length of time unmolested; but yet they were at no time sure that it would be so, because they were subject at all times to the spites and caprices of individuals and the populace, and at any hour of the day or night any Christian was liable to be arrested and prosecuted before the tribunals, or to be made the butt of the capricious and violent temper of the heathen populace.

Yet to no one of these sources more than another, could be attributed the guilt or the dishonor of the persecution, because each one was but the inevitable fruit of that system from which persecution is inseparable. The theory which attaches blame to the emperors as the persecutors of the Christians is a mistaken one, because the emperor was but the representative, the embodiment, of the State itself. The State of Rome was a system built up by the accumulated wisdom of all the Roman ages; and to expect him whose chief pride was that he was a Roman, and who was conscious that it was the highest possible honor to be a Roman emperor — to expect such a one to defer to the views of a new and despised sect of religionists whose doctrines were entirely antagonistic to the entire system of which he was a representative, would be to expect more than Roman pride would bear. As the case stood, to have done such a thing, would have been to make himself one of the despised sect, or else the originator of another one, worthy only, in the eyes of the populace, of the same contempt as these. Of course we know now that the emperors should have done just that thing, and they were told then that they ought to do it, but the fact is nevertheless that Roman pride would not yield. Nor is this the only case of the kind in the history of Christianity.

The theory that would make the governors responsible is likewise a mistaken one, because the governors were simply the officers of the State set over a particular province to conduct the affairs of the government and to maintain the laws. It was not in their power to set aside the laws, although as we have seen, some of them even went as far as possible in that direction rather than cause the Christians to suffer by enforcing the law.

The only theory that will stand the test at all is that which places upon the priests and the people the guilt of the persecutions. They were the ones

who did it from real bitterness of the persecuting spirit. And yet to attach all the blame to these, would be a mistake, because it would have been impossible for them to persecute had it not been for the system of government of which they were a part.

Had the State been totally separated from religion, taking no cognizance of it in any way whatever; had the State confined itself to its proper jurisdiction, and used its power and authority to compel people to be civil and to maintain

the public peace, it would have been impossible for either people, priests, governors, or emperors, to be persecutors. Had there been no laws on the subject of religion, no laws enforcing respect for the gods, nor prohibiting the introduction of new religions, — even though religious controversies might have arisen, and having arisen even had they engendered bitter controversies and stirred up spiteful spirits, — it would have been impossible for any party to do any manner of wrong to another.

Instead of this, however, the Roman government was a system in which religion was inseparable from the State — a system in which the religion recognized was held as essential to the very existence of the State; and the laws which compelled respect to this religion were but the efforts of the State at self-preservation. Therefore there was a system permanently established, and an instrument formed, ready to be wielded by every one of these agencies to persecute the professors of that religion.

Except in cases of the open violence of the mob, all that was done in any instance by any of the agencies mentioned, was to enforce the law. If the Christians had obeyed the laws, they never would have been persecuted. But that was the very point at issue. It was not right to obey the laws. The laws were wrong. To obey the laws was to cease to be a Christian. To obey the laws was to dishonor God and to deny Christ. To obey the laws was to consent that mankind should be deprived of the blessing of both civil and religious liberty, as well as to forfeit for themselves eternal life.

If religion be properly a matter of State, and rightfully a subject of legislation, then there never was any such thing as persecution of the Christians. And what is more, there never has been in all history any such thing as persecution on account of religion. If religion be properly a subject of legislation and of law, then it is the right of the State to make any laws it may choose on the subject of religion; and it is its right to attach to these

laws whatever penalty will most surely secure proper respect for the religion chosen. And if the legislation be right, if the law be right, the enforcement of the law under whatever penalty cannot be wrong. Consequently if religion be properly a matter of the State, of legislation, and of law, there never was and there never can be any such thing as persecution on account of religion or for conscience' sake.

From all these evidences it is certain that the real blame and the real guilt of the persecution of the Christians by the Roman empire lay in the pagan theory of State and government — the union of religion and the State. This was the theory of the State, and the only theory that then held sway, and this necessarily embodied both a civil and a religious despotism. And as Jesus Christ came into the world to set men free and to plant in their hearts and minds the genuine principles of liberty, it was proper that he should command that this message of freedom, and this principle of liberty, should be proclaimed in all the world to every creature, even though it should meet with the open hostility of earth's mightiest power. And proclaim it his disciples did, at the expense of heavy privations and untold sufferings.

“Among the authentic records of pagan persecutions, there are histories which display, perhaps more vividly than any other, both the depth of cruelty to which human nature may sink, and the heroism of resistance it may attain.... The most horrible recorded instances of torture were usually inflicted, either by the populace or in their presence in the arena. We read of Christians bound in chairs of red-hot iron, while the stench of their half-consumed flesh rose in a suffocating cloud to heaven; of others who were torn to the very bone by shells or hooks of iron; of holy virgins given over to the lust of the gladiator, or to the mercies of the pander; of two hundred and twenty-seven converts sent on one occasion to the mines, each with the sinews of one leg severed by a red-hot iron, and with an eye scooped from its socket; of fires so slow that the victims writhed for hours in their agonies; of bodies torn limb from limb, or sprinkled with burning lead; of mingled salt and vinegar poured over the flesh that was bleeding from the rack; of tortures prolonged and varied through entire days. For the love of their divine Master, for the cause they believed to be true, men, and even weak girls, endured these things without flinching, when one word would have freed them from their sufferings. No opinion we may form of the proceedings of priests in a later age, should impair the

reverence with which we bend before the martyr's tomb." —
 Lecky. ^{f104a}

All this was endured by men and women, and even weak girls, that people in future ages might be free — free to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences — free both civilly and religiously. All this was endured in support of the principle that with religion civil government can of right have nothing to do. Yet for two hundred and fifty years this contest continued. On one side was the poor and despised, on the other the rich and the honored. On one side was the apparently weak, yet really strong; on the other the apparently powerful, yet really weak. On one side was a new doctrine sustained by no earthly power, and without recognition; on the other side was a system which was the outgrowth of ages, and supported by all the resources of the mightiest empire that the world had ever known. Yet it was the conflict of truth and right against error and wrong, of the power of God against the power of the Roman State; and it was bound to conquer. Two hundred and fifty years this contest continued, and then as the outcome of the longest, the most widespread, and the most terrible persecution that ever was inflicted by the Roman State, that empire was forced officially to recognize the right of every man to worship as he pleased. Thus was Christianity acknowledged to be victorious over all the power of Rome. The rights of conscience were established, and the separation of religion and the State was virtually complete.

Whatever men may hold Christianity to be, however they may view it, whether as the glorious reality that it is, or only a myth; whether as the manifestation of the truth of God, or only an invention of men; — it never can be denied that from Christianity alone the world received that inestimable boon, the rights of conscience; and the principle — invaluable alike to religion, the State, and the individual — of the absolute, complete, and total separation between the civil and the religious powers.

It never can be denied that Christianity was in the Roman empire in the first and second centuries as really as it ever was at any time afterward. Marcus Aurelius, Suetonius, Hadrian, Tacitus, and Pliny, all give the most unexceptionable testimony that it was there. And just as certainly as it was there, so certainly did it proclaim the right of men to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences, and that the State has not of right anything to do with religion. And so certainly was there a prolonged and

terrible contest upon this issue. Therefore those who object to Christianity while advocating the rights of conscience, and opposing a union of religion and the State, contradict themselves and undermine the foundation upon which they stand. Christianity is the glorious original of the rights of conscience and of the individual. Jesus Christ was the first to announce it to the world; and his disciples were the first to proclaim it to all men, and to maintain it in behalf of all men in all future ages. George Bancroft states the literal truth when he says: —

“No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Caesar only that which is Caesar’s. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men.” ^{f105a}

Therefore it is not too much to repeat that, from Christianity alone the world has received that inestimable boon, the rights of conscience; and the principle invaluable alike to religion, the State, and the individual — of the absolute, complete, and total separation between the civil and the religious powers.

Yet this victory of Christianity over Pagan Rome was no sooner won, and the assured triumph of Christianity was no sooner at hand, than ambitious bishops and political priests perverted it and destroyed the prospect of all its splendid fruit. They seized upon the civil power, and by making the State the servant of the church, established a despotism as much more cruel than the one which had just been conquered, as the truth which was thus perverted was higher, nobler, and more glorious than the evil system which had been established in the blindness and error of paganism.

The system which had been conquered was that in which the State recognizes and makes use of religion only for its political value, and only as the servant of the State. This was paganism, and such a system is pagan wherever found. The system which was established by the perversion of Christianity and the splendid victory that it had won, was a system in which the State is made the servant of the church, and in which the power of the State is exercised to promote the interests of the church. This was the papacy

And to tell the history of the perversion of Christianity, and the establishment, and the support, of the papal despotism, is the purpose of the following chapters of this book.

CHAPTER 6.

THE RISE OF CONSTANTINE.

DURING the eighty years occupied for the most part by the “dark, unrelenting Tiberius, the furious Caligula, the feeble Claudius, the profligate and cruel Nero, the beastly Vitellius, and the timid, inhuman Domitian,” “Rome groaned beneath an unremitting tyranny, which exterminated the ancient families of the republic and was fatal to almost every virtue, and every talent, that arose in that unhappy period.” — Gibbon^{f101}

This dreary scene was relieved by a respite of eighty-four years through the successful reigns of Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius; only to be opened up again by Commodus, A.D. 180, and to continue unrelieved for more than one hundred years. It is useless to pursue the subject in detail. Of this period it may be remarked as of one before, that to attempt to follow it in detail, would be only “to record the mandates of despotism, incessant accusations, faithless friendships, the ruin of innocence; one unvarying repetition of causes terminating in the same event, and presenting no novelty from their similarity and tiresome reiteration.” — Tacitus^{f102}

The inroads of the barbarians obliged the legions to be always stationed on the frontier of the empire, all the way from the mouth of the Rhine to the mouth of the Danube. Emperors were made and unmade by the soldiers according to their own caprice, many of whom never saw the capital of their empire; and the office was one so certainly to be terminated by murder that although from Commodus to Constantine there were sixty men named as emperor, only seven died a natural death; two — Decius and Valerian — perished by the enemy; and all the rest were murdered in the internal strifes of the failing empire.

DIOCLETIAN,

the commander of the imperial body-guard, was proclaimed emperor by the troops September 17, 285. He organized system by which he wished to give to the office of emperor a tenure more secure than that allowed by the licentious caprice of the soldiery. He reigned alone only about six months,

when — April 1, A.D. 286 — he associated with himself in the office of emperor, Maximian. Six years afterward, March 1, A.D. 292, he named two other associates, Galerius and Constantius, though in inferior stations. Diocletian and Maximian each bore the title of Augustus, while Galerius and Constantius each bore that of Caesar. Both these Caesars were already married, but each was obliged to put away his wife and be adopted as a son, and marry a daughter, of one of the Augusti. Galerius was adopted as the son of Diocletian, and married his daughter; Constantius as the son of Maximian, and married his step-daughter. The empire was then divided into four principal parts, each to be governed by one of the four emperors. Diocletian retained as his part, Thrace, Egypt and Asia. To Maximian was given Italy and Africa. Upon Galerius was bestowed what was known as the Illyrian provinces, bounded by Thrace, the Adriatic, the Danube, the Alps, and the Rhine; while to Constantius fell all that was west of the Rhine and the Alps; namely, Gaul, Spain, and Britain.

It appears to have been Diocletian's intention that whenever the place of either of the two Augusti became vacant, it should be filled by one of the Caesars, whose place in turn should be filled by a new appointment, thus securing a permanent, peaceful, and steady succession to the imperial authority. Nor did the division and distribution of the offices stop here. It was extended in regular gradation to the smallest parts of the empire. Diocletian fixed his capital at Nicomedia; and Maximian his at Milan, which under his care assumed the splendor of an imperial city. "The houses are described as numerous and well built; the manners of the people as polished and liberal. A circus, a theater, a mint, a palace, baths, which bore the name of their founder Maximian; porticoes adorned with statues, and a double circumference of walls contributed to the beauty of the new capital.... By the taste of the monarch, and at the expense of the people, Nicomedia acquired, in the space of a few years, a degree of magnificence which might appear to have required the labor of ages, and became inferior only to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, in extent or populousness." — Gibbon ^{f103} And with the exception of the short reign of Maxentius, from the day when these two emperors made these two cities their capitals, no emperor ever dwelt in Rome.

Diocletian and Maximian also established each a court and a ceremonial modeled upon that of the king of Persia. Whoever would address the emperor must pass a succession of guards and officers, and "when a subject was at last admitted to the imperial presence, he was required,

whatever might be his rank, to fall prostrate on the ground, and to adore according to the eastern fashion, the divinity of his lord and master.” The two emperors assumed not exactly crowns, but diadems, the first that had been worn by Romans since the abolition of the kingly office. “The sumptuous robes of Diocletian and his successors were of silk and gold, and it is remarked with indignation, that even their shoes were studded with precious stones.”

It is, however, as the author of the last and most terrible persecution of Christianity by Pagan Rome — the last effort of the pagan State against the freedom of thought and of worship taught by Christianity — that Diocletian is chiefly known to the world, though strictly speaking he was not the author of it.

Diocletian and Constantius were both friendly to the Christians, and had many professed Christians in public offices. In considerable numbers they were employed in Diocletian’s palace; but Galerius and Maximian were savagely opposed to every form of the Christian name. Galerius urged upon Diocletian the issuing of a decree condemning Christianity. Diocletian hesitated, but agreed to prohibit any Christian from holding any public office or employment, and spoke strongly against the shedding of blood. Galerius persuaded him to allow the calling of a council of the officers of the State, the outcome of which was that on February 24, A.D. 303, a “general edict of persecution was published; and though Diocletian, still averse to the effusion of blood, had moderated the fury of Galerius, who proposed that every one refusing to offer sacrifice should immediately be burnt alive, the penalty inflicted on the obstinacy of the Christians might be deemed sufficiently rigorous and effectual.

“It was enacted that their churches in all provinces of the empire should be demolished to their foundations, and the punishment of death was denounced against all who should presume to hold any secret assemblies for the purpose of religious worship. The philosophers, who now assumed the unworthy office of directing the blind zeal of persecution, had diligently studied the nature and genius of the Christian religion; and as they were not ignorant that the speculative doctrines of the faith were supposed to be contained in the writings of the prophets, of the evangelists, and of the apostles, they most probably suggested the order that the bishops and the presbyters should deliver all their sacred books into the

hands of the magistrates, who were commanded under the severest penalties, to burn them in a public and solemn manner. By the same edict the property of the church was at once confiscated; and the several parts of which it might consist, were either sold to the highest bidder, united to the imperial domain, bestowed on the cities and corporations, or granted to the solicitations of rapacious courtiers.

“After taking such effectual measures to abolish the worship and to dissolve the government of the Christians, it was thought necessary to subject to the most intolerable hardships the condition of those perverse individuals who should still reject the religion of nature, of Rome, and of their ancestors. Persons of a liberal birth were declared incapable of holding any honors or employments; slaves were forever deprived of the hopes of freedom, and the whole body of the people were put out the their protection of the law. The judges were authorized to hear and to determine every action that was brought against a Christian. But the Christians were not permitted to complain of any injury which they themselves had suffered; and thus those unfortunate secretaries were exposed to the severity, while they were excluded from the benefits, of public justice.” — Gibbon^{f104}

The attack upon the church buildings began the day before this decree was published. Then, “at the earliest dawn of day, the praetorian praefect, accompanied by several generals, tribunes, and officers of the revenue, repaired to the principal church of Nicomedia, which was situated on an eminence in the most populous and beautiful part of the city. The doors were instantly broke open; they rushed into the sanctuary; and they searched in vain for some visible object of worship, they were obliged to content themselves with committing to the flames the volumes of Holy Scripture. The ministers of Diocletian were followed by a numerous body of guards and pioneers, who marched in order of battle, and were provided with all the instruments used in the destruction of fortified cities. By their incessant labor, a sacred edifice which towered above the imperial palace, and had long excited the indignation and envy of the Gentiles, was in a few hours leveled with the ground.” — Gibbon^{f105}

The decree had hardly been posted up in the most public place in Nicomedia, when a professed Christian, whose zeal outran his good sense,

pulled it down, and tore it to pieces. It had been now more than forty years since the decree of Gallienus had legally recognized Christianity. In this time of peace the churches had become filled with a mass of people who were Christians only in name. Large church buildings were built in all parts of the empire. The genuine faith and discipline of the church had been seriously relaxed long before that, and now in this time of peace, and through the vast numbers that united themselves with the name of the Christianity, there came the natural result — violent contention and ambitious aspirations. Quite a striking picture of the churches in this time is given us in the following extract, by one who was there at the time: —

“When by reason of excessive liberty, we sunk into negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and we were almost, as it were, on the point of taking up arms against each other and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity, then the divine judgment which usually proceeds with a lenient hand, whilst the multitudes were yet crowding into the church, with gentle and mild visitations began to afflict its episcopacy, the persecution having begun with those brethren that were in the army. But as if destitute of all sensibility, we were not prompt in measures to appease and propitiate the Deity; some, indeed, like atheists, regarding our situation as unheeded and unobserved by a providence we added one wickedness and misery to another. But some that appeared to be our pastors, deserting the law of piety, were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.” —
Eusebius. ^{f106}

When the decree was issued for the abolition of Christianity, vast multitudes of these formal professors turned back again with the same readiness and with the same selfish motives with which they had joined the church; and as is always the case, their easy rejection of the faith made the persecution so much the more severe upon those refusing to yield.

Within fifteen days after the publication of the edict, a fire broke out twice in the emperor's palace at Nicomedia, and although it was quenched both

times without doing any material damage, as it was attributed to the resentment of the Christians, it caused their suffering to be yet more severe. “At first, indeed, the magistrates were restrained from the effusion of blood; but the use of every other severity was permitted, and even recommended to their zeal; nor could the Christians, though they cheerfully resigned the ornaments of their churches, resolve to interrupt their religious assemblies, or to deliver their sacred books to the flames.” — Gibbon^{f107}

As they refused to discontinue their meetings or to burn the Scriptures, another edict was shortly passed, commanding that all the bishops, presbyters, readers, and exorcists should be punished. Another edict soon followed, commanding the magistrates everywhere to compel all these to renounce the Christian faith and return to the worship of the gods by offering the appointed sacrifice. This again was soon followed by an edict, the fourth in the series, including the whole body of the Christians within the provisions of the edicts which had preceded. Heavy penalties were pronounced against all who should attempt to shield the Christians from the force of the edicts.

“Many were burnt alive, and the tortures by which the persecutors sought to shake their resolution were so dreadful that even such a death seemed an act of mercy. The only province of the empire where the Christians were at peace was Gaul, which had received its baptism of blood under Marcus Aurelius, but was now governed by Constantius Chlorus, who protected them from personal molestation, though he was compelled, in obedience to the emperor, to destroy their churches. In Spain, which was also under the government, but not under the direct inspection of Constantius, the persecution was moderate, but in all other parts of the empire it raged with fierceness, till the abdication of Diocletian in 305. This event almost immediately restored peace to the western province, but greatly aggravated the misfortunes of the Eastern Christians, who passed under the absolute rule of Galerius. Horrible, varied and prolonged tortures were employed to quell their fortitude, and their final resistance was crowned by the dreadful of all deaths, roasting over a slow fire.

“It was not till A.D. 311, eight years after the commencement of the general persecution, ten years after the first measure against the Christians, that the Eastern persecution ceased. Galerius, the

archenemy of the Christians, was struck down by a fearful disease. His body, it is said became a mass of loathsome and fetid sores — a living corpse, devoured by countless worms, and exhaling the odor of a charnel-house. He who had shed so much innocent blood, shrank himself from a Roman death. In his extreme anguish he appealed in turn to physician after physician, and to temple after temple. At last he relented towards the Christians. He issued a proclamation restoring them to liberty, permitting them to rebuild their churches, and asking their prayers for his recovery.” — Leaky.
f108

The edict of Galerius here referred to was as follows: —

“Among the important cares which have occupied our mind for the utility and preservation of the empire, it was our intention to correct and re-establish all things according to the ancient laws and public discipline of the Romans. We were particularly desirous of reclaiming, into the way of reason and nature, the deluded Christians, who had renounced the religion and ceremonies instituted by their fathers; and presumptuously despising the practice of antiquity, had invented extravagant laws and opinions according to the dictates of their fancy, and had collected a various society from the different provinces of our empire.

“The edicts which we have published to enforce the worship of the gods, having exposed many of the Christians to danger and distress, many having suffered death, and many more who still persist in their impious folly, being left destitute of any public exercise of religion, we are disposed to extend to those unhappy men the effects of our wonted clemency. We permit them therefore freely to profess their private opinions and to assemble in their conventicles without fear or molestation, provided always that they preserve a due respect to the established laws of government. By another rescript we shall signify our intentions to the judges and magistrates, and we hope that our indulgence will engage the Christians to offer up their prayers to the deity whom they adore, for our safety and prosperity, for their own, and for that of the republic.” f109

Shortly after Diocletian issued the last of the four edicts against Christianity and in the twenty-second year of his reign, he abdicated the empire, May 1, A.D. 305. By previous arrangement Maximian on his part also abdicated the imperial authority at his palace in Milan. "The abdication of Diocletian and Maximian was succeeded by eighteen years of discord and confusion. The empire was afflicted by five civil wars; and the remainder of the time was not so much a state of tranquillity as a suspension of arms between several hostile monarchs who, viewing each other with an eye of fear and hatred, strove to increase their respective forces at the expense of their subjects." — Gibbon. ^{f110}

Galerius and Constantius immediately succeeded to the places of these two, each assuming the title of Augustus. Galerius at once assumed to himself the authority to appoint the two Caesars, without waiting to consult Constantius. As a matter of course he appointed those whom he could use to promote his own ambitious designs to secure to himself the supreme authority in the empire. One of these was his own nephew, Maximin, who was given command of Syria and Egypt. The other was one of his own subordinate officers, Severus, who was sent to Milan to succeed Maximian.

Thus Galerius virtually held control of three fourths of the empire, and only waited a good opportunity to lay claim to the rest. This opportunity he supposed was given him when, July 25, A.D. 306, Constantius died in Britain; but he was disappointed, for as soon as Constantius was dead, the army proclaimed Constantine Augustus and emperor, and a messenger was sent to Galerius to announce to him the fact. Such a proceeding had not been included in his plans, and Galerius threatened to burn both the letter and the messenger who brought it. Constantine, however, at the head of the legions of Britain, was in a position not to be despised. Galerius, therefore decided to make the best of the situation. He recognized Constantine as the successor of Constantius in that division of the empire, with the title of Caesar, but fourth in rank, while he raised Severus to the dignity of Augustus.

Just at this time there was another important move upon the stage of action. The people of the city of Rome were greatly offended at the action of Diocletian in removing the capital, and Galerius now took step that deepened their sense of injury. A general census was begun to list all the property of the Roman citizens for the purpose of levying a general tax.

Wherever there was any suspicion of concealment of any property, the citizen was tortured to compel an honest statement of his possessions. Rome had been exempt from taxation for nearly five hundred years, and when the census takers began their work there, the injury which the people felt that they had already suffered by the removal of their capital, was so deepened, that they broke out into open revolt, and proclaimed Maxentius emperor, October 28, A.D. 306. Maxentius was the son of Maximian. "The praefect of the city and a few magistrates, who maintained their fidelity to Severus, were massacred by the guards; and Maxentius, invested with the imperial ornaments, was acknowledged by the applauding Senate and people as the protector of the Roman freedom and dignity." — Gibbon. ^{fl11}

At the invitation of Maxentius and the Senate, Maximian gladly left his place of retirement, and again assumed the position of associate emperor. Galerius ordered Severus, who was stationed at Milan, to march to Rome and put down this rebellion. But when he reached the city, he found it so well fortified and defended against him that he dared not attack it. Besides this, a large number of his troops deserted him to their old commander Maximian, and he was compelled, if he would save his life, to march back again as fast as he could. He stopped at Ravenna, which was strongly fortified, and where he had a large fleet. Maximian soon came up and began a seige. Severus had found so little favor among the people of Italy, and had been deserted by so large number of his troops, that Maximian found it an easy task to convince him that there was a plan formed by the city of Ravenna also, to betray him and deliver him up. By this means, and the positive assurance that his life would be preserved, Severus was persuaded to surrender. But no sooner was the city secured, than he found that the only liberty that was left him was to kill himself.

February A.D. 307, Maximian went to Milan, took possession of his former capital, and without waiting, crossed the Alps to meet Constantine, who was then at Arles in Gaul. March 31 an alliance was formed. Constantine married Maximian's daughter Fausta, and Maximian gave him the title of Augustus. Galerius himself now undertook to punish the Romans for their rebellion; but his experience was identical with that of Severus, only that he was fortunate enough to escape with his life and some of his troops. In his retreat, the enmity of the Romans was yet more deepened by the desolation which his legions left in their train. "They murdered, they ravished, they plundered, they drove away the flocks and herds of the Italians; they burnt the villages through which they passed and they

endeavored to destroy the country which it had not been in their power to subdue.” — Gibbon^{f112}

Galerius, not willing to recognize either Maxentius or Maximian, appointed Licinius to the office of Augustus, November 11, 307, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Severus. Maximin, governor of Syria and Egypt, with the title of Caesar, no sooner heard of the appointment of Licinius to the title of Augustus, than he demanded of Galerius the same honor; and the demand was made in a tone which in the existing condition of things Galerius was compelled to respect. Thus at the beginning of the year 308, “for the first, and indeed for the last, time the Roman world was administered by six emperors.” — Gibbon.^{f113}

It was not however the purpose of these six emperors to administer the Roman world together. Each one was determined to administer it alone. Each one was jealous of all the others, and narrowly watched them all, ready instantly to grasp and make the most of whatever opportunity might present itself. The first two of the emperors between whom this mutual jealousy produced an open quarrel, were Maximian and Maxentius. Maxentius refused to acknowledge himself subordinate to his father, and his father insisted that it was by his ability as a commander that Maxentius was made secure in his claim to the dignity of emperor. The difference between them was submitted to the troops for decision. They decided in favor of Maxentius. Maximian left his son and Italy, and went to his son-in-law Constantine, in Gaul, and there a second time he abdicated the imperial dignity; but only that he might the more securely contrive new mischiefs.

Not long afterward an invasion of the Franks called Constantine and his troops to the Rhine north of the Moselle. A report of the death of Constantine was hastily seized upon by Maximian as the truth, and he assumed the position of emperor; took the money from Constantine’s treasury, and distributed it among the soldiers; and began overtures for an alliance with Maxentius. Constantine heard of Maximian’s movements; marched quickly from the Rhine to the Saone; took some boats at Chalons; and with his legions so unexpectedly arrived at Arles that Maximian considered it his only safety to take refuge in Marseilles. Constantine followed and attacked the city. The garrison gave up Maximian, who, like Severus, was allowed the choice of killing himself or of being put to death.

Galerius died in the month of May, A.D. 311. Four of the six emperors now remained, and another apportionment of the eastern dominions was made between Licinius and Maximin. With the latter Maxentius formed an alliance which drew Constantine and Licinius together on the other side. "Maxentius was cruel, rapacious and profligate," "a tyrant as contemptible as he was odious." In him it seemed as though the times of Commodus and Elagabalus were returned.

In A.D. 308, Marcellus was elected bishop of Rome. "This new bishop wished to avail himself of the calm which religion enjoyed, at the commencement of his pontificate, to ordain rules and re-establish in the church the discipline which the troubles [of the Galerian persecution] had altered. But his severity rendered him odious to the people, and caused divisions among the faithful. Discord degenerated into sedition, and the quarrel terminated in murder." Maxentius blamed Marcellus as being the chief cause of these disturbances, "and condemned him to groom post-horses in a stable on the high-road."

After about nine months of this service, some priests succeeded in carrying Marcellus off. They concealed him in the house of a Roman lady named Lucilla. When the officers would have taken him again, the faithful assembled under arms to defend him. Maxentius ordered out his guards and dispersed them. He then commanded that Lucilla's house should be converted into a stable, and obliged Marcellus to continue in the office of the groom. In January, A.D. 310, Marcellus died, and was succeeded by Eusebius, whom Maxentius banished to Sicily. He died there after a few months, and was succeeded by Melchiades, in the same year, A. D. 310.

In A.D. 311, Melchiades wrote a letter to Constantine, and sent it by a delegation of bishops to him at Treves in Gaul, inviting him to come to the relief of the church, and the conquest of Rome. Constantine deliberated, and Maxentius became more and more tyrannical. In A.D. 312, an embassy from Rome went to Constantine at Arles, and in the name of the Senate and people requested him to deliver the city from the despotism of the tyrant. Constantine gladly embraced the opportunity thus offered, and quickly set out toward Rome.^{f114}

At Turin he met and destroyed a strong body of the troops of Maxentius; and at Verona after, a considerable siege of the city, and a hard-fought battle in the field, which beginning in the afternoon, continued through the

whole of the following night, he vanquished quite a formidable army. Between Verona and Rome there was nothing to check the march of Constantine. Maxentius drew out his army, and met Constantine on the banks of the Tiber, nine miles from Rome. He crossed the Tiber and set his army in battle array, with the river in his rear. The battle was joined. Maxentius was soon defeated; and his army, broken to pieces, attempted to escape. In the confusion and by the terrible onslaught of Constantine's veterans, thousands of the soldiers of Maxentius were crowded into the river and drowned. Maxentius, endeavoring to escape on his horse across the Milvian bridge, was crowded off into the river, and being clothed with heavy armor, was drowned, October 28, A.D. 312.

In the month of March, 313, Constantine and Licinius met in Milan. Constantine's sister Constantia was given in marriage to Licinius as a bond of friendship between the two emperors. Maximin, on hearing of the death of Maxentius, declared war against Licinius, and started with an army from Syria toward Europe. He crossed the Bosphorus, captured Byzantium, marched onward and took Heraclea. By this time Licinius himself had arrived within eighteen miles of that place, and April 30 a battle was fought, and Maximin was defeated. He himself, however, escaped, and in the month of the following August, his life ended in a manner not certainly known.

The edict of Galerius restoring to Christians the right to worship had had little or no effect upon Maximin. In his dominions and by his direction the persecutions had continued. Before Constantine and Licinius had separated, after their meeting at Milan in March, they jointly issued the celebrated edict of Milan, which acknowledged the right for which Christianity had contended for two hundred and fifty weary and painful years, by confirming "to each individual of the Roman world the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion." That edict is as follows: —

"Wherefore as I, Constantine Augustus, and I, Licinius Augustus came under favorable auspices to Milan, and took under consideration all affairs that pertained to the public benefit and welfare, these things among the rest appeared to us to be most advantageous and profitable to all.

"We have resolved among the first things to ordain those matters by which reverence and worship to the Deity might be exhibited.

That is, how we may grant likewise to the Christians, and to all the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish. That whatsoever divinity and celestial power may exist, may be propitious to us and to ‘all that live under our government. Therefore, we have decreed the following ordinance as our will, with a salutary and most correct intention, that no freedom at all shall be refused to Christians, to follow or to keep their observances or worship. But that to each one power be granted to devote his mind to that worship which he may think adapted to himself. That the Deity may in all things exhibit to us his accustomed favor and kindness.

“It was just and consistent that we should write that this was our pleasure. That all exceptions respecting the Christians being completely removed, which were contained in the former epistle that we sent to your fidelity, and whatever measures were wholly sinister and foreign to our mildness, that these should be altogether annulled; and now that each one of the Christians may freely and without molestation pursue and follow that course and worship which he has proposed to himself: which, indeed, we have resolved to communicate most fully to your care and diligence, that you may know we have granted liberty and full freedom to the Christians, to observe their own mode of worship which as your fidelity understands absolutely granted to them by us, the privilege is also granted to others to pursue that worship and religion they wish. Which it is obvious is consistent with the peace and tranquillity of our times; that each may have the privilege to select and to worship whatsoever divinity he pleases. But this has been done by us, that we might not appear in any manner to detract anything from any manner of religion, or any mode of worship.” ^{f115}

If all the professors of Christianity had been content with this victory, and had held the tide of events steadily to the principles of this edict, — the principles for which Christianity had so long contended, — the miseries of the ages to come would never have been.

Yet in order that we may enter upon the direct history of the perversion of this victory, in such a way that it may be best understood, it is essential that we trace two other lines of events that culminate in Constantine, and which

gave the most material force to that important series of movements which made the papacy a success.

CHAPTER 7.

ANCIENT SUN WORSHIP.

IN the history of mankind no form of idolatry has been more widely practiced than that of the worship of the sun. It may well be described as universal; for there is scarcely a nation in which the worship of the sun in some form has not found a place. In Egypt, the oldest nation of historic times, under the names of Ra and Osiris, with half a dozen other forms; in Phenicia and the land of Canaan, under the names of Baal, Melkarth, Shamas, Adoni, Moloch, and many other forms; in Syria, Tammuz and Elagabalus; among the Moabites, under the names of Baal-peor and Chemosh; among the Babylonians and Assyrians, under the names of Bel and Shamas; among the Medes and Persians and other kindred nations, under the name of Ormuz and Mithra; among the ancient Indians, under the name of Mitra, Mithra, or Mithras;^{fl21} in Greece, under Adonis, Apollo, Bacchus, and Hercules; in Phrygia, under the term Atys; and in Rome, under Bacchus, Apollo, and Hercules; — in all these places, and under all these forms, the sun was worshiped by all these peoples. The myth of Hercules alone will illustrate the wide-spread practice of this worship: “The mythology of Hercules is of a very mixed character in the form in which it has come down to us. There is in it the identification of one or more Grecian heroes with Melcarth, the sun-god of the Phenicians. hence we find Hercules so frequently represented as the sun-god, and his twelve labors regarded as the passage of the sun through the twelve signs of the zodiac. he is the powerful planet which animates and imparts fecundity to the universe, whose divinity has been honored in every quarter by temples and altars, and consecrated in the religious strains of all national. From Meroe in Ethiopia, and Thebes in Upper Egypt, even to Britain, and the icy regions of Scythia; from the ancient Taprobana and Palibothra in India, to Cadiz and the shores of the Atlantic; from the forests of Germany to the burning sands of Africa; — everywhere, in short, where the benefits of the luminary of day are experienced, there we find established the name and worship of a Hercules.

“Many ages before the period when Alcmena is said to have lived, and the pretended Tyrrhian hero to have performed his wonderful exploits, Egypt and Phenicia, which certainly did not borrow their

divinities from Greece, had raised temples to the sun, under a name analogous to that of Hercules, and had carried his worship to the isle to Thasus and to Gades. Here was consecrated a temple to the year, and to the months which divided it into twelve parts, that is, to the twelve labors or victories which conducted Hercules to immortality. It is under the name of Hercules Astrochyton, or the god clothed with a mantle of stars, that the poet Nonnus designates the sun, adored by the Tyrians. He is the same god,' observes the poet, 'whom different nations adore under a multitude of different names: Belus on the bank of the Euphrates, Ammon in Libya, Apis at Memphis, Saturn in Arabia,^{f122} Jupiter in Assyria, Serapis in Egypt, Helios among the Babylonians, Apollo at Delphi, AEsculapius throughout Greece,' etc. Martianus Capella in his hymn to the sun, as also Ausonius and Macrobius, confirms the fact of this multiplicity of names given to a single star.

"The Egyptians, according to Plutarch, thought that Hercules had his seat in the sun and that he traveled with it around the moon. The author of the hymns ascribed to Orpheus, fixes still more strongly the identity of Hercules with the sun. He calls Hercules the god who produced time whose forms vary, the father of all things, and destroyer of all. He is the god who brings back by turns Aurora and the night, and who, moving onward from east to west, runs through the career of his twelve labors; the valiant Titan who chases away maladies, and delivers man from the evils which afflict him.'" — Anthom.^{f123}

By whatever name or under whatever form the sun was worshiped, there was always a female divinity associated with it. Sometimes this female was the moon sometimes the earth, sometimes the atmosphere, and at other times simply the female principle in nature. In other forms it was the idea of a male and female blended in one, as in the case of Baalim. The female sometimes appeared as the wife of the one with whom she was worshiped; sometimes as both the sister and the wife, as in the case of Osiris; yet again as the wife of some other god; and often not exactly as a wife at all, but simply as a female associate. With Osiris was associated Isis; with Baal, Ashtaroth, or Astarte; with Bel, Mylitta; with Shamas, Anunit; with Adonis, Venus; with Hercules, Omphale; with Apollo, Diana; with Atys, Cybele. Sometimes they were worshiped in the images of the male and female human figure; sometimes in the form of a bull and a heifer, as in

Osiris and Isis; sometimes in a form in which the human and the beast were blended; sometimes in a simple carved disc for the male, and a piece of carved wood for the female, as in some forms of Baal and Astarte; sometimes in the form of stones which had fallen from heaven, but mostly in the form of cones or obelisks^{f124} which they themselves had shaped to represent the male, and of other shapes to represent the female. And yet in unison with all these the sun itself was worshiped, especially at its rising, by a bow or prostration, or kissing of the hand.

In none of these forms, however, not even in the naked shining sun, was it the literal object that was worshiped, but certain functions or powers, of which these were but the representations. It was observed that the sun in co-operation with the earth and the atmosphere which gave rain, caused all manner of verdure to spring forth and bear its proper fruit. It was held, therefore, that the sun was the supreme formative power, the mighty author of fruitfulness, and that the greatest and most glorious manifestation and exertion of his powers were employed in reproduction. Sun worship was therefore nothing more nor less than the worship of the principle of reproduction in man and nature. And as the influence of the real sun was extended over and through all nature, so this principle was extended through all worship.

“All paganism is at bottom a worship of nature in some form or other, and in all pagan religions the deepest and most awe-inspiring attribute of nature was its power of re-production. The mystery of birth and becoming was the deepest mystery of nature; it lay at the root of all thoughtful paganism, and appeared in various forms, some of a more innocent, others of a most debasing type. To ancient pagan thinkers, as well as to modern men of science, the key to the hidden secret of the origin and preservation of the universe, lay in the mystery of sex. Two energies or agents, one an active and generative, other a feminine, passive, or susceptible one, were everywhere thought to combine for creative purposes; and heaven and earth sun and moon, day and night, were believed to co-operate to the production of being. Upon some such basis as this rested almost all the polytheistic worship of the old civilization; and to it may be traced back, by stage, the separation of divinity into male and female gods; the deification of distinct powers of nature, and the idealization of man’s own faculties, desires, and lusts; where every power of his understanding was embodied as an

object of adoration, and every impulse of his will became an incarnation of deity.” — “Encyclopedia Britannica.” ^{fl25}

As the sun was the great god, the supreme lord, and as he exerted his most glorious powers in reproduction, it was held to be the most acceptable worship for his devotees so to employ themselves and their powers. Consequently prostitution was the one chief characteristic of sun worship wherever found. As the association of a female without reference to relationship was the only requirement necessary to worship, the result was the perfect confusion of all relationships among the worshipers, even to the mutual interchange of garments between the sexes. In the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus there is a faithful record of such a result among the sun worshipers of the land of Canaan whom the Lord caused to be blotted from the earth. The prohibition in ^{fl25}Deuteronomy 22:5 — “The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment” — was aimed directly at this practice in sun worship.

The sacrifice of virginity was the most acceptable offering that ever could be made in the worship of the sun. Indeed, until this sacrifice had been made, no other offering was acceptable. One ancient writer saw the manner of worship of Bel and Mylitta in Babylon, and has left a record of what he saw. He says: —

“The Babylonians have one most shameful custom. Every woman born in the country must once in her life go and sit down in the precinct of Venus, and there consort with a stranger.... Venus is called Mylitta by the Assyrians.” — Herodotus. ^{fl26}

Baal-peor, by whose shameful worship Balaam succeeded in bringing evil upon Israel when he failed in his own efforts to curse them, was the god which in Moab presided over such characters as above described by Herodotus in Babylon. This particular system of worship did not prevail outside of Egypt and the Eastern nations. In Greece and Rome the worship was through Bacchus, Hercules, Apollo, etc., and was more in the form of festivals — mysteries — celebrated with obscene symbols and in most lascivious rites. The rites of Bacchus are thus described: —

“The worship of Bacchus prevailed in almost all parts of Greece. Men and women joined in his festivals dressed in Asiatic robes and bonnets, their heads wreathed with vine and ivy leaves, with fawn skins flung over their shoulders, and thyrsi or blunt spears twined

with vine leaves, in their hands. They ran through the country shouting *Io Bacche ! Euoi ! Iacche !* etc., swinging their thyrsi, beating on drums, and sounding various instruments. Indecent emblems were carried in procession, and the ceremonies often assumed a most immoral character and tendency. The Woman, who bore a chief part in these frantic revels, were called *Bacchae* *Maenades* *Thyiades* *Euades*, etc.” — Anthon.^{f127}

In the mysteries *Bacchus* was identified with *Osiris*, and was worshiped as the sun. In India, *Schiva* and his worship were identical with *Bacchus* and his worship. “The two systems of worship have the same obscenities, and the same emblems of the generative power.” — Anthon.^{f128} “An obscure native of Greece brought first to *Etruria*, and shortly afterwards to the more congenial soil of *Rome*, the mysterious orgies of *Bacchus*, which had already obtained an infamous celebrity in the East. The horrible wickednesses which were perpetrated at the initiations, at which the passions of the youth of either sex were inflamed by wine and music, secresy and security, had been practiced by the devotees without remorse for some time, before they were discovered.... The *Bacchanalia*, though constantly interdicted, continued to reappear in the city.” — *Merivale*.^{f129}

The worship of the *Phrygian Cybele* and *Atys* was common in Greece five hundred years before Christ, and was introduced into *Rome* about 547 B. C., when an embassy was sent to the king of *Pergamus* to ask for the stone which represented *Cybele*, and which was said to have fallen from heaven. The king gave up the stone, which was taken to *Rome*. A temple was built, and a festival established in her honor. The festival was called *Megalesia*, and was celebrated annually in the early part of April, and is thus described: —

“Like Asiatic worship in general, that of *Cybele* was enthusiastic. Her priests named *Galli* and *Corybantes*, ran about with dreadful cries and howlings, beating on timbrels, clashing cymbals, sounding pipes, and cutting their flesh with knives. The box-tree and cypress were considered as sacred to her, as from the former she made the pipes, and *Atys* was said to have been changed into the latter.” — Anthon.^{f130}

The universality of the worship of the sun in Hercules has been already shown. Of the manner in which his worship was conducted, we have the following account: —

“It seems to have been marked by an almost delirious sensuality. Married and unmarried females prostituted themselves at the festival of the gods. The two sexes changed their respective characters; and tradition reported that Hercules himself had given an example of this, when, assuming the vestments and occupation of a female, he subjected himself to the service of the voluptuous Omphale. The Lydian Hercules was named Sandon, after the robe dyed with sandyx, in which Omphale had arrayed him, and which the females of the country imitated in celebrating his licentious worship.” — Anthon.^{f131}

In Rome and Italy, “The worship of Hercules was from an early date among the most widely diffused; he was, to use the words of an ancient author, adored in every hamlet of Italy, and altars were everywhere erected to him in the streets of the cities and along the country roads.” — Mommsen.^{f132}

As before stated, the almost numberless forms of sun worship were practiced in Canaan. In the practice of these fearful abominations they had so corrupted themselves that in the expressive figure of the Scripture, the very earth had grown so sick that it was compelled to vomit out the filthy inhabitants. “The land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.” ~~
~~Leviticus 18:25. All of this the God of heaven taught his people to renounce. “Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations; neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you: (for all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled): that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you. For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people. Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, that ye commit not any one of these abominable customs, which were committed before you, and that ye defile not yourselves therein: I am the Lord your God.” ~~
~~Leviticus 18:26-30.^{f133}

In all these prohibitions the people were taught to shun as the terrible plague that it was, every suggestion of the evil influences of the worship of the sun. They were to break down all the sun-images and carved stocks — groves — that might be found anywhere in all the land which the Lord had given them. See ~~<P2324>~~ Exodus 23:24; ~~<P3313>~~ Exodus 33:13, 14.

In yet another and most comprehensive way the Lord taught his people to shun every indication of the worship of the sun. As has been shown, the devotees of the sun worshiped with their faces toward the east. When God established his worship with the children of Israel in the very midst of the sun worshiping nations round about, at first a sanctuary was built and afterwards a temple, where he dwelt by the glory of his presence. To the door of this sanctuary every form of sacrifice and offering was to be brought, and there they were to worship. And the door of that sanctuary (the temple also) was always toward the east, in order that all who would sacrifice to Jehovah and worship him, would in so doing turn their backs upon the sun and its worship; and that whoever joined in the worship of the sun, had first to turn his back upon Jehovah.

Through the periods of the judges there were lapses into sun worship among the children of Israel, but they were restored to the worship of the Lord, and by the influence of Samuel and David, and Solomon in his early days, the whole nation was separated from sun worship in all its forms, and united in the pure worship of Jehovah. Yet in his later years Solomon turned from the Lord, and “loved many strange women, together with daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, and Hittites; of the nations concerning which the Lord said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in into you: for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods: Solomon clave unto these in love. And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines: and his wives turned away his heart. For it came to pass when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father. For Solomon went after Ashtarothe the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites. And Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord and went not fully after the Lord, as did David his father. Then did Solomon build a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon.

And likewise did he for all his strange wives, which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods.” ~~<1100>~~ 1 Kings 11:1-8.

After the death of Solomon, the ten tribes separated themselves from Judah and Benjamin, and under the kingship, and by the direction, of Jeroboam, established a false worship through the two golden calves copied from Egypt, one of which was placed in Bethel and the other in Dan. Each of the successors of Jeroboam walked in the way of Jeroboam “and in his sin wherewith he made Israel to sin,” unto the time of Omri, who in this wicked way “did worse than all that were before him.” “And Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him. And it came to pass as if it had been a light thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, that he took to wife Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Zidonians, and went and served Baal, and worshiped him. And he reared up an altar for Baal in the house of Baal, which he had built in Samaria. And Ahab made a grove; and Ahab did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him.” ~~<1160>~~ 1 Kings 16:30-33.

From this it is evident that as corrupt and degrading as was the worship established by Jeroboam, that of the sun was far worse. Ethbaal was a priest of Baal and Astarte, who assassinated the king and made himself king in his stead. Jezebel brought with her into Israel the worship of Baal and Astarte, — the male and female sun, — and established it to such an extent that in a few years there were four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal and four hundred of Astarte, and only seven thousand people in all Israel who had not joined in the wicked worship. Elijah began a reformation, but the worship and the gods introduced by Jezebel remained in some measure till the reign of Jehu, who gathered every worshiper of Baal to a general assembly in honor of Baal, and slew them all. “And they brought forth the images out of the house of Baal, and burned them. And they brake down the image of Ball, and brake down the house of Baal, and made it a draught house unto this day. Thus Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel. Howbeit from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin, Jehu departed not from after them, to wit, the golden calves that were in Bethel and that were in Dan.” ~~<2005>~~ 2 Kings 10:26-29.

Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, married Jehoram, the son of Jehoshaphat king of Judah, and with her, sun worship through Baal and Ashtaroth was introduced into the kingdom of Judah; for Jehoram “walked

in the way of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab; for the daughter of Ahab was his wife: and he did evil in the sight of the Lord.” ~~<1218>~~2 Kings 8:18. This worship of Baalim continued till the time of Hezekiah, who “brake the images [sun images] in pieces, and cut down the groves [Ahseras, representations of Ashtaroth], and threw-down the high places and the altars out of all Judah and Benjamin.” ~~<480>~~2 Chronicles 31:1. By Manasseh, however, this worship was all restored in its fullest extent; “for he built again the high places which Hezekiah his father had broken down, and he reared up altars for Baalim, and made groves, and worshiped all the host of heaven, and served them. Also he built altars in the house of the Lord whereof the Lord had said, In Jerusalem shall my name be forever. And he built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. And he caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son Hinnom: also he observed times and used enchantments, and used witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards: he wrought much evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger. And he set a carved image, the idol which he had made in the house of God of which God had said to David and to Solomon his son, In this house and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen before all the tribes of Israel, will I put my name forever.” ~~<483>~~2 Chronicles 33:3-7.

This image which he set in the house of the Lord was rather a double image of Baal and Ashtaroth, which he put up above the altars of Baal in the house of the Lord. The cloisters about the temple were used as stables for the horses which were dedicated to the sun. By the side of the temple he built houses for the priests and priestesses of the Baalim, where the women wove hangings for the figures of Astarte.

Happily, Manasseh was succeeded by Josiah, who annihilated this whole system. “For in the eighth year of his reign, while he was yet young, he began to seek after the God of David his father: and in the twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images. And they brake down the altars of Baalim in his presence; and the images that were on high above them he cut down; and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images he brake in pieces and made dust of them, and strewed it upon the graves of them that had sacrificed unto them.”

“And he brake down the houses of the sodomites, that were by the house of the Lord, where the women wove hangings for the grove. And he

brought all the priests out of the cities of Judah and defiled the high places where the priests had burned incense, from Geba to Beer-sheba, and brake down the high places of the gates that were in the entering in of the gate of Joshua, the governor of the city, which were on a man's left hand at the gate of the city.... And he defiled Topheth, which is the valley of the children of Hinnom. that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech. And he took away the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, at the entering in of the house of the Lord, by the chamber of Nathan-melech the chamberlain, which was in the suburbs, and burned the chariots of the sun with fire. And the altars that were on the top of the upper chamber of Ahaz, which the kings of Judah had made, and the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of the Lord, did the king beat down, and brake them down from thence, and cast the dust of them into the brook Kidron." ~~141B~~ 2 Chronicles 34:3,4; ~~1231F~~ 2 Kings 23:7-12

Yet by the time that Zedekiah reigned, there was again a serious lapse not only into certain forms of sun worship, but into the open worship of the literal sun. Ezekiel was among the captives in Babylonia, and by the Spirit of God he was taken in a vision to Jerusalem, and was caused to see the abominations that were being practiced there. First, he was caused to see the image of Jealousy in the very entry way to the altar of sacrifices, before the house of the Lord.

He was told to turn, and he would see greater abominations than this. He then saw, "and behold every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about. And there stood before them seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel, and in the midst of them Stood Jaazaniah the son of Shaphan, with every man his censer in his hand; and a thick cloud of incense went up."

Again he was told to turn, and he would see yet greater abominations than this that they were doing. He was then brought "to the door of the gate of the Lord's house which was toward the north: and, behold, there sat women weeping] for Tammuz."

And he was told to turn yet again, and he should see greater abominations even than this. "And he brought me into the inner court of the Lord's house, and, behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the

porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, and they worshiped the sun toward the east.” ⁴⁸⁶Ezekiel 8:16.

All that is meant in this we cannot tell; but this much is certain, that, in the estimate of Jehovah, as bad as was the worship of Astarte, and however much it provoked to jealousy; as bad as was the worship of all manner of abominable beasts; as bad as was the worship of Tammuz; yet worse than all these, even though in them were embodied some forms of sun worship — more abominable than all these was the setting of the face toward the east, in the worship of the sun itself. This was to turn the back upon the Lord; to leave him and his worship behind; and, in worshipping the visible sun, to choose all that was included in all the forms of its worship that might be known. This was open apostasy — the renunciation of all that was good and the acceptance of all that was bad.

Now, aside from the lascivious rites of Bacchus and Hercules, and beyond the fearful orgies of Cybele, this very form of worship prevailed in the Roman empire. The worship of the sun itself was the principal worship of the Romans in the time of Constantine. The sun, as represented in Apollo, was the chief and patron divinity recognized by Augustus. “Apollo was the patron of the spot which had given a name to his great victory of Actium; Apollo himself, it was proclaimed, had fought for Rome and for Octavius on that auspicious day; the same Apollo, the sun-god, had shuddered in his bright career at the murder of the dictator, and had terrified the nations by the eclipse of his divine countenance... Besides building a splendid temple to Apollo on the Palatine Hill, the emperor sought to honor him by transplanting to the Circus Maximus, the sports of which were under his special protection, an obelisk from Heliopolis [city of the sun] in Egypt. This flame-shaped column was a symbol of the sun, and originally bore a blazing orb upon its summit.” — Merivale. ^{f134}

To Sol Deus invictus — the sun, the unconquerable god — were attributed the world-wide conquests of the Roman power. The greatest and most magnificent temple that ever was built on earth, except only that built by Solomon, was erected by Antoninus Pius, emperor of Rome, at Baalbek, in honor of the visible shining sun.

But it was in Elagabalus that the worship of the sun received its strongest imperial impetus. The way that he became emperor was this: The emperor

Caracalla was murdered near Antioch, March 8, A.D. 217, and there Macrinus became emperor in his stead. Caracalla's mother committed suicide shortly afterward, and then Macrinus commanded Julia Maesa, her sister, to leave Antioch with her family. She went to Emesa where a considerable body of troops was stationed, and where was a temple of the sun which the troops frequented in their worship. Julia's grandson, Bassianus, was made high-priest of the sun in this temple. In this young man the troops "recognized," or thought they recognized, the features of Caracalla." Julia took particular pains, by the careful distribution of money, to deepen this impression, and May 16, 218, he was declared emperor by the troops at Emesa. He asserted his hereditary right to the office because of his relationship of Caracalla.

The rebellion rapidly spread among the troops throughout the province. Officers who tried to check it were murdered, and the power of young Bassianus daily grew.

Macrinus assembled his troops, and left Antioch to quell the insurrection. A battle was fought, and Macrinus was slain, thus ending a reign of eighty-seven days, and Bassianus became emperor in fact, June 7, A.D. 218. He assumed the name of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, and sent letters to the Senate announcing his accession to the empire in the place of Macrinus. Not being ready just then to go to Rome personally, he sent a picture of himself which he commanded to be placed in the Senate house over the altar of victory. "He was drawn in his sacerdotal robes of silk and gold, after the loose flowing fashion of the Medes and Phenicians; his head was covered with a lofty tiara, his numerous collars and bracelets were adorned with gems of an inestimable value. His eyebrows were tinged with black, and his cheeks painted with an artificial red and white." — Gibbon. ^{f135} The name under which the sun was worshiped at Emesa, where Bassianus was high-priest, was Elagabalus. His accession to the office of emperor he attributed to the favor of this sun-god. Therefore as emperor he assumed the name of Elagabalus as greater and more honorable than any that might be derived from any other source, and by this name alone is he known in history.

When he went to Rome, the "black conical stone" from Emesa, the symbol of the functions of the sun, was taken with him, and as he moved "in a solemn procession through the streets of Rome, the way was strewed with gold dust; the black stone, set in precious gems, was placed on a chariot

drawn by six mill-white horses richly caparisoned. The pious emperor held he reins, and supported by his ministers, moved slowly backwards, that he might perpetually enjoy the felicity of the divine presence. In a magnificent temple raised on the Palatine Mount, the sacrifices of the god Elagabalus were celebrated with every circumstance of cost and solemnity. The richest wines, the most extraordinary victims, and the rarest aromatics, were profusely consumed on his altar. Around the altar a chorus of Syrian damsels performed their lascivious dances to the sound of barbarian music.” — Ginnon.^{f136}

It was in perfect harmony with the rites of sun worship everywhere that all the laws of nature and decency should be violated and subverted by Elagabalus; that he should have a long train of concubines, and a rapid succession of wives; that a vestal virgin should be taken by force from her sacred retreat to feed his passion ; and that he should put on the dress, and play the part, of a woman, while he publicly assigned to another the title and the place of husband to himself. All these things belonged with the worship of the sun, and all this Elagabalus did, not as emperor, but as imperial high-priest and representative of the sun. As emperor and high-priest of the sun, it was his chief purpose, and “it was openly asserted, that the worship of the sun, under his name of Elagabalus, was to supercede all other worship.” — Milman.^{f137}

As soon as Aurelian became emperor, March, A. D.270, he began the erection of a temple of Rome in honor of the sun. In A.D. 272 he made an expedition against Zenobia, who had established her authority in the East with her capital at Baalbek. When he had overthrown her power and captured her capital city, he left an officer with a garrison of troops to govern the city while he returned to Europe. The people arose and murdered the governor and his soldiers. Aurelian returned and gave up the people to indiscriminate massacre, and made of the city itself a heap of ruins. The only attempt he made to repair it was to restore the temple of the sun, which Antoninus had built. When he returned to Rome in A.D. 274, he celebrated a triumph, which, in magnificence and the abundance of treasures, was second to none that Rome had ever seen. At this time also he dedicated his magnificent temple to the sun.

“A considerable portion of his oriental spoils was consecrated to the gods of Rome ; the Capitol, and every other temple, glittered with the offerings of his ostentatious piety; and the temple of the

sun alone received above fifteen thousand pounds of gold. This last was a magnificent structure, erected by the emperor on the side of the Quirinal Hill, and dedicated soon after the triumph, to that deity whom Aurelian adored as the parent of his life and fortunes. His mother had been an inferior priestess in a chapel of the sun; a peculiar devotion to the god of light, was a sentiment which the fortunate peasant imbibed in his infancy; and every step of his elevation, every victory of his reign, fortified superstition by gratitude.” — Gibbon. ^{f138}

The immediate predecessor of the emperor Diocletian died on his way from Persia to Europe. The fact of his death was concealed from the army for a time, which gave rise to a strong suspicion that he had been murdered. When Diocletian was chosen emperor, he therefore deemed it necessary to purge himself of all suspicion by a means which would prove satisfactory to all. He did it by a solemn oath in the face of the sun. “Conscious that the station which he had filled, exposed him to some suspicions, Diocletian ascended the tribunal, and raising his eyes towards the sun, made a solemn profession of his own innocence, in the presence of that all-seeing deity.” — Gibbon. ^{f139} And it was the oracle of the sun — Apollo — at Miletus, which he consulted before he issued the decree of persecution, to which he was so strongly urged by Galerius, who was prompted by his mother, a fanatical worshiper of Cybele.

But it was in Constantine that, after Elagabalus, the sun found its most worshipful devotee. As emperor of Rome he had to show some deference to the other gods, and therefore on the medals which were issued in honor of his victories, there were the figures of Jupiter and Mars, as well as of Hercules and Apollo. Up to the period of his war with Maxentius, A.D. 312, “all that we know of Constantine’s religion would imply that he was outwardly, and even zealously, pagan. In a public oration, his panegyrist extols the magnificence of his offerings to the gods. His victorious presence was not merely expected to restore more than their former splendor to the Gaulish cities ruined by barbaric incursions, but sumptuous temples were to arise at his bidding, to propitiate the deities, particularly Apollo, his tutelary god. The medals struck for these victories are covered with the symbols of paganism. Eusebius himself admits that Constantine was at this time in doubt which religion he should embrace.” Milman ^{f140}

Thus as emperor, and to satisfy the prejudices of the people, some respectful deference was shown to other gods, but “the devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. The unerring shafts of that deity, the brightness of his eyes, his laurel wreath, immortal beauty, and elegant accomplishments, seemed to point him out as the patron of a young hero. The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelar deity; and that, either waking or in a vision, he was blessed with the auspicious omens of a long and victorious reign. The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine.” — Gibbon

In the time of Constantine, and in Constantine himself. the worship of the sun occupied the imperial seat, and was the imperial religion of Rome. It will be necessary in another chapter to trace the same thing among the people of the empire.

CHAPTER 8.

THE FALLING AWAY — THE GREAT APOSTASY.

WHEN Paul was at Thessalonica, he preached to the people about the second coming of the Lord. After he had gone away, he wrote to them a letter in which he said more about this same event, and in his writing he made it so much of a reality, and his hope was so centered in the event that apparently he put himself among those who would see the Savior come, and wrote as though he and others would be alive at that time. He wrote: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [go before] them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." ~~1~~ 1 Thessalonians 4:15-17.

The Thessalonians not bearing in mind what he had told them when he was there, misinterpreted these strong and apparently personal statements, and therefore put into the apostle's words a meaning that he did not intend should be there. Upon this they fell into the mistake of supposing that the second coming of Christ was immediately at hand, and was so near that they could even live without working until he should come. This idea had been worked up quite fully among them by persons pretending to have received revelations by the Spirit; by others pretending that they had received word from Paul to that effect; and yet others went so far as to write letters to that effect, and forge Paul's name to them. These facts coming to the apostle's knowledge, he wrote a second letter to correct the mistakes which, in view of the teaching he had given when he was present with them, they were wholly unwarranted in making.

In his second letter Paul did not modify in the least the doctrine that Christ is coming, or that he will then certainly gather his people to himself. There was no mistake in the doctrine concerning the fact of his coming. The mistake was in the time when they expected him to come. This is the point which the apostle corrects in his second letter, and writes thus: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our

gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.” ~~2~~ 2 Thessalonians 2:1-8.

All this he had taught them when he was there with them, and therefore reminded them, in the fifth verse, “Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? Then, having recalled to their minds the fact, he simply appeals to their knowledge, and says, “And now ye know what withholdeth that he [the son of perdition] might be revealed in his time.” (This plainly sets forth the prophecy of a great falling away or apostasy from the truth of the gospel. The purity of the gospel of Christ would be corrupted and its intent perverted. The falling away of which Paul wrote to the Thessalonians, is referred to in his counsel to the elder to the church at Ephesus, whom he called to meet him at Miletus. To them he said: “For I know this that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.” ~~40~~ Acts 20:29-31.

This warning was not alone to the people of Ephesus in the three years that he was there. It is seen through all his epistles. Because of this readiness of individuals to assert themselves, to get wrong views of the truth, and to speak perverse things, the churches had constantly to be checked guided trained, reprov'd, and rebuked. There were men even in the church who were ever ready to question the authority of the apostles. There were those who made it a business to follow up Paul, and by every possible means to counteract his teaching and destroy his influence. They declared that he was not an apostle of the Lord at all, but of men; that he had never seen the Lord; that he was simply a tent maker going about over the country

working at his trade, and passing himself off as an apostle. Others charged him with teaching the doctrine that it is right to do evil that good may come.

But it was not alone nor chiefly from these characters that the danger threatened. It was those who from among the disciples would arise speaking perverse things, of which an instance and a warning are given in the letter to Timothy: “Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some.” ^{<1>} Timothy 2:15-18.

Nor yet was it with such as these that the greatest danger lay. It was from those who would arise not only speaking perverse things, but “speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.” Through error of judgment, a man might speak perverse things with no bad intention; but the ones here mentioned would speak perverse things purposely and with the intention of making disciples for themselves — to draw away disciples after them instead of to draw disciples to Christ. These would pervert the truth and would have to pervert the truth, in order to accomplish their purpose. He who always speaks the truth as it is in Jesus, will draw disciples to Jesus and not to himself. To draw to Christ will be his only wish. But when one seeks to draw disciples to himself, and puts himself in the place of Christ, then he must pervert the truth, and accommodate it to the wishes of those whom he hopes to make his own disciples. This is wickedness; this is apostasy.

There was another consideration which made the danger the more imminent. These words were spoken to the bishops. It was a company of bishops, to whom the apostle was speaking when he said: “Of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.” From that order of men who were chosen to guide and to care for the church of Christ, from those who were set to protect the church — from this order of men there would be those who would pervert their calling, their office, and the purpose of it, to build up themselves, and gather disciples to themselves in the place of Christ. To watch this spirit, to check its influence, and to guard against its workings, was constant effort

of the apostle; and for the reason as stated to the Thessalonians, that the mystery of iniquity was already working. There were at that time elements abroad which the apostle could plainly see would develop into all that the Scriptures had announced. And scarcely were the last of the apostles dead when the evil appeared in its practical workings.

No sooner were the apostles removed from the stage of action, no sooner was their watchful attention gone, and their apostolic authority removed, than this very thing appeared of which the apostle had spoken. Certain bishops, in order to make easier the conversion of the heathen; to multiply disciples, and by this increase their own influence and authority; began to adopt heathen customs and forms.

When the canon of Scripture was closed, and the last of the apostles was dead, the first century was gone; and within twenty years of that time the perversion of the truth of Christ had become widespread. In the history of this century and of this subject the record is, —

“It is certain that to religious worship, both public and private, many rites were added, without necessity, and to the offense of sober and good men.” — Mosheim.^{f141}

And the reason of this is stated to be that — “The Christians were pronounced atheists, because they were destitute of temples, altars, victims, priests, and all that pomp in which the vulgar suppose the essence of religion to consist. For unenlightened persons are prone to estimate religion by what meets their eyes. To silence this accusation, the Christian doctors thought it necessary to introduce some external rites, which would strike the senses of the people, so that they could maintain themselves really to possess all those things of which Christians were charged with being destitute. though under different forms.” — Mosheim.^{f142}

This was at once to accommodate the Christian worship and its forms to that of the heathen, and almost at one step to heathenize Christianity. No heathen element or form can be connected with Christianity or its worship, and Christianity remain pure.

Of all the ceremonies of the heathen, the mysteries were the most sacred and most universally practiced. Some mysteries were in honor of Bacchus, some of Cybele, but the greatest of all, those considered the most sacred of all and the most widely practiced, were the Eleusinian, so called because

celebrated at Eleusis in Greece. But whatever was the mystery that was celebrated, there was always in it as an essential part of it, the elements of abomination that characterized sun worship everywhere, because the mysteries were simply forms of the wide-spread and multiform worship of the sun. Among the first of the perversions of the Christian worship was to give to its forms the title and air of the mysteries. For says the record: —

Among the Greeks and the people of the East, nothing was held more sacred than what were called the mysteries. This circumstances led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say that they also had similar mysteries, or certain holy rites concealed from the vulgar and they not only applied the terms used in the pagan mysteries to Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's supper, but they gradually introduced also the rites which were designated by those terms." —

Mosheim.^{f143}

That this point may be more fully understood we shall give a sketch of the Eleusinian mysteries. As we have stated, although there were others, these were of such preeminence that they acquired the specific name by way of — the mysteries. The festival was sacred to Ceres and Proserpine. Everything about it contained a mystery, and was to be kept secret by the initiated. "This mysterious secrecy was solemnly observed and enjoined on all the votaries of the goddess; and if any one ever appeared at the celebration, either intentionally or through ignorance, without proper introduction, he was immediately punished with death. Persons of both sexes and all ages were initiated at this solemnity, and it was looked upon so heinous one of the heaviest accusations which contributed to the condemnation of Socrates. The initiated were under the more particular care of the deities, and therefore their lives were supposed to be attended with more happiness and real security than those of other men. This benefit was not only granted during life, but it extended beyond the grave, and they were honored with the first places in the Elysian fields, while others were left to wallow in perpetual filth and ignominy." — Anthon.^{f144}

There were the greater and the lesser mysteries. The greater were the Eleusinian in fact, and the lesser were invented, according to the mythological story, because Hercules passed near Eleusis, where the greater mysteries were celebrated, and desired to be initiated, but as he was a stranger and therefore could not lawfully be admitted, a form of mysteries was adopted into which he could be initiated. These were ever afterward

celebrated as the lesser, and were observed at Agrae. In the course of time the lesser were made preparatory to the greater, and the candidate must be initiated into these before he could be initiated into the greater. “No person could be initiated at Eleusis without a previous purification at Agrae. This purification they performed by keeping themselves pure, chaste, and unpolluted during nine days, after which they came and offered sacrifices and prayers, wearing garlands of flowers, and having under their feet Jupiter’s skin, which was the skin of a victim offered to that god. The person who assisted was called Hudranos, from hudor, water, which was used at the purification; and they themselves were called the initiated. A year after the initiation at the less mysteries they sacrificed a sow to Ceres, and were admitted into the greater, and the secrets of the festivals were solemnly revealed to them, from which they were called inspectors.

“The initiation was performed in the following manner: The candidates, crowned with myrtle, were admitted by night into a place called the mystical temple, a vast and stupendous building. As they entered the temple, they purified themselves by washing their hands in holy water, and received for admonition that they were to come with a mind pure and undefiled, without which the cleanliness of the body would be unacceptable. After this the holy mysteries were read to them from a large book called petroma, because made of two stones, Petrai, fitly cemented together; and then the priest proposed to them certain questions, to which they readily answered. After this, strange and fearful objects presented themselves to their sight; the place often seemed to quake, and to appear suddenly resplendent with fire, and immediately covered with gloomy darkness and horror.” — Anthon.^{f145} After initiation, the celebration lasted nine days.

These mysteries, as well as those of Bacchus and others, were directly related to the sun for “the most holy and perfect rite in the Eleusinian Mysteries was to show an ear of corn mowed down in silence, and this was a symbol of the Phrygian Atys.” — “Encyclopedia Britannica.”^{f146}

The Phrygian Atys, as we have before shown, was simply the incarnation of the sun, and the mysteries being a form of sun worship, the “sacred” symbols cannot be described with decency. Having given in a previous chapter the characteristics of the celebration of the worship of the sun, it is not necessary to describe the actions that were performed in the celebration of the mysteries that were performed in the celebration of the mysteries

after the initiation, any further than is spoken by the apostle with direct reference to this subject. "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them. For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret." ~~HEB~~ Ephesians 5:11, 12.

It was to accommodate the Christian worship to the minds of a people who practiced these things that the bishops gave to the Christian ordinances the name of mysteries. The Lord's supper was made the greater mystery, baptism the lesser and the initiatory robe, and the celebration of the former. After the heathen manner also a white garment was used as the initiatory robe, and the candidate having been baptized, and thus initiatory robe, and the candidate mysteries, was admitted into what was called in the church the order of catechumens, in which order they remained a certain length of time, as in the heathen celebration, before they were admitted to the celebration of the Lord's supper, the greater mystery.

"This practice originated in the Eastern provinces, and then after the time of Adrian (who first introduced the pagan mysteries among the Latins) it spread among the Christians of the West." The reign of Hadrian was from 117-138. Therefore, before the second century was half gone, before the last of the apostles had been dead forty years, this apostasy, this working of the mystery of iniquity, had so largely spread over both the East and the West, that it is literally true that "a large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries." — Mosheim. ^{f147}

Nor is this all. In the previous chapter we have abundantly shown the worship of the sun to have been universal. These apostates not being content with so much much of the sun worship as appeared in the celebration of the mysteries, adopted the heathen custom of worshipping toward the East. So says the history: —

"Before the coming of Christ, all the Eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion that God, whose essence they looked upon to be light, and whom they considered as being circumscribed within certain limits, dwelt in that part of the firmament from which he sends forth the sun, the bright image of his benignity and glory.

The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error [of supposing that God dwelt in that part of the firmament]; but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshiping toward the east, which sprang from it. Nor is this custom abolished even in out times, but still prevails in a great number of Christian churches.” — Moscheim.^{f148}

The next step in addition to this was the adoption of the day of the sun as a festival day. To such an extent were the forms of sun worship practiced in this apostasy, that before the close of the second century the heathen themselves charged these so-called Christians with worshiping the sun. A presbyter of the church of Carthage, then and now one of the “church Fathers,” who wrote about A.D. 200, considered it necessary to make a defense of the practice, which he did to the following effect in an address to the rulers and magistrates of the Roman empire: —

“Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our god. We shall be counted Persians perhaps though we do not worship the orb of day painted on a piece of linen cloth, having himself everywhere in his own disc. The idea no doubt has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer. But you, many of you, also under pretense sometimes of worshiping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sunday to rejoicing from a far different reason than sun worship we have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury though they too go far away from Jewish ways, of which indeed they are ignorant.” — Tertullian.^{f149}

And again in an address to all the heathen he justifies this practice by the argument, in effect, You do the same thing, you originated it too, therefore you have no right to blame us. In his own words his defense is as follows:

“Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians, because it is a wellknown fact that we pray towards the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity. What then? Do you do less than this? Do not many among you, with an affectation of sometimes worshiping the heavenly bodies, likewise move your lips

in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day, in preference to the preceding day, as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and banqueting.” — Tertullian. ^{f150}

This accommodation was easily made, and all this practice was easily justified, by the perverse minded teachers, in the perversion of such scriptures as, “The Lord God is a sun and shield” (Psam 84:2); and, “Unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings.” ~~<3042>~~ Malachi 4:2.

As this custom spread and through it such disciples were multiplied, the ambition of the bishop of Rome grew space. It was in honor of the day of the sun that there was manifested the first attempt of the bishop of Rome to compel the obedience of all other bishops, and the fact that this attempt was made in such a cause, at the very time when these pretended Christians were openly accused by the heathen with worshiping the sun, is strongly suggestive.

From Rome there came now another addition to the sun-worshiping apostasy. The first Christians being mostly Jews, continued to celebrate the passover in remembrance of the death of Christ, the true passover; and this was continued among those who from among the Gentiles had turned to Christ. Accordingly the celebration was always on the passover day — the fourteenth of the first month. Rome, however, and from her all the West, adopted the day of the sun as the day of this celebration. According to the Eastern custom, the celebration, being on the fourteenth day of the month, would of course fall on different days of the week as the years revolved. The rule of Rome was that the celebration must always be on a Sunday — the Sunday nearest to the fourteenth day of the first month of the Jewish year. And if the fourteenth day of that month should of the Jewish year. Sunday, then the celebration was not to be held on that day, but upon the next Sunday. One reason of this was not only to be as like heathen as possible, but to be as unlike the Jews as possible: this, in order not only to facilitate the “conversion” of the heathen by conforming to their customs, but also by pandering to their spirit of contempt and hatred of the Jews. It was upon this point that the bishop of Rome made his first open attempt at absolutism.

We know not precisely when this began, but it was practiced in Rome as early as the time of Sixtus I, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 119-128. The practice was promoted by his successors, and Anicetus, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 157-168, “would neither conform to that [Eastern] custom himself, nor suffer any under his jurisdiction to conform to it, obliging them to celebrate that solemnity on the Sunday next following the fourteenth of the moon.” — Bower.^{f151} In A.D. 160, Polycarp, bishop of Ephesus, made a journey to Rome to consult with Anicetus about this question, though nothing special came of the consultation. Victor, who was bishop of Rome A.D. 192-202, likewise proposed to oblige only those under his jurisdiction to conform to the practice of Rome; but he asserted jurisdiction over all, and therefore presumed to command all.

Accordingly, after having taken the advice of some foreign bishops, he wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition by the pen of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who declared in their name, with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart, in this manner, from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the church of Rome.” — Mosheim.^{f152}

In view of these things it will readily be seen that between paganism and this kind of Christianity it soon became difficult to distinguish, and the third century only went to make any distinction still more difficult to be discerned.

In the latter part of the second century, there sprang up in Egypt a school of pagan philosophy called the “Eclectic.” The patrons of this school called themselves “Eclectics” because they professed to be in search of truth alone, and to be ready to adopt any tenet of any system in existence which seemed to them to be agreeable to their ideas of truth. They held Plato to be the one person above all others who had attained the nearest to truth in the greatest number of points. Hence they were also called “Platonists.”

“This philosophy was adopted by such of the learned at Alexandria, as wished to be accounted Christians, and yet to retain the name, the garb, and the rank of philosophers. In particular, all those who in this century presided in the schools of the Christians at Alexandria, Athenagoras, Pantaenus, and Clemens Alexandrinus, are said to have approved of it. These men were persuaded that true philosophy, the great and most salutary gift of God, lay in scattered fragments among all the sects of philosophers; and therefore, that it was the duty of every wise man and especially of a Christian teacher, to collect those fragments from all quarters, and to use them for the defense of religion and the confutation of impiety. Yet this selection of opinions did not prevent them from regarding Plato as wiser than all the rest, and as especially remarkable for treating the Deity, the soul, and things remote from sense, so as to suit the Christian scheme.” — Mosheim.^{f153}

In the end of the second century, and especially in the first forty-one years of the third, there flourished in Alexandria one of these would-be-philosophers — Ammonius Saccas by name — who gave a turn to the philosophy of the Eclectics, which caused his sect to be called the New Platonists. The difference between the Eclectics and the system founded by Ammonius was this: The Eclectics held, as above stated, that in every system of thought in the world there was some truth, but mixed with error, their task being to select from all these to form one harmonious system. Ammonius held that when the truth was known, all sects had the same identical system of truth; that the differences among them were caused simply by the different ways of stating that truth; and that the proper task of the philosopher was to find such a means of stating the truth that all should be able to understand it, and so each one understand all the others. This was to be accomplished by a system of allegorizing and mystification, by which anybody could get whatever he wanted out of any writing that might come to his notice.

One of the earliest attaches to this philosophy from among those who professed to be Christians, was Clement of Alexandria, who became the head of that kind of school at Alexandria. These philosophers “believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings; the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words; the other recondite, and concealed under the words, like a nut by the shell. The former they neglected, as of little value, their study chiefly being to extract the latter: in

other words, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings, by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meanings. Some also, and this is stated especially of Clement, accommodated the divine oracles to the precepts of philosophy.” — Mosheim.^{f154}

The following highly edifying explanation by Clement, of the Scripture relating to the fish which Peter caught, will illustrate this system of interpretation: —

“That fish then which, at the command of the Lord. Peter caught points to digestible and God-given and moderate food. And by those who rise from the water to the bait of righteousness, he admonishes us to take away luxury and avarice, as the coin from the fish; in order that he might displace vainglory; and by giving the stater to the taxgatherers and rendering the Caesar the things which are Caesar’s might preserve to God the things which are God’s. The stater is capable of other explanations not unknown to us, but the present is not a suitable occasion for their treatment. Let the mention we make for our present purpose suffice, as it is not unsuitable to the flowers of the Word; and we have often done this, drawing to the urgent point of the question the most beneficial fountain, in order to water those who have been planted by the Word.”^{f155}

And this, of the Saviour’s miracle of turning the water into wine, also helps to an understanding of the excellent wisdom of this philosophy: —

“He gave life to the watery element of the meaning of the law, filling with his blood the doer of it who is of Adam, that is, the whole world; supplying piety with drink from the vine of truth, the mixture of the old law and of the new word, in order to the fulfillment of the predestined time.”^{f156}

Of the benefits children will derive from a starvation diet, he gives this valuable instruction: —

“They say that the bodies of children, when shooting up to their height, are made to grow right by deficiency in nourishment. For then the spirit, which pervades the body in order to its growth, is

not checked by abundance of food obstructing the freedom of its course.”^{fl57}

The close resemblance between the pagan philosophy and that of the New Platonists is illustrated by the fact that but one of the classes concerned could tell to which of them Ammonius Saccas belonged. The pagans generally regarded him a pagan. His own kind of Christians counted him a good Christian all his life. The genuine Christians all knew that he was a pagan, and that the truth of the whole matter was that he was a pretended Christian “who adopted with such dexterity the doctrines of the pagan philosophy as to appear a Christian to the Christians, and a pagan to the pagans.”^{fl58} He died A.D. 241.

Clement is supposed to have died about A.D. 220, and the fame and influence which he had acquired — and it was considerable — was far outshone by Origen, who had been taught by both Clement and Ammonius. Origen imbibed all the allegorical and mystifying processes of both Ammonius and Clement, and multiplied upon them from his own wild imagination. He was not content with finding two meanings in the Scriptures as those before him, but took the secondary sense, the hidden meaning, and added to it four additional meanings of his own. His system then stood thus: First, All scripture contains two meanings, the literal and the hidden. Second, This hidden sense has within itself two meanings, the moral and the mystical. Third, The mystical has within it yet two other meanings, the allegorical and the anagogical. According to this method of mysticism, therefore, in every passage of Scripture there are at least three meanings, and there may be any number from three to six.

His explanation of it is this: First, Man is composed of three parts, a rational mind, a sensitive soul, and a visible body. The Scriptures resemble man, and therefore have a three-fold sense;

- (a) a literal sense which corresponds to the body;
- (b) a moral sense corresponding to the soul; and
- (c) a mystical sense which corresponds to the mind.

Second, As the body is the baser part of man, so the literal is the baser sense of Scripture; and as the body often betrays good men into sin, so the literal sense of Scripture often leads into error. Therefore, those who

would see more in the Scripture than common people could see, must search out this hidden meaning, and yet further must search in that hidden meaning for the moral sense. And those who would be perfect must carry their search yet farther, and beyond this moral sense which they found in the hidden meaning they must find the mystical sense, with its additional train of allegorical and anagogical senses.

As in this system of philosophy the body of man was a clog to the soul and hindered it in its heavenly aspirations, and was therefore to be despised, and by punishment and starvation was to be separated as far as possible from the soul, it followed that the literal sense of Scripture, which corresponded to man's body likewise, was a hinderance to the proper understanding of all the hidden meanings of the Scripture, and was to be despised and separated as far as possible from the hidden sense, and counted of the least possible worth. Accordingly, one of the first principles of this teaching was the following: —

“The source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so will not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us therefore seek after the spirit and substantial fruit of the word, which are hidden and mysterious.” — Origen. ^{f159}

And the next step was but the logical result of this; namely: —

“The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.” — Origen. ^{f160}

By such a system as this it is evident that any one could find whatever he pleased in any passage of Scripture, and that the Scripture could be made to support any doctrine that was ever invented by the wildest fancy of the veriest fanatic. Even though the doctrine might be flatly contradictory to the Scripture, the Scripture could be made fully to agree with and teach the doctrine.

From this sketch of Platonism as held by Origen, the essential truth of the following passage will be readily seen: —

“This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and other Christians, did immense harm to Christianity. For it led the teachers of it to involve in philosophic obscurity many parts of our religion, which were in themselves plain and easy to be understood; and to add to the precepts of the Saviour no few

things, of which not a word can be found in the Holy Scriptures.... It recommended to Christians various foolish and useless rites, suited only to nourish superstition, no small part of which we see religiously observed by many even to the present day. And finally it alienated the minds of many, in the following centuries, from Christianity itself, and produced a heterogeneous species of religion, consisting of Christian and Platonic principles combined.” — Mosheim.^{f161}

On the part of real Christians, those who loved the truth as it is in Christ, there was strong opposition from the first to this whole system of philosophy with its mystification and allegory. “But the friends of philosophy and literature gradually acquired the ascendancy. To this issue Origen contributed very much; who, having early imbibed the principles of the New Platonism, inauspiciously applied them to theology, and earnestly recommended them to the numerous youth who attended on his instructions. And the greater the influence of this man, which quickly spread over the whole Christian world, the more readily was his method of explaining the sacred doctrines propagated.” — Mosheim.^{f162}

While this effort was being made on the side of philosophy to unite all religions, there was at the same time a like effort on the side of politics. This was the aim of Elagabalus, A.D. 218 to 222. We have already shown that it was the ambition of Elagabalus to make the worship of the sun supersede all other worship in Rome. It is further related of him that a more ambitious scheme even than this was in the emperor’s mind, which was nothing less than the blending of all religions into one, of which “the sun was to be the central object of adoration.” — Milman.^{f163} But the elements were not yet fully prepared for such a fusion. Also the shortness of the reign of Elagabalus prevented any decided advancement toward success.

Alexander Severus — A.D. 222 to 225 — held to the same idea, and carried it into effect so far as his individual practice was concerned. “The mother of Alexander Severus, the able, perhaps crafty and rapacious, Mammeaea, had at least held intercourse with the Christians of Syria. She had conversed with the celebrated Origen, and listened to his exhortations, if without conversion, still not without respect. Alexander, though he had neither the religious education, the pontifical character, nor the dissolute manners of his predecessor, was a Syrian, with no hereditary attachment to

the Roman form of paganism. He seems to have affected a kind of universalism: he paid decent respect to the gods of the capitol; he held in honor the Egyptian worship, and enlarged the temples of Isis and Serapis. In his own palace, with respectful indifference, he enshrined, as it were, as his household deities, the representatives of the different religions or philosophic systems which were prevalent in the Roman empire, — Orpheus, Abraham, Christ and Apollonius of Tyana.... The homage of Alexander Severus may be a fair test of the general sentiment of the more intelligent heathen of his time.” — Milman.^{f164} His reign was also too short to accomplish anything beyond his own individual example. But the same tendency went rapidly forward.

On the side of philosophy and the apostasy, the progress was continuous and rapid. About the middle of this century, Origen and Celsus, a pagan philosopher, held a protracted discussion upon the respective merits of the pagan and the Christian philosophy. And the standing of the two systems at this time, is well described in the following statement: —

“Heathenism, as interpreted by philosophy, almost found favor with some of the more moderate Christian apologists.... The Christians endeavored to enlist the earlier philosophers in their cause; they were scarcely content with asserting that the nobler Grecian philosophy might be designed to prepare the human mind for the reception of Christianity; they were almost inclined to endow these sages with a kind of prophetic foreknowledge of its more mysterious doctrines. ‘I have explained,’ says the Christian in Minucius Felix, ‘the opinions of almost all the philosophers, whose most illustrious glory it is that they have worshiped one God, though under various names; so that one might suppose either that the Christians of the present day are philosophers, or that the philosophers of old were already Christians.’

“These advances on the part of Christianity were more than met by paganism. The heathen religion, which prevailed at least among the more enlightened pagans during this period,... was almost as different from that of the older Greeks and Romans, or even that which prevailed at the commencement of the empire, as it was from Christianity.... On the great elementary principle of Christianity, the unity of the supreme God, this approximation had long been silently made. Celsus, in his celebrated controversy with Origen, asserts

that this philosophical notion of the Deity is perfectly reconcilable with paganism.” — Milman.^{f165}

The emperor Decius, having no sympathy with any religion, philosophy, or morality, but that of the old original Roman, did his best to restore it throughout the empire. Hence the persecution, as described in Chapter IV of this book. Valerian followed closely the course marked out by Decius; but in the forty years of peace to religion, from the edict of toleration by Gallienus to the edict of persecution by Diocletian, all these elements worked steadily forward in the same general direction. Of the progress of the apostasy during this time, we have a powerful illustration in the practice of Gregory Thaumaturgus, the “wonder-worker.”

Gregory was a pupil and a convert of Origen’s. Origen strongly urged him “to devote his acquirements in heathen science and learning, to the elucidation of the Scriptures.” When he left Origen’s school at Alexandria, he returned to Pontus, and became bishop of Neo Caesarea, A.D. 240 to 270, and how fully he followed the advice of Origen is shown by the following: —

“When Gregory perceived that the ignorant multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the pleasures and sensual gratifications which they enjoyed at the pagan festivals, he granted them a permission to indulge themselves in the like pleasures, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, hoping that, in process of time, they would return of their own accord, to a more virtuous and regular course of life.’ There is no sort of doubt that, by this permission, Gregory allowed the Christians to dance, sport, and feast at the tombs of the martyrs, upon their respective festivals, and to do everything which the pagans were accustomed to in their temples, during the feasts celebrated in honor of their gods.” — Mosheim.^{f166}

Neo Caesarea was one of the most important cities in Pontus. Yet so diligently did Gregory thus employ the talents committed to him by Origen, that it is related of him that whereas “there were said to be only seventeen Christians in the whole city when he first entered it as bishop, there were said to be only seventeen pagans in it at the time of his death.”^{f167} It is manifest, however, from Gregory’s practice, that those who were by him

brought to the Christian name were as much pagan as before except in the mere matter of the name.

In the time of Diocletian, that which was known as paganism was so far different from the original paganism of Rome that Milman plainly designates it as the “new paganism.” This new paganism was so little removed from the apostate form of Christianity which we have traced, as really to differ from it only in name. The standing of the two systems at the accession of Diocletian is thus described: —

“Among the cares of his administration, he by no means neglected the purification of the ancient religions. In paganism itself, that silent but manifest change of which we have already noticed the commencement, had been creeping on.... This new paganism, as has been observed, arose out of the alliance of the philosophy and the religion of the old world. These once implacable adversaries had reconciled their differences, and coalesced against the common enemy. Christianity itself had no slight influence upon the formation of the new system; and now an Eastern element, more and more strongly dominant, mingled with the whole, and lent it, as it were, a visible object of worship. From Christianity, the new paganism had adopted the unity of the Deity, and scrupled not to degrade all the gods of the older world into subordinate demons or ministers. The Christians had incautiously held the same language: both concurred in the name of demons; but the pagans used the term in the Platonic sense, as good but subordinate spirits, while the same term spoke to the Christian ear as expressive of malignant and diabolic agency. But the Jupiter Optimus Maximums was not the great Supreme of the new system. The universal deity of the East, the sun, to the philosophic was the emblem or representative; to the vulgar, the Deity. Diocletian himself, though he paid so much deference to the older faith as to assume the title of Jovius, as belonging to the lord of the world, yet, on his accession, when he would exculpate himself from all concern in the murder of his predecessor, Numerian, appealed in the face of the army to the all-seeing deity of the sun. It is the oracle of Apollo of Miletus, consulted by the hesitating emperor, which is to decide the fate of Christianity. The metaphorical language of Christianity had unconsciously lent strength to this new adversary; and, in adoring the visible orb,

some, no doubt, supposed that they were not departing far from the worship of the ‘Sun of Righteousness.’” — Milman.^{f168}

Diocletian himself really contemplated the same fusion of all religions into one, with the sun as the one great universal deity, which Elagabalus had contemplated in his day; but by Galerius and the leading philosopher of the new paganism, he was persuaded to use all the power of the State in the effort to make paganism alone supreme over and against every form and every profession of the Christian name. The result, however, was as already related, that Galerius was compelled to issue a public edict confessing his failure.

Then came Constantine, the best imperial representative of the new paganism, and the most devout worshiper of the sun as the supreme and universal deity, with the avowed purpose, as expressed in his own words, “First to bring the diverse judgments formed by all nations respecting the Deity to a condition, as it were, of settled uniformity.” In Constantine the new paganism met its ideal and the New Platonism — the apostate, paganized, sun worshiping form of Christianity — met its long-wished-for instrument. In him the two streams met. In him the aspiration of Elagabalus, the hope of Ammonius Saccas and Origen, and the ambition of the perverse-minded, self-exalted bishops, were all realized and accomplished — a new, imperial, and universal religion was created. Therefore, “The reign of Constantine the Great forms one of the epochs in the history of the world. It is the era of the dissolution of the Roman empire ; the commencement, or rather consolidation, of a kind of Eastern despotism, with a new capital, a new patriciate, a new constitution, a new financial system, a new, though as yet imperfect, jurisprudence, and, finally, a new religion.” — Milman.^{f169}

The epoch thus formed was the epoch of the papacy; and the new religion thus created was the PAPAL RELIGION.

CHAPTER 9.

THE EXALTATION OF THE BISHOPRIC.

THE Scripture was fulfilled; there had come a falling away. But that there should come a falling away, was not all of the story — through that falling away there was to be revealed “that man of sin,” “the son of perdition,” “the mystery of iniquity,” “that wicked,” who would oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; and who, when he did appear, would continue even till that great and notable event — the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Referring again to the scripture quoted from ~~SND~~ 2 Thessalonians 2:2, at the beginning of the previous chapter, it is seen that self-exaltation is the spring of the development of this power.

As that scripture expresses it, “He opposeth and exalteth himself.” As another scripture gives it, “He shall magnify himself in his heart.” And another, “He magnified himself even to the prince of the host” — the Lord Jesus Christ. And yet another, “He shall also stand up against the Prince of princes.” That is, he shall reign, or assert authority above, and in opposition to, the authority of Christ; or, as the thought is developed by Paul, this power would oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple — the place of worship — of God, showing himself that he is God.

Referring also again to the instruction of Paul to the elders who met him at Miletus, there is seen a prophecy of this same spirit of self-exaltation, — a wish to gain disciples to themselves instead of to Christ. They would prefer themselves to Christ, thus at once putting themselves above him, in opposition to him. And this would be developed from among the bishops. “Of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.”

This spirit was actively manifested in opposition to the apostle John while he was yet alive, for he says: “I wrote unto the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not.” ~~GOB~~ 3 John 1:9.

This assertion of pre-eminence was shown in prating against the apostle with malicious words, and not only rejecting him, but casting out of the church those members who would receive him. It was but a little while after the living authority of the apostles was gone, before this was carried to yet further extremes.

According to the word of Christ, there is no such thing as pre-eminence, or mastership, or sovereignty of position, among men in the church. There was once an argument among his disciples as to who should be counted the greatest, and Jesus called them unto him and said: “Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever among you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son on man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.” ~~4102~~ Mark 10:42-45.

And in warning his disciples of all times against the practice of the scribes and Pharisees of that time, who were but the popes of their day, he says they “love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren....Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.” ~~4106~~ Matthew 23:6-12.

With these instructions the apostles went forth under the great commission of Christ, preaching everywhere that with the Lord there is no respect of persons, but that all are equal before God. There is neither lordship nor over-lordship among men in the church of Christ; but all are brethren. Christ only is the head of the church, and the head of every man in the church.

In the church each member has the same rights as any other member; but for the good of all and the mutual benefit of all concerned, as well as better to carry on his work in the world, the Lord has established his church, and with it a system of church order in which certain ones are chosen to exercise certain functions for the mutual benefit of all in the organization. These officers are chosen from among the membership by the voice of the

membership. Of these officers there are two classes, and two only, — bishops and deacons. This is shown by Paul's letter to the Philippians — “Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.” ~~SCOT~~Philippians 1:1.

Bishops are sometimes called elders; but the same office is always signified. When Paul gave directions to Titus in this matter, he said: “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee if any be blameless.... For abishop must be blameless, as the steward of God.”

~~SCOT~~Titus 1:5-7.

This is further shown in ~~400~~Acts 20, to which we have before referred; when Paul had called unto him to Miletus “the elders of the church” of Ephesus, among other things he said to them: “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers,” — episkopoi — bishops.

Peter also writes to the same effect: “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.” ~~600~~1 Peter 5:1-3.

This text not only shows that the terms “elder” and “bishop” refer to the same identical office, but it shows that Peter counted himself as one among them; and that not only by his precept but by his example he showed that in this office, although overseers they were not overrulers or lords.

The true idea on this point has been clearly stated as follows: —

“It has been said that the pope, the bishops, the priests, and all those who people convents, form the spiritual or ecclesiastical estate; and that princes, nobles, citizens, and peasants form the secular or lay estate. This is a specious tale But let no man be alarmed. All Christians belong to the spiritual estate; and the only difference between them is in the functions which they fulfill. We have all but one baptism, but one faith; and these constitute the spiritual man. Unction, tonsure, ordination, consecration, given by

the pope, or by a bishop, may make a hypocrite, but can never make a spiritual man. We are all consecrated priests by baptism, as St. Peter says: ‘You are a royal priesthood;’ although all do not actually perform the offices of kings and priests, because no one can assume what is common to all without the common consent. But if this consecration of God did not belong to us, the unction of the pope could not make a single priest. If ten brothers, the sons of one king, and possessing equal claims to his inheritance, should choose one of their number to administer for them, they would all be kings, and yet only one of them would be the administrator of their common power. So it is in the church. Were several pious laymen banished to a desert, and were they, from not having among them a priest consecrated by a bishop, to agree in selecting one of their number, whether married or not, he would be as truly a priest as if all the bishops of the world had consecrated him.” — Luther.^{f171}

Such is the order in the church of Christ, and as every Christian is God’s freeman and Christ’s servant, it follows as has been well stated that “monarchy in spiritual things does not harmonize with the spirit of Christianity.” — Neander.^{f172} Yet this order was not suffered long to remain. A distinction was very soon asserted between the bishop and the elder, and the bishop assumed a precedence and an authority over the elder, who was now distinguished from the bishop by the title of “presbyter” only. This was easily and very naturally accomplished.

For instance, a church would be established in a certain city. Soon perhaps another church or churches would be established in that same city, or near to it in the country. These other churches would look naturally to the original church as to a mother, and the elders of the original church would naturally have a care for the others as they arose. It was only proper to show Christian respect and deference to these; but this respect and deference was soon demanded, and authority to require it was asserted by those who were bishops first.

Again: as churches multiplied and with them also elders multiplied, it was necessary, in carrying forward the work of the gospel, for the officers of the church often to have meetings for consultation. On these occasions it was but natural and proper for the seniors to preside; but instead of allowing this to remain still a matter of choice in the conducting of each

successive meeting or assembly, it was claimed as a right that the one originally chosen should hold that position for life.

Thus was that distinction established between the elders or presbyters, and the bishops. Those who usurped this permanent authority and office took to themselves exclusively the title of “bishop,” and all the others were still to retain the title of “presbyter.” The presbyters in turn assumed over the deacons a supremacy and authority which did not belong to them, and all together — bishops, presbyters, and deacons — held themselves to be superior orders in the church over the general membership, and assumed to themselves the title of “clergy,” while upon the general membership the term “laity” was conferred.

In support of these three orders among the “clergy,” it was claimed that they came in proper succession from the high-priests, the priests, and the Levites of the Levitical law. “Accordingly, the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high-priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites.” — Mosheim.^{f173}

These distinctions were established as early as the middle of the second century. This led to a further and most wicked invention. As they were now priests and Levites after the order of the priesthood of the former dispensation, it was necessary that they also should have a sacrifice to offer. Accordingly, the Lord’s supper was turned into “the unbloody sacrifice.” Thus arose that which is still in the Roman Catholic Church the daily “sacrifice” of the mass. “The comparison of the Christian oblations with the Jewish victims and sacrifices, produced many unnecessary rites, and by degrees corrupted the very doctrine of the holy supper, which was converted, sooner, in fact, than one would think, into a sacrifice.” — Mosheim.^{f174} With this also came a splendor in dress, copied from that of the former real priesthood.

The estimate in which the bishop was now held may be gathered from the following words of a document of the second century: —

“It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord himself.” “It is well to reverence both God and the bishop. He who honors the bishop has been honored of God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does (in reality) serve the devil.” — Ignatius.^{f175}

The next step was for certain bishops to assert authority over other bishops; and the plea upon which this was claimed as a right, was that the bishops of those churches which had been established by the apostles were of right to be considered as superior to all others. Furthermore it was claimed that in those churches the true doctrine of Christ had been preserved in the greatest purity. As the bishops of those churches claimed to be the repositories of the true doctrine, whenever any question arose upon any matter of doctrine or interpretation of the scripture, appeal was made to the bishop of the nearest apostolic church. As Rome was the capital of the empire, and as the church there claimed direct descent not only from one but from two apostles, it soon came to pass that the church of Rome claimed to be the source of true doctrine, and the bishop of that church to be supreme over all other bishops. In the latter part of the second century, during the episcopate of Eleutherius, A.D. 176 to 192, the absolute authority of the church of Rome in matters of doctrine was plainly asserted in the following words: —

“It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the church, — those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the father.” “Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings; (we do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally-known church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul: as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church, on account of its pre-eminent authority... Since, therefore, we have such proofs, it is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth: so that every man, whosoever will, can draw

from her the water of life. For she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers.” — Irenaus.^{f176}

When this authority and power was asserted during the bishopric of Eleutherius, it is not at all strange that his immediate successor, Victor, A.D. 192 to 202, should attempt to carry into practice the authority thus claimed for him. The occasion of it was the question of the celebration of what is now Easter, as already related in the preceding chapter. This action of Victor is pronounced by Bower “the first essay of papal usurpation.” Thus early did Rome not only claim supremacy, but attempt to enforce her claim of supremacy, over all other churches. Such was the arrogance of the bishops of Rome at the beginning of the third century.

The character of the bishopric in A.D. 250 is clearly seen in the quotation already given on page 131 of this book; but for the convenience of the reader, we insert it again in this place: —

“Not a few bishops who ought to furnish both exhortation and example to others, despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their throne, deserted their people, wandered about over foreign provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise, while brethren were starving in the church. They sought to possess money in hoards, they seized estates by crafty deceits, they increased their gains by multiplying usuries.” — Cyprian.^{f177}

As the bishopric became more exalted, and arrogated to itself more authority, the office became an object of unworthy ambition and unholy aspiration. Arrogance characterized those who were in power, and envy those who were not. And whenever a vacancy occurred, unseemly and wholly unchristian strife arose among rival presbyters for the vacant seat. “The deacons, beholding the presbyters thus deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order.” — Mosheim.^{f178}

Cornelius became bishop of Rome, A.D. 251. A presbyter of the same church aspired to the same office, and was supported by a considerable party in the church, and also by five other presbyters. He wrote letters to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, charging Cornelius with heinous sins. Cornelius also wrote about the same time to Cyprian, who thus learning of

the division in the church of Rome, called together in council the bishops of his province, and they sent two of their number with letters to Rome to inquire into the trouble. The church in Rome immediately sent letters in answer to the bishops in Africa, assuring them that Cornelius had been properly chosen, and was worthy of the situation. The two messengers returning, also confirmed the testimony of the letters by a report of their own investigations. Upon this the African bishops sent Cornelius a series of resolutions which they had adopted in the council lately held, with respect to those who denied the faith in the time of the persecution by Decius, to the effect that all such should not be excluded forever from the church, but should be admitted after doing sufficient penance — those who had bought exemption in the time of persecution being obliged to do longer penance than others: — and if while doing penance they should come suddenly to the point of death, they should be received into the church at once.

Upon receiving the resolutions, Cornelius called a council of sixty bishops, and a large number from the other orders of the clergy. Among them was Novatian, who had been opposed to Cornelius for the office of bishop. In the council he likewise opposed the resolution sent up from Africa. He maintained that all who had yielded in the time of persecution ought never again to be admitted to the church upon any terms whatever. The majority, however, was against him, and he himself was turned out of the church. Upon this he joined with a presbyter by the name of Novatus, who had been turned out of the church at Carthage, and the followers of the two together agreed to ordain Novatian a bishop in Rome. Novatian immediately set himself in opposition to Cornelius. This party then sent letters to the other churches round about, informing them of the ordination of Novatian, and exhorting them not to communicate with any who had in any way denied the faith under persecution. Cornelius also at the same time wrote to other bishops informing them that the ordination of Novatian was irregular. Thus the division and the controversy spread farther and farther.

While this was going on in Rome, there was also a division in the church of Carthage, where a certain Felicissimus had been excommunicated, whose party also had elected a bishop of their own, by the name of Fortunatus. Felicissimus went to Rome, hoping to win Cornelius to his side, and the messengers of Novatian went to Carthage to gain the favor of Cyprian and the bishops of Africa to their side. But Cyprian stood by the bishop of Rome, and carried with him the bishops of Africa. Novatian sent yet other messengers into Africa, who diligently worked up partisans there, and it

was not long before they secured the ordination of some of their party as bishops. These newly ordained bishops asserted their right to exercise the office of bishop over churches connected with the church of Rome, instead of the regular bishops of those churches. This increased the confusion, which spread finally throughout the provinces of Africa. This became a matter of great perplexity to Cornelius. As both parties were continually sending their letters, and messengers, and embassies, to him, and as both made the same claims, it was very difficult for him to decide who were the regular Catholic bishops. But Cyprian, to relieve this perplexity, drew up a list of all the Catholic bishops in the African provinces, and sent it to Cornelius at Rome.

These discussions gave an opportunity for the further assertion of the dignity and authority of the bishopric. Cyprian, "the representative of the episcopal system" (Neander^{f179}), declared that —

"The church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers." Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the church, and the church is the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, that he is not in the church."
f180

He insisted that God made the bishops and the bishops made the deacons, and argued thus: — "But if we [bishops] may dare anything against God who makes bishops, deacons may also dare against us by whom they are made." f181

"The epistle of Cyprian to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, shows the height to which the episcopal power had aspired before the religion of Christ had become that of the Roman empire. The passages of the Old Testament, and even of the New, in which honor or deference is paid to the Hebrew pontificate, are recited in profuse detail; implicit obedience is demanded for the priest of God, who is the sole infallible judge or delegate of Christ." —; Milman. f182

Cornelius was succeeded in the bishopric of Rome by Lucius, who was put to death in less than six months, and was succeeded by Stephen, A.D. 253 to 253. Soon after Stephen's election, the bishop of Lyons in Gaul wrote to inform him that the bishop of Arles had adopted the views and discipline of Novatian. He also wrote to Cyprian to the same effect. About the same time a question involving much the same point was causing a difficulty in

Spain. There two bishops, Basilides and Martial, had been deposed by a council of bishops, and two others were appointed in their places. They were both charged with surrendering the Scriptures in the time of persecution. Basilides went to Rome to secure the support of the bishop of Rome in his desire to be re-instated. In this he succeeded, and returned to Spain, and there exercised his office as bishop as he had formerly done, and Martial followed his example. Then the bishops of Spain sent letters and deputies to Carthage, asking the advice and help of the African bishops; and the deputies whom they sent were the two bishops whom they had put in the place of Basilides and Martial. A council of twenty-eight bishops was held in Carthage, presided over by Cyprian. Having only a one-sided view of the case, as the bishop of Rome had had the other side they indorsed the action of the church of Spain, and decided that Basilides and Martial ought not to be acknowledged as bishops; that it was not lawful to commune with them; and that whosoever should do so ought to be excommunicated.

Not long afterward, there arose another subject of controversy, which caused much contention with far-reaching consequences. As the bishops arrogated to themselves more and more authority, both in discipline and doctrine, “heretics” increased. Whosoever might disagree with the bishop, was at once branded as a heretic, and was cut off from his communion, as Diotrephes had counted as a heretic even the apostle John. Upon this point the representative of the episcopal system further declared: — “Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, from any other source than from this, that God’s priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time priest in the church, and for the time judge in the stead of Christ; whom, if according to divine teaching, the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests; no one, after the divine judgment, after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the Co-bishops, would make himself a judge, not now of the bishop, but of God. No one would rend the church by a division of the unity of Christ.” — Cyprian.^{f183}

He therefore argued that if any person was outside of this system of episcopal unity, and was not obedient to the bishop, this was all the evidence necessary to demonstrate that he was a heretic. Consequently he declared that no one ought “even to be inquisitive as to what” any one “teaches, so long as he teaches out of the pale of unity.”^{f184} In this way the truth itself could easily be made heresy.

By this system, "heretics" soon became numerous, and, as many persons were changing their residence from place to place, a question was raised whether baptism by heretics was valid. Some bishops of important churches held that it was, others held that it was not. Yet up to this time all bishops and churches were allowed to decide this for themselves. A council of bishops in Africa and Numidia, about the beginning of the third century, had established in those provinces the discipline that all heretics must be re-baptized when applying for admission to any of those churches. This practice was also adopted in Cappadocia, Galatia, Phrygia, Cilicia, and neighboring provinces, by a council held at Iconium in Phrygia, A.D. 230. Pontus and Egypt followed the same course, but Italy, Gaul, and Spain held, on the contrary, that baptism by heretics was valid, it mattered not what the heresy might be.

Thus stood the question when Stephen became bishop of Rome. Soon after the difficulty with the Spanish bishops, some bishops of Numidia and Mauritania sent in quires to Cyprian, raising anew the question of baptism by heretics. A council of seventy-one bishops was held at Carthage, which declared that the practice of re-baptizing should be invariably followed. The council sent a letter to Stephen of Rome, reporting their decision, and asking him to agree with it. Stephen answered the council by letter in which he first called particular attention to the great dignity of the bishopric of Rome, and the honor which it derived from its succession to the apostle Peter. Next he informed them that he absolutely rejected and condemned their decrees. He then threatened to cut off from his communion all who should presume to disobey by re-baptizing any heretics, and finally not only ordered Cyprian to change his opinion on the subject, and practice accordingly, but declared him to be "a false Christ," a "false apostle," and a "deceitful workman."

On receipt of Stephen's letter, Cyprian called another council of eighty-five bishops, which met September 1, A.D. 256. The council canvassed the whole subject anew, came to their original conclusion, and again sent word by messengers to Stephen, who not only refused to receive them at all, but forbade all the church of Rome either to receive or entertain them in any manner. He then proceeded to execute his threat, and excommunicated the whole council, and whoever held the same opinion as the council. This excluded from his communion the bishops of Africa, Numidia, Mauritania, Egypt, Cilicia, Galatia, and Cappadocia. He endeavored by a letter, however, to win the bishop of Alexandria to his view, but failed.

Cyprian wrote to Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, telling him of Stephen's conduct. In reply Firmilian wrote to Cyprian a letter in which he compared Stephen to Judas Iscariot, and branded him as "inhuman," "audacious," "insolent," "wicket," "impious," "schismatic," "a defamer of Peter and Paul," and "worse than all heretics." This Firmilian is pronounced "one of the most eminent prelates at that time in the church, both for piety and learning;" but Cyprian was not far behind him and Stephen in eminence for this kind of piety. For he wrote to the bishop of Sobrata a letter in which he charged Stephen with "pride and impertinence, self-contradiction and ignorance, with indifference, obstinacy, and childishness," and called him "a favorer and abettor of heretics against the church of God." — Bower.^{f185} Stephen died August 2, A.D. 257, and thus was stopped the generous flow of pious phrases.

Stephen was succeeded by Sixtus II, who held the office about a year, and was put to death in the persecution under Valerian. He was succeeded July 22, A.D. 259, by Dionysius. At this time there was another Dionysius, who was bishop of Alexandria, and who had entered into a certain controversy with Sabellius upon the subject of the trinity. In the arguments which he published, some persons thought they discovered heresy, and reported it to the bishop of Rome, who called a council of the bishops of Italy, and requested Dionysius to answer the accusation and give an explanation of his faith. Dionysius addressed to the bishop of Rome a "confutation and apology," explaining the expressions in his former writings, which it was charged contained heresy.

During the bishopric of Dionysius, there occurred the case of Paul of Samosata, who at that time was bishop of Antioch, an account of which will illustrate the condition of the bishoprics of the principal cities of the empire at this time.

The bishops of the East said of Paul that before his connection with the church he was poor almost to beggary, and that he had received neither wealth from his father nor obtained possessions by any art or trade or business, yet had now acquired excessive wealth by his iniquities and sacrileges; that by various means which he employed, he had exacted and extorted from the brethren, promising to aid them for a reward: that he took advantage of those who were in difficulty, to compel them to give him money to be free from their oppressors; that he made merchandise of piety; that he affected lofty things, and assumed too great things, attaining

worldly dignity, wishing rather to be called a magistrate than a bishop; that he went strutting through the forum reading letters and repeating them aloud as he walked; that in public he was escorted by multitudes going before and following after him; that he brought reproach upon the faith by his pomp and haughtiness; that out of vanity and proud pretensions he contrived in ecclesiastical assemblies to catch at glory and empty shadows, and to confound the minds of the more simple; that he had prepared himself a tribunal and a high throne separated from the people like a ruler of this world, rather than a disciple of Christ; that he was in the habit of slapping his hand upon his thigh and stamping upon the tribunal with his foot, reproving and insulting those who would not applaud his sermons; that he magnified himself not as a bishop but as a sophist and juggler; that he stopped the singing of psalms in honor of Christ, and had prepared choirs of women to sing other compositions at the great festivals; that he hired deacons and presbyters of neighboring districts to preach his views of the trinity; that he had with him certain women whom the people of Antioch called “adopted sisters;” that he allowed his presbyters and deacons also to follow the same practice; that he had made his presbyters and deacons rich by indulging their covetous dispositions, and had thus bought their favor, so that none of them would accuse him of the evil doing; that many bishops beside Paul had indulged themselves in the same things, or had incurred suspicion of it, especially in the matter of the adopted sisters; that although Paul had dismissed one of these, he retained two others with him, blooming in age and eminent in beauty, taking them with him wherever he went, indulging in luxury and surfeiting; that although men around him were groaning and lamenting because of these things, they were so much afraid of his tyranny and power that they did not venture to accuse him; and finally, that all these things might be borne with in the hope of correcting the evil, were it not that he had trifled away the sacred mystery, and paraded his execrable heresy.^{f186}

On account of Paul’s heresy, a council of eighty bishops was assembled at Antioch. Paul was excommunicated, pronounced deposed from the bishopric, and the council on their own authority appointed a successor. Their assumed authority to appoint a successor without consulting the membership of the church of Antioch, caused yet a larger number to take sides with Paul, because such proceeding was decidedly irregular.

At this time Zenobia was queen of the East, and with her Paul was rather a favorite. Under her protection and upon the irregularity of the proceedings

of the council, he openly for four years defied the decrees of the council, and held his place as bishop of Antioch. When Aurelian, in A.D. 270, went to the East to dethrone Zenobia, the bishops appealed to him to enforce their decrees and remove Paul. Aurelian referred the case for decision to the bishops of Rome and Italy. Before this controversy was ended, Dionysius died, and his successor, Felix, decided against Paul. Then according to the decree that Aurelian had already pronounced, Paul was removed from the office and emoluments of the bishopric of Antioch.

We do not know whether the charges brought against Paul were all true or not, as those who made the charges were all his enemies. But whether they were true or not, is not particularly important; because if they were true, it is not to the credit of the bishopric of that time, for they clearly involve other bishops in the most serious moral delinquencies of Paul. On the other hand if the charges were not true, then that a company of eighty bishops should falsely make such charges, is scarcely less to the credit of the bishopric of the time, than the other would be if it were true.

In either case, therefore, it is certain that the statement of Eusebius of the condition of the bishopric in 302, when the Diocletian persecution began, is strictly true. "They were sunk in negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and almost on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity." Also some who appeared to be pastors were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.

The Scripture was fulfilled. There had come a falling away; there was a self-exaltation of the bishopric; and THE TIME WAS COME WHEN THE MAN OF SIN SHOULD BE REVEALED.

CHAPTER 10.

THE RELIGION OF CONSTANTINE.

MUCH research and great effort has been made to discover the time of Constantine's conversion to Christianity. One writer dates it at his accession in 306, another in 312, another in 321, yet another not till 323, and still another about 327. Others put it at his death-bed baptism, while still others insist that he never was a Christian. When he became a Christian, or whether he ever did, is an interesting question even at this time, and we propose to set forth as fully as in our power lies, facts by which any person can decide this question.

We have already given the history of Constantine's accession and onward to the defeat of Maxentius. We have also shown that at the time of his accession to the throne he was a devout worshiper of the sun. We have related how an incursion of the Franks into Gaul drew him from Arles to the Rhine, and gave Maximian an opportunity to usurp the imperial authority in his absence; and how he was called by this usurpation from his war with the Franks to save his own imperial authority. As he was about to return to the Rhine to enter again upon the war with the Franks, he received the intelligence that they had retired from Gaul to their own country: and to express his gratitude — A.D. 308 — he gave public thanks in a celebrated temple of Apollo, probably a Autun (Augustodunum), and presented a magnificent offering to the god." — Neander. ^{f201}

We have also shown how events rapidly culminated in the war between him and Maxentius, and of his attitude toward Christians, as expressed in the Edict of Milan. "Up to this period, all that we know of Constantine's religion would imply that he was outwardly, and even zealously, pagan. In a public oration, his panegyrist extols the magnificence of his offerings to the gods. His victorious presence was not merely expected to restore more than their former splendor to the Gaulish cities ruined by barbaric incursions, but sumptuous temples were to arise at his bidding, to propitiate the deities, particularly Apollo, his tutelary god. The medals struck for these victories are covered with the symbols of paganism." — Milman. ^{f202}

But about the latter part of the year 311 or early in 312, there certainly came such a change in his mind as to lead him to favor Christianity. The influences that caused this change will be more fully set forth hereafter. In this place it is necessary merely to say that there was enmity between him and Galerius, which of itself naturally threw Constantine into opposition to the plans and ambitions of that emperor. Galerius had done all that he could to keep Constantine from escaping from the dominions of Diocletian to those of Constantius. Constantine knew that the purpose of Galerius in this was nothing but evil, if not death, to him. By extraordinary speed he defeated the scheme of Galerius in this, and when he was made emperor in Britain, as we have seen, the purposes of Galerius were almost wholly disconcerted. This, we repeat, naturally made Constantine an opponent of the plans of Galerius. Therefore when Galerius spent his strongest efforts in behalf of the pagan party in the State, Constantine naturally leaned toward the other. In this also he had the example of his humane father, who, although not able to defeat wholly the edicts of persecution, greatly modified their effects. Another thing that influenced him in this direction was because, as he himself said, —

“My father revered the Christian God, and uniformly prospered. while the emperors who worshiped the beathen gods, died a miserable death; therefore, that I may enjoy a happy life and reign I will imitate the example of my father, and join myself to the cause of the Christians, who are growing daily, while the heathen are diminishing.” ^{f203}

And “this low utilitarian consideration weighed heavily in the mind of an the ambitious captain, who looked forward to the highest seat of power within the gift of his age.” — Schaff. ^{f204} It is manifest that the only consideration that operated upon his mind at this time was this utilitarian one, and that whatever favor he felt toward Christians so far was merely as a matter of policy, with the hope that by this he might be aided in his aspirations to the sole rulership of the empire. This is confirmed by another in these words: —

“But to Constantine himself, if at this time Christianity had obtained any hold upon his mind, it was now the Christianity of the warrior, as subsequently it was that of the statesman. It was the military commander who availed himself of the assistance of any tutelar

divinity who might insure success to his daring enterprise.” —
Milman.^{f205}

Such was his attitude toward Christianity before the defeat of Maxentius. Nor was there afterward any material change, either in his profession or his character. In the same manner as the cruel emperors before him, at the defeat of Maxentius, not content with the death of that emperor himself and a large number of his adherents, he executed vengeance also on his infant son. “Utterly devoid of faith in anything else except himself and his own destiny, unyielding in that ambition to exercise dominion, which nerved him for the doubtful war against Maxentius, he regarded both mankind and religion with pity and contempt, and sought to rule men for their good and his own glory, by means of any faith which they might prefer; and hence, as Christianity became more known and popular, he identified himself with it more and more, only in order to foster any agency which seemed to be available in the work of consolidating the warring factions of the empire, and securing the permanency of his throne.” — The Author of Arius the Libyan.

At what time he made the labarum is not certainly known ; but whenever it was, it was simply another instance of his policy in pretending to favor the church party while still retaining his paganism. For when he constructed the labarum, he simply “changed the heathen labarum into a standard of the Christian cross with the Greek monogram of Christ, which he had also put upon the shields of his soldiers.” “On the top of the shaft was a crown composed of gold and precious stones, and containing the monogram of Christ; and just under this crown was a likeness of the emperor and his sons in gold.” — Schaff.^{f206}

That by this emblem Constantine intended to profess to the church party his alliance with them, is evident, yet, he did not propose to forsake his paganism; for the object in placing there the likenesses of himself and sons was that they might be worshiped by the pagan part of his army. This is confirmed in the following words:

“Even in the labarum, if the initiated eyes of the Christian soldierly could discern the sacred of Christ indistinctly glittering above the cross, there appeared, either embossed on the beam below or embroidered on the square purple banner which depended from it, the bust of the emperor and those of his family, to whom the

heathen part of his army might pay their homage of veneration.”

“And so, for the first time, the meek and peaceful Jesus became the God of battle; and the cross, the holy sign of Christian redemption, a banner of bloody strife.” — Milmun.^{f207}

In honor of his triumph over Maxentius, a statue of himself was erected in the Roman forum — A.D. 316. In his right hand was the labarum with the inscription, —

“By virtue of this salutary sign, which is the true symbol of valor, I have preserved and liberated your city from the yoke of tyranny.”
— Euseliu.^{f208}

Afterward a triumphal arch was also built in Rome to commemorate the victory at the Milvian bridge, in which his ambiguous relationship between the two religions is again displayed: —

“The inscription on this arch of Constantine ascribes his victory over the hated tyrant, not only to his master mind, but indefinitely also to the impulse of Deity, by which a Christian would naturally understand the true God, while a heathen, like the orator Nazarius, in his eulogy on Constantine, might take it for the celestial guardian power of the ‘urbs aterna’ [the eternal city]. — Schaff.^{f209}

Again: after the defeat of Maxentius and his triumphal entry into the city of Rome, though he declined to celebrate the pagan rite of going to the Capitol to offer sacrifice to Jupiter and the gods, he restored the pagan temples, and assumed the title of Pontifex Maximus. And when some pagans of Africa brought to him the head of Maxentius, he granted as a reward that the province of Africa should be permitted to establish a priesthood and a worship in honor of the family of Constantine.

We have before related that in 313 jointly with Licinius he issued the Edict of Milan, which “confirmed to each individual of the Roman world the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion.” Shortly after this he openly patronized the Catholic Church, and then the Edict of Milan was reversed in his part of the dominion, “and the sects who dissented from the Catholic Church were afflicted and oppressed.” Soon afterward he exempted the Catholic clergy from all public offices and obligations ; yet in A.D. 317 his coins still bore the pagan symbols. In A.D. 321, to please the bishops of the Catholic Church he issued an edict commanding judges,

townspeople, and mechanics to rest on Sunday. Yet in this also his paganism was still manifest, as the edict required rest on “ the venerable day of the sun,” and “enjoined the observance, or rather forbade the public desecration, of Sunday, not under the name of Sabbatum, or Dies Domini, but under its old astrological and heathen title, Dies Solis, familiar to all his subjects, so that the law was as applicable to the worshippers of Hercules, Apollo, and Mithras, as to the Christians.” — Schaff. ^{f210}

Another considerable authority confirms this fact in the following statement: —

“To fully understand the provisions of this legislation, the peculiar position of Constantine must be taken into consideration. He was not himself free from all remains of heathen superstition. It seems certain that before his conversion he had been particularly devoted to the worship of Apollo, the sun-god.... The problem before him was to legislate for the new faith in such a manner as not to seem entirely inconsistent with his old practices, and not to come in conflict with the prejudices of his pagan subjects. These facts serve to explain the peculiarities of this decree. He names the holy day, not the Lord’s day, but the ‘day of the sun’ the heathen designation, and thus at once seems to identify it with his former Apollo-worship.” — Rev. Geo. Elliott. ^{f211}

Another excellent authority remarks upon this as follows:

“It is the day of sun, which is to be observed by the general veneration. The courts were to be closed, and the noise and tumult of public business and legal litigation were no longer to violate the repose of the sacred day. But the believer in the new paganism, of which the solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple in the sanctity of the first day of the week.” — Milman. ^{f212}

And yet another adds the following pointed testimony: —

“The same tenacious adherence to the ancient god of light has left its trace, even to our own time, on one of the most sacred and universal of Christian institutions. The retention of the old pagan name of Dies Solis or ‘Sunday’ for the weekly Christian festival, is, in great measure, owing to the union of pagan and Christian

sentiment with which the first day of the week was recommended by Constantine to his subjects, pagan and Christian alike, as the ‘venerable day of the sun.’ ...It was his mode of harmonizing the discordant religions of the empire under one common institution.” — Stanley.^{f213}

The next day after issuing this Sunday law, that is, March 8, A.D. 321, he published another edict, in which he “expressly ordains, that whenever lightning should strike the imperial palace or any other public building, the haruspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use.” And by yet another “law of the same year, he declares also the employment of heathen magic, for good ends, as for the prevention or healing of diseases, for the protection of harvests, for the prevention of rain and of hail, to be permitted, and in such expressions, too, as certainly betray a faith in the efficacy of these pretended supernatural means, unless the whole is to be ascribed simply to the legal forms of paganism.” — Neander.^{f214}

Meanwhile Constantine had been drawing closer to the bishops, and bestowing favors on the Catholic Church, the full account of which will be given in the following chapters. By this time, therefore, he could afford to hold the profession of the two religions upon an equal balance. Accordingly, now “his coins bore on the one side the letters of the name of Christ; on the other the figure of the sun-god, and the inscription, ‘Sol invictus’ (the unconquerable sun), as if he could not bear to relinquish the patronage of the bright luminary which represented to him, as to Augustus and to Julian, his own guardian Deity.” — Stanley^{f215}

In A.D. 315 there had been war between Constantine and Licinius. After two battles, a peace was concluded which continued till 323, when, “without any previous injury,” but out of sheer ambition and “a love of power that would brook no rival,” and “at the expense of truth and humanity,” Constantine entered again upon a war with Licinius. On July 3 was fought the battle of Hadrianople, in which Licinius was defeated with a loss of thirty-four thousand men. He retreated to Byzantium, where Constantine besieged him. When Constantine was about to take the city, Licinius deserted it and passed over to Asia. Constantine followed, and another battle was fought at Chrysopolis, where Licinius was again defeated with so great a loss of men that he was compelled to sue for

peace. His wife Constantia, the sister of Constantine, interceded with her brother in favor of her husband, and obtained from him a solemn promise, confirmed by an oath, that if Licinius would resign all claims to the office of emperor, he should be allowed to pass the rest of his life in peace and as became his station. Thesesalonica was appointed as the place of his dwelling, or as it proved, his imprisonment; and it was not long before he was put to death, — A.D. 324, — in violation of the solemn oath of Constantine. The fact that Licinius was past seventy years of age at the time, lent to the transaction, in addition to its character of deliberate perjury, the element of positive cruelty.

The next year A.D. 325, Constantine convened at Nice the first general council of the Catholic Church, presided over its deliberations, and enforced its decrees. As he entered to take his seat as president of the council, he is thus described: —

“There was a brightness in his look and a mingled expression of fierceness and gentleness in his lion-like eye, which well became one who, as Augustus before him, had fancied, and perhaps still fancied, himself to be the favorite of the sun god Apollo.” — Stanley.^{f216}

By this time he had progressed so far in his profession of the Catholic religion that he counted himself a bishop, or rather, a bishop of bishops, though he had never yet been received even into the order of Catechumens, much less had he been initiated into full membership in the church.

The following year — A.D. 326 — Constantine went to Rome to celebrate in that city the twentieth year of his accession to the office of emperor, and while there, in the month of April, and wholly in jealous tyranny, he had his son Crispus murdered. Crispus was his eldest son, who had assisted in his wars, especially with Licinius, and had proved himself an able commander. He commanded the fleet at the siege of Byzantium, and after the battle the names of Constantine and Crispus were united in the joyful acclamations of their Eastern subjects. This excited the jealousy of Constantine, who soon began to slight Crispus, and bestow imperial favors upon his younger son, Constantius, who was but a mere boy. Constantine pretended that Crispus had entered into a conspiracy against him, and October 21, 325, he issued an edict restoring the order of delators, after the manner of Tiberius and Domitian. “By all the allurements of honors and rewards, he invites

informers of every degree to accuse without exception his magistrates or ministers, his friends or his most intimate favorites, protesting, with a solemn asseveration, that he himself will listen to the charge.” — Gibbon ^{f217}

The informers were not long in finding accusations against Crispus and a large number of his friends, and “in the midst of the festival, the unfortunate Crispus was apprehended by order of the emperor, who laid aside the tenderness of a father, without assuming the equity of a judge.... He was sent under a strong guard to Pola, in Istria, where, soon afterwards, he was put to death, either by the hand of the executioners, or by the more gentle operation of poison. The Caesar Licinius, a youth of amiable manners, was involved in the ruin of Crispus: and the stern jealousy of Constantine was unmoved by the prayers and tears of his favorite sister, pleading for the life of a son, whose rank was his only crime, and whose loss she did not long survive.” — Gibbon. ^{f218}

Nor were these the only ones involved in the execution. “The sword of justice or of cruelty, once let loose, raged against those who were suspected as partisans of the dangerous Crispus, or as implicated in the wide-spread conspiracy, till the bold satire of an eminent officer of state did not scruple, in some lines privately circulated, to compare the splendid but bloody times with those of Nero.” — Milman. ^{f219}

Nor yet did he stop here. “This was only the first act of the domestic tragedy: the death of the emperor’s wife Fausta, the partner of twenty years of wedlock, the mother of his three surviving sons, increased the general horror. She was suffocated in a bath which had been heated to an insupportable degree of temperature.” “The tragedy which took place in the family of Constantine betrayed to the surprised and anxious world that, if his outward demeanor showed respect or veneration for Christianity, its milder doctrines had made little impression on the unsoftened paganism of his heart.” — Milman ^{f220}

Shortly after this, Constantine’s mother went to Jerusalem on a pilgrimage to recover the holy places, and to build churches upon them. She carried a letter from Constantine to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, in which he stated that it was always his “first and only object to excite all minds to the observation of the holy law with alacrity and diligence proportioned to the brightness of the manifestation which is thrown by new miracles upon the

truth of the faith, day by day:" and that it was his " most intense desire to erect beautiful edifices" upon that spot which had been consecrated " by the sufferings of our Lord, who thus brought faith to light." ^{f221}

Helena was said to be about eighty years old at this time, and tale was invented, and one hundred years later became a matter of history, that she discovered the tomb in which the Saviour had been buried; that in it were found all three of the crosses that were used on the day of the crucifixion, the nails that were used in the crucifixion of the Saviour, and the tablet which Pilate had caused to be put upon the cross of the Saviour. But nobody could tell which was the true cross. Yet says the fable:

"From this trouble she was shortly relieved by Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, whose faith solved the doubt, for he sought a sign from God and obtained it. The sign was this: A certain woman of the neighborhood, who had been long afflicted with disease, was now just at the that point of death. The bishop therefore ordered that each of the crosses should be applied to the dying woman, believing that she would be healed upon being touched by the precious cross. Nor was he disappointed in his expectation: for the two crosses having been applied which were not the Lord's the woman still continued in a dying state; but when the third, Which was the true cross, touched her, she was immediately healed, and recovered her former strength. In this manner then was the genuine cross discovered. The emperor's mother erected over the place of the sepulcher a magnificent church, and named it New Jerusalem, having built it opposite to that old and deserted city. There she left a portion of the cross, inclosed in a silver case, as a memorial to those who might wish to see it. The other part she sent to the emperor, who, being persuaded that the city would be perfectly secure where that relic should be preserved, privately inclosed it in his own statue, wick stands on a large column of porphyry in the forum called Constantine's at Constantinople. I have written this from report indeed; but almost all the inhabitants of Constantinople affirm that it is true. Moreover, Constantine caused the nails with which Christ's hands were fastened to the cross (for his mother having found these also in the sepulcher had sent them) to be converted into bridle bits and helmet, which he used in his military expeditions." — Socrates. ^{f222}

From this it would seem that by this time he would be ready to stand by the profession of Christianity alone, but such was not the case; for in A.D. 328, when he traced the limits and laid the foundation of his projected new city of Constantinople, he held the same ambiguous course as formerly, and accordingly “issued an imperial edict announcing to the world that Constantine by the command of God had founded the eternal city.” “But however the Deity might have intimated his injunctions to commence the work, or whatever the nature of the invisible guide which, as he declared, thus directed his steps, this vague appeal to the Deity would impress with the same respect all his subjects, and by its impartial ambiguity offend none. In earlier times the pagans would have bowed down in homage before this manifestation of the nameless tutelar deity of the new city; at the present period, they had become familiarized, as it were, with the concentration of Olympus into one Supreme Being. The Christians would, of course, assert the exclusive right of the one true God to the appellation, and attribute to his inspiration and guidance every important act of the Christian emperor.” — Milman.^{f223}

Yet a little later his actions seemed to indicate that he had reverted to paganism alone; for when in A.D. 330 the actual work of building the city was inaugurated, the “ancient ritual of Roman paganism contained a solemn ceremony, which dedicated a new city to the protection of the Deity” (Milman^{f224}), and Sopater, a Neoplatonic heathen, “assisted with his heathen ceremonies at the consecration.” — Stanley.^{f225}

However, in building the city he fully acquitted himself in the estimation of both pagans and Catholics. For while he erected magnificent edifices for the Catholic Church, he also set up the images of the pagan deities “in all the public places of Constantinople. If the inhabitants were not encouraged, at least they were not forbidden, to pay divine honors to the immortal sculptures of Phidias and Praxiteles, which were brought from all quarters to adorn the squares and baths of Byzantium. The whole Roman world contributed to the splendor of Constantinople. The tutelar deities of all the cities of Greece (their influence, of course, much enfeebled by their removal from their local sanctuaries) were assembled, — the Minerva of Lyndus, the Cybele of Mount Dindymus (which was said to have been placed there by the Argonauts), the muses of Helicon, the Amphitrite of Rhodes, the Pan consecrated by united Greece after the defeat of the Persians, the Delphic Tripod. The Diocuri [Castor and Pollux] overlooked the Hippodrome.” — Milman.^{f226}

When in 334 the city was finished, and he would celebrate its completion, “the ceremonial of the dedication was attended by still more dubious circumstances. After a most splendid exhibition of chariot games in the Hippodrome, the emperor moved in a magnificent car through the most public part of the city, encircled by all his guards in the attire of a religious ceremonial, and bearing torches in their hands. The emperor himself held a golden statue of the Fortune of the city in his hands. An imperial edict enacted the annual celebration of this rite. On the birthday of the city, the gilded statue of himself, thus bearing the same golden image of Fortune, was annually to be led through the Hippodrome to the foot of the imperial throne, and to receive the adoration of the reigning emperor.” — Milman.

f227

Yet it seems as though he considered this not enough. When he had besieged Licinius at this place, he had pitched his tent on a certain hill. In the building of the city he chose that spot for the principal forum at one end of which was a statue of Cybele, and at the other the goddess of Fortune, the patroness of the new city. In the center of the forum he planted a column, the pedestal of which was of white marble twenty feet high. Upon this were set, one upon another, ten pieces of “porphyry, each of each measured about ten feet in height and about thirty-three in circumference,” making the pillar in all about one hundred and twenty feet in height. On the top of this pillar, Constantine placed a colossal bronze statue of Apollo, with the figure of his own head upon it, and round about the crown like the rays of the sun were the nails of “the true cross,” which his mother had sent to him from Jerusalem. The full account of this is well given by another, and is of sufficient importance in this connection to be quoted in full: —

“The lingering attachment of Constantine to the favorite superstition of his earlier days may be traced on still better authority. The Grecian worship of Apollo had been exalted into the oriental veneration of the sun, as the visible representative of the Deity and of all the statues that were introduced from different quarters, none were received with greater honor than those of Apollo. In one part of the city stood the Pythian, in another the Sminthian deity. The Delphic Tripod, which, according to Zosimus, contained an image of the god, stood upon the column of three twisted serpents, supposed to represent the mystic Python. ;But on a still loftier, the famous pillar of porphyry, stood an image in

which, if we are to credit modern authority (and the more modern our authority, the less likely is it to have invented so singular a statement), Constantine dared to mingle together the attributes of the sun, of Christ, and of himself. According to one tradition, this pillar was based, as it were, on another superstition. The venerable Palladium itself, surreptitiously conveyed from Rome was buried beneath it, and thus transferred the eternal destiny of the old to the new capital. The pillar, formed of marble and of porphyry, rose to the height of a hundred and twenty feet. The colossal image on the top was that of Apollo, either from Phrygia or from Athens. But the head of Constantine had been substituted for that of the god. The scepter proclaimed the dominion of the world and it held in its hand the globe, emblematic of universal empire. Around the head, instead of rays, were fixed the nails of the true cross. Is this paganism approximating to Christianity or Christianity degenerating into paganism?" — Milman.^{f228}

We are satisfied that the reader will have no difficulty in answering the question which is here propounded. "It is no more certain that he despised and pitied paganism while he was solemnly offering sacrifices to Jupiter, and winning the admiration and love of the Roman world for his imperial piety, than it is certain that he pitied and despised the church of Christ, even while he was manipulating the faith into a sure and reliable support of the empire; in both courses he only played with the world, giving men any religious toy which the greater part might prefer to have, in exchange for the liberty of which he robbed them so plausibly and successfully that they scarcely perceived his theft, and enthusiastically caressed the royal thief." — Author of "Arius the Libyan." It was the same mixture of pagan and apostate Christian wickedness, the origin and progress of which we have seen in the chapter on "The Falling A way."

Nor is the record yet complete. In A.D. 335, in the further exercise of his office of bishop of bishops in the church, Constantine convened the Synod of Tyre to examine further into some questions that were raised in the trinitarian controversy. Yet all this time he was still keeping about him that Sopater who had assisted with the heathen ceremonials at the foundation of Constantinople. Sopater was so openly favored by Constantine that the church party grew jealous and quite alarmed for fear they should lose their emperor altogether.^{f229}

In A.D. 337 Constantine was taken with a serious illness, and being satisfied that he was about to die, he called for an Arian bishop, and was baptized. Then “he was clothed in robes of dazzling whiteness; his couch was covered with white also: in the white robes of baptism, on a white deathbed, he lay, in expectation of his end.... At noon on Whit-Sunday, the 22nd of May, in the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the thirty-first of his reign, he expired.... So passed away the first Christian emperor, the first defender of the faith — the first imperial patron of the papal see, and of the whole Eastern church, — the first founder of the holy places — PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN, ORTHODOX AND HERETICAL, LIBERAL AND FANATICAL, not to be imitated or admired, but much to be remembered, and deeply to be studied.” — Stanley. ^{f230}

His body was inclosed in a coffin of gold and taken in solemn procession to Constantinople, where it lay in state for three months, waiting for his two eldest sons to arrive, the youngest only being present.

And yet the record is not complete. When he was attacked by his last illness he suspected poison, and before he died he gave to the bishop of Nicomedia his will to be handed to his eldest son when he should arrive at Constantinople. The bishop having read it and found its terrible import, put it in the dead emperor’s hand, and left it there until Constantius took it. The purport of the instruction was that he believed he had been poisoned by his brothers and their children, and instructed his sons to avenge his death. “That bequest was obeyed by the massacre of six out of the surviving princes of the imperial family. Two alone escaped.” Stanley. ^{f231}

As neither Christians nor pagans could tell to which religion Constantine belonged while he was alive, and consequently both claimed him, so likewise both claimed him after he was dead: —

“Even after his death both religions vied, as it were, for Constantine. He received with impartial favor the honors of both. The first Christian emperor was defiled by the pagans; in a latter period he was worshiped as a saint by part of the Christian church. On the same medal appears his title of ‘god,’ with the monogram, the sacred symbol of Christianity; in another he is seated in the chariot of the sun, in a car drawn by four horses, with a hand stretched forth from the clouds to raise him to heaven.” — Milman.

Even to this time and to this extent Constantine himself was to blame for his ambiguous position, as he had been all the time he had lived as emperor. He himself had erected a grand church in Constantinople called the Church of the Apostles, which he intended to be his burial place. Further particulars are as follows: —

“He had in fact made choice of this spot in the prospect of his own death, anticipating with extraordinary fervor of faith that his body would share their title with the apostles themselves, and that he should thus even after death become the subject, with them, of the devotions which would be performed to their honor in this place. He accordingly caused twelve coffins to be set up in this church, like sacred pillars in honor and memory of the apostolic number, in the center of which his own was placed, having six of theirs on either side of it.” — Eusebius.^{f233}

And as had been his practice all the way along, he called this church by a name “truly indicating the mixture of pagan and Christian ideas led to its erection, the ‘Heroon.’” — Stanley.^{f234} The word “Heroon” denotes the temple or chapel of a hero.

We have now given the facts simply as we have found them, in regard to Constantine’s religious life. We think no one can have the slightest difficulty in deciding that he never was a Christian in any proper sense of the word. We think all must agree “that his progress in the knowledge of Christianity was not a progress in the practice of its virtues;” that “his love of display and his prodigality, his suspiciousness and his despotism, increased with his power, and that the very brightest period of his reign is stained with gross crimes, which even the spirit of the age and the policy of an absolute monarch cannot excuse.” — Schaff.^{f235}

All of this is confirmed by another in recording the “fact that he was by general consent, a worse prince at the close of his reign than at its beginning, when he was little better than a pagan.” — Stanley.^{f236}

The synopsis of the whole question as to what was the religion of Constantine, can be no better expressed than it has already been by another in the following words: —

“Constantine adopted Christianity first as a superstition, and put it by the side of his heathen superstition, till finally in his conviction

the Christian vanquished the pagan, though without itself developing into a pure and enlightened faith.” — Schaff.^{f237}

And the final analysis, the conclusion of the whole matter, the sum of all that has been, or that can be, said is that in Constantine the elements of the actual pagan and the apostate Christian were so perfectly mixed as to produce THE TYPICAL PAPIST OF ALL TIMES.

CHAPTER 11.

CONSTANTINE AND THE BISHOPS.

FROM the reading of Chapter VI, it will be remembered that Diocletian had no sooner abdicated than the system of orderly government which he had established and which he hoped would continue, fell to precess, and confusion once more ruled in the affairs of state. So far as the government was concerned, the army was now, as it had been for hundreds of years, the source of power; but among the four aspiring emperors not only the military force, but the territory of the empire, was almost equally divided. So nearly equal was this division that not one of the emperors had any material advantage over another in this respect. Yet it was the ambition of each one to become sole emperor. It therefore became a matter of vital concern to each one to obtain whatever power he might and yet there was no further resource to be hoped for from the side of the empire. Thus stood matters among the emperors.

How was it with the church? We insert again the quotation made from Eusebius concerning the state of things in the churches before the persecution by Diocletian: —

“When by reason of excessive liberty, we sunk into negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and we were almost, as it were on the point of taking up arms against each other. and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity, then the divine judgment, which usually proceeds with a lenient hand, whilst the multitudes were yet crowding into the church, with gentle and mild visitations began to afflict its episcopacy; the persecution having begun with those brethren that were in the army. But, as if destitute of all sensibility, we were not prompt in measures to appease and propitiate the Deity; some, indeed, like atheists, regarding our situation as unheeded and unobserved by a providence, we added one wickedness and misery to another. But some that appeared to be our pastors, deserting the law of piety, were inflamed against each

other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.”

The persecution had caused all these divisions and disputes to be laid aside. Every other interest was forgotten in the one all-absorbing question of the rights of conscience against pagan despotism. Thus there was created at least an outward unity among all the sects of whatever name, professing the Christian religion in any form. Thus was molded a compact power which permeated every part of the empire, and which was at the same time estranged from every material interest of the empire as it then stood. Here was power which if it could be secured and used, would assure success to him who would gain it, as certainly as he could make the alliance. This condition of affairs was clearly discerned at the time. Constantine “understood the signs of the times and acted accordingly.”

“To Constantine, who had fled from the treacherous custody of Galerius, it naturally occurred that if he should ally himself to the Christian party, conspicuous advantages must forthwith accrue to him. It would give him in every corner of the empire men and women ready to encounter fire and sword; it would give him partisans not only animated by the traditions of their fathers, but — for human nature will even in the religious assert itself — demanding retribution for the horrible barbarities and injustice that had been inflicted on themselves; it would give him, and this was the most important of all, unwavering adherents in every legion in the army. He took his course. The events of war crowned him with success. He could not be otherwise than outwardly true to those who had given him power, and who continued to maintain him on the throne.” — Draper. ^{f241}

Constantine was not the only one who saw this opportunity. Maximin likewise detected it, but was distrusted by the church party. Constantine being a much more accomplished politician, succeeded. In addition to the advantages which offered themselves in this asserted unity of the churches, there was a movement among the bishops, which made it an additional incentive to Constantine to form the alliance which he did with the church. Although it is true that all the differences and disputes and strifes among the bishops and sects had been forgotten in the supreme conflict between paganism and freedom of thought, there is one thing mentioned by

Eusebius that still remained. That was the ambition of the bishops “to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.” Nor was it alone government in the church which they were anxious to assert; but government in the State as well, to be used in the interests of the church. For, “There had in fact arisen in the church... a false theocratical theory, originating, not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments.” — Neander. ^{f242}

This theocratical theory of the bishops is the key to the whole history of Constantine and the church of his time, and through all the dreary period that followed. It led the bishops into the wildest extravagance in their worship of the imperial influence, and coincided precisely with Constantine’s idea of an absolute monarchy.

The idea of the theocracy that the bishops hoped to establish appears more clearly and fully in Eusebius’s “Life of Constantine” than in any other one production of the time. There the whole scheme appears just as they had created it, and as it was applied in the history of the time. The church was a second Israel in Egyptian bondage. Maxentius was a second Pharaoh, Constantine was a second Moses. As the original Moses had grown up in the palace of the Pharaohs, so likewise this new Moses had grown up in the very society of the new Pharaohs. Thus runs the story: —

“Ancient history relates that a cruel race of tyrants oppressed the Hebrew nation; and the God who graciously regarded them in their affliction, provided that the prophet Moses, who was then an infant, should be brought up in the very palaces and bosoms of the oppressors, and instructed in all the wisdom they possessed. And when he had arrived at the age of manhood, and the time was come for divine justice to avenge the wrongs of the afflicted people, then the prophet of God, in obedience to the will of a more powerful Lord, forsook the royal household, and estranging himself in word and deed from those by whom he had been brought up. Openly preferred the society of his true brethren and kinsfolk. And in due time God exalted him to be the leader of the whole nation; and, after delivering the Hebrews from the bondage of their enemies, inflicted divine vengeance through his means upon the tyrant race. This ancient story, though regarded by too many as fabulous, has reached the ears of all. But now the same God has given to us to be eye-witnesses of miracles more wonderful than fables, and, from

their recent appearance, more authentic than any report. For the tyrants of our day have ventured to war against the supreme God, and have sorely afflicted his church. And in the midst of these, Constantine, who was shortly to become their destroyer, but at that time of tender age, and blooming with the dawn of early youth, dwelt, as God's servant Moses had done, in the very home of the tyrants. Young, however, as he was, he shared not in the pursuits of the impious: for from that early period his noble nature (under the leading of the Divine Spirit), inclined him to a life of piety and acceptable service to God." — Eusebius. ^{f243}

We have related how Galerius sought to prevent Constantine's joining his father in Britain; and how Constantine succeeded in eluding his vigilance. By the theocratical bishops this was made to be the flight of the new Moses from the wrath of the new Pharaohs. Thus the story continues: —

"The emperors then in power, who observed his manly and vigorous figure and superior mind with feelings of jealousy and fear,... carefully watched for an opportunity of inflicting some brand of disgrace on his character. But he, being aware of their designs (the details of which, through the providence of God, were more than once laid open to his view), sought safety in flight, and in this respect his conduct still affords a parallel to that of the great prophet Moses." — Eusebius. ^{f244}

As the original Moses, without the interposition of any human agency, had been called to the work to which the Lord had appointed him, so the theocratical bishops had the new Moses likewise appointed directly by the authority of God: —

"Thus then, the God of all, the supreme Governor of the world, by his own will, appointed Constantine, the descendant of so renowned a parent, to be prince and sovereign: so that, while others have been raised to this distinction by the election of their fellow-men, he is the only one to whose elevation no mortal may boast of having contributed." — Eusebius. ^{f245}

Eusebius knew as well as any other man in the empire that the legions in Britain had proclaimed Constantine emperor, precisely as the armies had been doing in like instances for more than a hundred years. He knew full well that Constantine held his title to the imperial power by the same tenure

precisely as had all the emperors before him from the accession of Claudius. In short, when the bishop Eusebius wrote this statement, he knew that he was writing a downright lie.

When Constantine marched against Maxentius, it was the new Moses on his way to deliver Israel. When the army of Maxentius was defeated and multitudes were drowned in the river, it was the Red Sea swallowing up the hosts of Pharaoh. When Maxentius was crowded off the bridge and by the weight of his armor sank instantly to the bottom of the river, it was the new Pharaoh and "the horse and his rider" being thrown into the sea and sinking to the bottom like a stone. Then was Israel delivered, and a song of deliverance was sung by the new Israel as by the original Israel at their deliverance. Thus the story continues: —

"And now those miracles recorded in Holy Writ, which God of old wrought against the ungodly (discredited by most as fables, yet believed by the faithful), did he in very deed confirm to all, alike believers and unbelievers, who were eye-witnesses to the wonders I am about to relate. For as once in the days of Moses and the Hebrew nation, who were worshipers of God, he cast Pharaoh's chariots and his host into the waves, and drowned his chosen chariot-captains the Red Sea, — so at this time did Maxentius, and the soldiers and guards with him, sink to the bottom as a stone, when, in his flight before the divinely aided forces of Constantine, he essayed to cross the river which lay in his way, over which he had made a strong bridge of boats, and had framed an engine of destruction, really against himself, but in the hope of ensnaring thereby him who was beloved-of God. For his God stood by the one to protect him, while the other, destitute of his aid, proved to be the miserable contriver of these secret devices to his own ruin. So that one might well say, "He made a pit, and digged it, and shall fall into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his iniquity shall come down upon his own pate." Thus, in the present instance, under divine direction, the machine erected on the bridge, with the ambuscade concealed therein, giving way unexpectedly before the appointed time, the passage began to sink down, and the boats with the men in them went bodily to the bottom. At first the wretch himself, then his armed attendants and guards, even as the sacred oracles had before described, 'sank as lead in the mighty waters.' So that they who thus obtained victory

from God might well, if not in the same words, yet in fact in the same spirit as the people of his great servant Moses, sing and speak as they did concerning the impious tyrant of old: ‘Let us sing unto the Lord, for he has been glorified exceedingly: the horse and his rider has he thrown into the sea. He is become my helper and my shield unto salvation.’ And again, ‘Who is like to thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, marvelous in praises, in praises, doing wonders?’” — Eusebius.^{f246}

Such adulation was not without response on the part of Constantine. He united himself closely with the bishops, of whom Eusebius was but one, and, in his turn, flattered them: —

“The emperor was also accustomed personally to invite the society of God’s ministers, whom he distinguished with the highest possible respect and honor, treating them in every sense as persons consecrated to the service of God. Accordingly, they were admitted to his table, though mean in their attire and outward appearance; yet not so in his estimation, since he judged not of their exterior as seen by the vulgar eye, but thought he discerned in them somewhat of the character of God himself.” — Eusebius.^{f247}

This worked charmingly. Throughout the empire the courtly bishops worked in Constantine’s interest; and as Licinius only now remained between Constantine and his longed-for position as sole emperor and absolute ruler, the bishops and their political church-followers prayed against Licinius and for Constantine. As these “wordly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about and entangle themselves in worldly concerns” (Neander^{f248}), Licinius attempted to check it. To stop their meddling with the political affairs of his dominions, he forbade the bishops to assemble together or to pass from their own dioceses to others. He enacted that women should be instructed only by women; that in their assemblies the men and the women should sit separate; and commanded that they of Nicomedia should meet outside the city, as the open air was more healthful for such large assemblies.

This only tended to make the bishops more active, as the acts of Licinius could be counted as persecution. Licinius next went so far as to remove from all public office whoever would not sacrifice to the gods, and the line

was quickly drawn once more in his dominion in favor of paganism. This caused Constantine's party to put on a bolder face, and they not only prayed for Constantine against Licinius, but they began to invent visions in which they pretended to see the "legions of Constantine marching victoriously through the streets at midday." — Neander. ^{f249}

These enactments on the part of Licinius furnished the new Moses with an opportunity to conquer the heathen in the wilderness, and to go on to the possession of the promised land and the full establishment of the new theocracy. War was declared, and Constantine, with the labarum at the head of his army, took up his march toward the dominions of Licinius.

Another step was now taken in furtherance of the theocratical idea, and in imitation of the original Moses. It will be remembered that, after the passage of the Red Sea, Moses erected a tabernacle, and pitched it afar off from the camp, where he went to consult the Lord and to receive what the Lord had to give in commandment to Israel. Constantine, to sustain his part in this scheme of a new theocracy, and as far as possible to conform to the theocratical plans of the bishops, likewise erected a tabernacle, and pitched it a considerable distance from his camp. To this tabernacle he would repair and pretend to have visions and communications from the Lord, and to receive directions in regard to his expected battles with Licinius. The original account is as follows: —

"In this manner Licinius gave himself up to these impieties, and rushed blindly towards the gulf of destruction. But as soon as the emperor was aware that he must meet his enemies in a second battle, he applied himself in earnestness to the worship of his Saviour. He pitched the tabernacle of the cross outside and at a distance from his camp, and there passed his time in pure and holy seclusion, and in offering up prayers to God; following thus the example of his ancient prophet, of whom the sacred oracles testify that he pitched the tabernacle without the camp. He was attended only by a few, of whose faith and piety, as well as affection to his person, he was well assured. And this custom he continued to observe whenever he meditated an engagement with the enemy. For he was deliberate in his measures, the better to insure safety, and desired in everything to be directed by divine counsel. And since his prayers ascended with fervor and earnestness to God, he was always honored with a manifestation of his presence. And then, as if

moved by a divine impulse, he would rush from the tabernacle, and suddenly give orders to his army to move at once without delay, and on the instant to draw their swords. On this they would immediately commence the attack, with great and general slaughter, so as with incredible celerity to secure the victory, and raise trophies in token of the overthrow of their enemies.” — Eusebius.
 f250

He soon carried this matter somewhat farther, and provided a tabernacle in each legion, with attendant priests and deacons, and also another which was constructed in the form of a church, “so that in case he or his army might be led into the desert, they might have a sacred edifice in which to praise and worship God, and participate in the mysteries. Priests and deacons followed the tent for the purpose of officiating therein, according to the law and regulations of the church.” — Sozomen. f251

Such was the original establishment of state chaplaincies. And it is but proper to remark that the system, wherever copied, has always been worthy of the original imposture.

The outcome of the war between Constantine and Licinius we have already related; also his murder of Licinius. And when, in violation of his solemn oath to his sister Constantine, Constantine caused Licinius to be executed, the courtier-bishop justified the wicked transaction as being the lawful execution of the will of God upon the enemy of God. Thus he speaks: —

“He then proceeded to deal with this adversary of God and his followers according to the laws of war, and consign them to the fate which their crimes deserved. Accordingly the tyrant himself [Licinius] and they whose counsels had supported him in his impiety, were together subjected to the just punishment of death. After this, those who had so lately been deceived by their vain confidence in false deities, acknowledged with unfeigned sincerity the God of Constantine, and openly professed their belief in him as the true and only God.” — Eusebius. f252

When Constantine went to take his seat as presiding officer in the Council of Nice, his theocratical flatterers pretended to be dazzled by his splendor, as though an angel of God had descended straight from heaven, and he who sat at Constantine’s right hand that day, thus testifies: —

“And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the emperor’s entrance, at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly messenger of God.” — Eusebius. ^{f253}

Constantine, to sustain his part in the farce, declared openly in the council that “the crimes of priests ought not to be made known to the multitude, lest they should become an occasion of offense or of sin;” and that if he should detect “a bishop in the very act of committing adultery,” he would throw “his imperial robe over the unlawful deed, lest any should witness the scene,” and be injured by the bad example.” Theodoret. ^{f254} And when the council was closed and the creed for which they had come together was established, he sent a letter to the “Catholic Church of the Alexandrians,” in which he announced that the conclusions reached by the council were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and could be none other than the divine will concerning the doctrine of God.

After the council was over, he gave a banquet in honor of the twentieth year of his reign, to which he invited the bishops and clergy who had attended the council. The bishops responded by pretending that it seemed to be the very likeness of the kingdom of Christ itself. The description is as follows: —

“The emperor himself invited and feasted with those ministers of God whom he had reconciled, and thus offered as it were through them a suitable sacrifice to God. Not one of the bishops was wanting at the imperial banquet, the circumstances of which were splendid beyond description. Detachments of the body guard and other troops surrounded the entrance of the palace with drawn swords, and through the midst of these the men of God proceeded without fear into the innermost of the imperial apartments, in which some were the emperor’s own companions at table, while others reclined on couches arranged on either side. One might have thought that a picture of Christ’s kingdom was thus shadowed forth, and that the scene was less like reality than a dream.” — Eusebius. ^{f255}

At the banquet “the emperor himself presided, and as the feast went on, called to himself one bishop after another, and loaded each with gifts in proportion to his deserts.” This so delighted the bishops that one of them — James of Nisibis, a member of that monkish tribe who habitually lived

on grass, browsing like oxen, was wrought up to such a height that he declared he saw angels standing round the emperor. Constantine, not to be outdone, saw angels standing around James, and pronounced him one of the three pillars of the world. He said, “There are three pillars of the world; Antony in Egypt, Nicolas of Myra, James in Assyria.”^{f256}

Another instance of this mutual cajolery is given concerning Eusebius and the emperor as follows: —

“One act, however, I must by no means omit to record, which this admirable prince performed in my own presence. On one occasion, emboldened by the confident assurance I entertained of his piety, I had begged permission to pronounce a discourse on the subject of our Saviour’s sepulcher in his hearing. With this request he most readily complied, and in the midst of a large number of auditors, in the interior of the palace itself, he stood and listened with the rest. I entreated him (but in vain) to seat himself on the imperial throne which stood near: he continued with fixed attention to weigh the topics of my discourse, and gave his own testimony to the truth of the theological doctrines it contained. After some time had passed, the oration being of considerable length, I was myself desirous of concluding; but this he would not permit, and exhorted me to proceed to the very end. On my again entreating him to sit, he in his turn admonished me to desist, saying it was not right to listen in a careless manner to the discussion of doctrines relating to God; and again, that this posture was good and profitable to himself, since it argued a becoming reverence to stand while listening to sacred truths. Having, a therefore concluded my discourse. I returned home, and resumed my usual occupations.” — Eusebius.^{f257}

Constantine himself occasionally appeared in the role of preacher also. “On these occasions a general invitation was issued, and thousands of people went to the palace to hear an emperor turned preacher” (Stanley^{f258}; they were ready at the strong points to respond with loud applause and cheering. At times he would attack his courtiers for their rapacity and worldliness generally, and they, understanding him perfectly, would cheer him loudly for his preaching, and go on in the same old way imitating his actions.

Again: when his mother sent the nails of the true cross to him from Jerusalem with the instruction that some of them should be used as bridle bits for his war-horse, it was counted a further evidence that the kingdom of God was come; for it was made to be the fulfillment of that which “Zachariah the prophet predicted, ‘that what is upon the bridles of the horses shall be holiness unto the Lord Almighty,’” — Theodoret.^{f259} And when he appointed his sons and nephews as Caesars to a share in the governmental authority, this was made to be a fulfillment of the prophecy of ~~2XNT~~ Daniel 8:17, “The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.!”

Yet more than this: Eusebius actually argued that the emperor’s dining hall might be the New Jerusalem described in the book of Revelation.^{f260} And at the celebration of the thirtieth year of his reign, another of the bishops was so carried away with the imperial honors conferred upon him, that he went so far as to declare that Constantine had been constituted by God to rule over all in the present world, and was destined also by the Lord to reign with the Son of God in the world to come. This, it seems, was rather too much even for Constantine, and he exhorted the gushing bishop not to use such language any more; but instead to pray for him that he might be accounted worthy to be a servant of God, rather than joint ruler, in the world to come. — Eusebius.^{f261}

But after he was dead, and therefore unable to put any check upon the extravagance of their adulation, Eusebius pretended to hesitate as to whether it would not be committing gross sacrilege to attempt to write his life. However, he finally concluded to venture upon it. Some of his statements we have already given; but there are a few more that should be reproduced in this connection. Referring to Constantine’s lying in state so long before his sons assumed the imperial authority, he says: —

“No mortal had ever, like this blessed prince, continued to reign even after his death, and to receive the same homage as during his life: he only, of all who have ever lived, obtained this reward from God: a suitable reward, since he alone of all sovereigns had in all his actions honored the supreme God and his Christ, and God himself accordingly was pleased that even his mortal remains should still retain imperial authority among men.”^{f262}

This was not enough, however. It must needs be that God should set him forth as the pattern of the human race: —

“And God himself, whom Constantine worshiped, has confirmed this truth by the clearest manifestations of his will, being present to aid him at the commencement, during the course, and at the end of his reign, and holding him up the human race as an exemplary pattern of godliness.”^{f263}

Next, he seeks some object worthy to be a standard of comparison for “this marvelous man.” But he is unable to find any such thing or person but the Saviour himself Therefore he declares: —

“We cannot compare him with that bird of Egypt, the only one, as they say, of its kind, which dies, self-sacrificed, in the midst of aromatic perfumes, and, rising from its own ashes, with new life soars aloft in the same form which it had before. Rather did he resemble his Saviour, who, as the sown corn which is multiplied from a single grain, had yielded abundant increase through the blessing of God, and had over-spread the world with his fruit. Even so did our thrice blessed prince become multiplied, as it were, through the succession of his sons. His statue was erected along with theirs in every province, and the name of Constantine was owned and honored even after the close of his mortal life.”^{f264}

But even this does not satisfy the aspirations of the episcopal adulator. The task is now become one of such grandeur as to transcend all his powers; he stops amazed, and in impotence resigns it all to Christ, who only, he professes, is worthy to do the subject justice: —

“For to whatever quarter I direct my view, whether to the east, or to the west, or over the whole world, or toward heaven itself, I see the blessed emperor everywhere present;... and I see him still living and powerful, and governing the general interests of mankind more completely than ever before, being multiplied as it were by the succession of his children to the imperial power....

“And I am indeed amazed when I consider that he who was but lately visible and present with us in his mortal body, is still, even after death, when the natural thought disclaims all superfluous distinctions as unsuitable, most marvelously endowed with the same

imperial dwellings, and honors, and praises, as heretofore. But further, when I raise my thoughts even to the arch of heaven, and there contemplate his thrice blessed soul in communion with God himself, freed from every mortal and earthly vesture, and shining in a refulgent robe of light; and when I perceive that it is no more connected with the fleeting periods and occupations of mortal life, but honored with an ever-blooming crown, and an immortality of endless and blessed existence; I stand as it were entranced and deprived of all power of utterance: and so, while I condemn my own weakness, and impose silence on myself, I resign the task of speaking his praises worthily to one who is better able, even to him who alone has power (being the immortal God — the Word) to confirm the truth of his own sayings.”^{f265}

All this with much more to the same purpose is set forth by that bishop who above all others is entitled “one of the best among the bishops of Constantine’s court,” and the one who “cannot be reckoned among the number of the ordinary court bishops of his period.” — Neander.^{f266}

By the plain, unbiased facts of history, Constantine stands before the world as a confirmed and constant hypocrite, a perjurer, and a many-times murderer. And yet this bishop, knowing all this, hesitates not to declare him the special favorite of God; to liken him to Jesus Christ; to make God indorse him to the human race as an example of godliness; and to exalt him so high that no one but “the immortal God” can worthily speak his praises!

When one of the best of the bishops of his court, one who was familiar with the whole course of his evil life, could see in the life and actions of such a man as this, a Moses, and angels, and the New Jerusalem, and the kingdom of God, and even the Lord Christ — when in such a life, all this could be seen by one of the best of the bishops, we can only wonderingly inquire what could not be seen there by the worst of the bishops!

Can any one wonder, or can any reasonable person dispute, that from a mixture composed of such bishops and such a character, there should come the mystery of iniquity in all its hideous enormity?

NOTE ON CONSTANTINE’S VISION OF THE CROSS.

It will be observed that in this account of Constantine nothing has been said about his “vision of the cross,” of which so much has been said by

almost every other writer who has gone over this ground. For this there are two main reasons. First, There is no point in the narrative where it could have been introduced, even though it were true. Second, The whole story is so manifestly a lie that it is unworthy of serious notice in any narrative that makes any pretensions to truth or soberness.

There is no point at which such an account could be inserted, because nobody ever heard of it until “long after” it was said to have occurred; and then it was made known by Constantine himself to Eusebius only, and was never made a matter of record until after Constantine’s death.

These things of themselves would go far to discredit the story; but when it is borne in mind that the only record that was even then made of it was in Eusebius’s “Life of Constantine,” the character of which is quite clearly seen in the extracts which we have made from it in the chapter, the story may be entirely discredited. Eusebius’s words are as follows: —

“While he was thus praying with fervent entreaty, a most marvelous sign appeared to him from heaven, the account of which it might have been difficult to receive with credit, had it been related by any other person. But since the victorious emperor himself long afterwards declared it to the writer of this history, when he was honored with his acquaintance and society, and confirmed his statement by an oath, who could hesitate to accredit the relation, especially since the testimony of after-time has established its truth?” ^{f267}

It will be seen at once that this account is of the same nature as that of Eusebius’s “Life of Constantine” throughout. It is of the same piece with that by which” no mortal was allowed to contribute to the elevation of Constantine.” If it should be pleaded that Constantine confirmed his statement by an oath, the answer is that this is no evidence of the truth of the statement. “That the emperor attested it on oath, as the historian tells us, is indeed no additional guarantee for the emperor’s veracity.” — Stanley. ^{f268}

He gave his oath to his sister as a pledge for the life of her husband, and shortly had him killed. In short, when Constantine confirmed a statement by an oath, this was about the best evidence that he could give that the statement was a lie. This is the impression clearly conveyed by Stanley’s narrative as may be seen by a comparison of Lecture iii, par. iii; Lecture iv,

par. 9; Lecture 6, par. 10, and is sustained by the evidence of Constantine's whole imperial course.

In addition to this, there is the fact that Eusebius himself only credited the story because it came from Constantine, and because it was established "by the testimony of after-time," in which testimony he was ever ready to see the most wonderful evidence of God's special regard for Constantine; and the further fact that it was one of the principles of Eusebius that "it may be lawful and fitting to use falsehood as a medicine, for the advantage of those who require such a method," ^{f269} which principle is fully illustrated in his dealings with Constantine.

When all these things, and many others which might be mentioned, are fairly considered, they combine to make the story of Constantine's vision of the cross, utterly unworthy of the slightest credit, or any place, in any sober or exact history. Therefore I do, and all others ought to, fully concur in the opinion that this "flattering fable" "can claim no place among the authentic records of history; and by writers whose only object is truth, it may very safely be consigned to contempt and oblivion." — Waddington.

^{f270}

CHAPTER 12.

THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

IF the mutual flattery of Constantine and the bishops had concerned only themselves, it would have been a matter of very slight importance indeed; but this was not so. Each side represented an important interest.

Constantine merely represented the State, and the bishops the church; and their mutual flattery was only the covering of a deep laid and far reaching scheme which each party was determined to work to the utmost, for its own interests. "It was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology." — Draper.^{f271} Consequently, in their mutual toadyism were involved the interests of both the Church and the State, and the welfare of human society for ages to come.

Therefore, "To the reign of Constantine the Great must be referred the commencement of those dark and dismal times which oppressed Europe for a thousand years. It is the true close of the Roman empire, the beginning of the Greek. The transition from one to the other is emphatically and abruptly marked by a new metropolis, a new religion, a new code, and, above all, a new policy. An ambitious man had attained to imperial power by personating the interests of a rapidly growing party. The unavoidable consequences were a union between the Church and the State, a diverting of the dangerous classes from civil to ecclesiastical paths, and the decay and materialization of religion." — Draper.^{f272}

To set forth the true account of the seed that was sown in the workings of this mutual intrigue, and to indicate certain inevitable fruits thereof, must now employ our thoughts. As we are to consider acts which were very far-reaching, and trace their consequences, we shall follow to its logical results each special act as it occurs, before noticing the next one.

When the alliance was formed between Constantine and what was represented to him as Christianity, it was with the idea on his part that this religion formed a united body throughout the empire. As has been shown, this was true in a certain sense, because the persecution as carried on by Galerius under the edicts of Diocletian, was against Christianity as a profession, without any distinction whatever as to its phases, and this

caused all the different sects to stand together as one in defense of the principles that were common to all. Therefore the essential unity of all the professions of Christianity he supposed to be a fact; and from all his actions and writings afterward it is certain that representations had been made to him by the bishops in a stronger measure than was true, and in an infinitely stronger measure than he found it in practice to be.

As has also been shown, the alliance with Christianity on his part was wholly political, and merely a part of the political machinery by which he designed to bring together again the divided elements of the empire into one harmonious whole, as contemplated by Diocletian. It being represented to him by the bishops who met him in Gaul in A.D. 311, that Christianity was a united body which, if he would support it, would in turn be a powerful support to him, he accepted their representations as the truth, and formed the alliance solely as a part of his political designs, and to help him to forward his declared "mission to unite the world under one head."

But an apparent unity upon the grand principles common to all sects of Christianity, created by a defense of the rights of Christians to believe and to worship according to the dictates of their own conscience, and a real unity which would stand together in Christian brotherhood under the blandishments of imperial favor, were two very different things. It was easy enough for all the sects in which Christianity claimed at that time to be represented, to stand together against an effort of the imperial power to crush out of existence the very name, as well as the right to profess it. It was not so easy for these same denominations to stand together as one, representing the charity and unifying influence of Christianity, when imperial support, imperial Influence, and imperial power, were the prizes to be gained.

Therefore, although the alliance was formed with what was supposed to be Christianity as a whole, without any respect to internal divisions, it was very soon discovered that each particular faction of the Christian profession was ambitious to be recognized as the one in which, above all others, Christianity was most certainly represented. The bishops were ready and willing to represent to Constantine that Christianity was one. They did so represent it to him. And although he entered the alliance with that understanding, the alliance had no sooner been well formed than it devolved upon him to decide among the conflicting factions and divisions just where that one was to be found.

The Edict of Milan ordered that the church property which had been confiscated by the edicts of Diocletian, should be restored to “the whole body of Christians,” without any distinction as to particular sects or names. Thus runs that part of the edict: —

“And this we further decree, with respect to the Christians, that the places in which they were formerly accustomed to assemble, concerning which also we formerly wrote to your fidelity, in a different form, that if any persons have purchased these, either from our treasury, or from any other one, these shall restore them to the Christians, without money and without demanding any price, without any superadded value or augmentation, without delay or hesitancy. And if any have happened to receive these places as presents, that they shall restore them as soon as possible to the Christians, so that if either those that purchased or those that received them as presents, have anything to request of our munificence, they may go to the provincial governor, as the judge; that provision may also be made for them by our clemency. All which it will be necessary to be delivered up to the body of Christians, by your care, without any delay.

“And since the Christians themselves are known to have had not only those places where they were accustomed to meet, but other places also, belonging not to individuals among them, but to the right of the whole body of Christians, you will also command all these, by virtue of the law before mentioned, without any hesitancy, to be restored to these same Christians, that is, to their body, and to each conventicle respectively. The aforesaid consideration, to wit, being observed; namely, that they who as we have said restore them without valuation and price, may expect their indemnity from our munificence and liberality. In all which it will be incumbent on you, to exhibit your exertions as much as possible to the aforesaid body of Christians, that our orders may be most speedily accomplished, that likewise in this provision may be made by our clemency, for the preservation of the common and public tranquillity. For by these means, as before said, the divine favor with regard to us, which we have already experienced in many affairs, will continue firm and permanent at all times.

“But that the purpose of this our ordinance and liberality may be extended to the knowledge of all, it is expected that these things written by us, should be proposed and published to the knowledge of all. That this act of our liberality and kindness may remain unknown to none.” ^{†273}

This was proper enough in itself. But Constantine and the bishops had formed an alliance for political purposes. The bishops had lent to Constantine their support, the fruit of which he was enjoying; and now they demanded that the expected return should be rendered. Accordingly, the restoration of the property of the Christians, under the Edict of Milan, had no sooner begun, than the contentions which had been raised before the late persecution, between the church of Rome and the churches of Africa, were not only made to assume new and political significance, but were made an issue upon which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of the Catholic Church. As the rule had already been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics, and not Christians, it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such could be partakers of the benefits of the edict restoring property to the Christians. The Catholic Church disputed the right of heretics to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians. This forced an imperial decision upon the question as to who were Christians. The dispute was raised in Africa. Anulinus was proconsul in that province. To settle this question, Constantine issued the following edict: —

“Hail, our most esteemed Anulinus: This is the course of our benevolence; that we wish those things that belong justly to others, should not only remain unmolested, but should also, when necessary, be restored, most esteemed Anulinus. Whence it is our will, that when thou shalt this epistle, if any of those things belonging to the Catholic Church of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by the decurions, or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches. Since we have previously determined, that whatsoever these same churches before possessed, shall be restored to their right when therefore, your fidelity has understood this decree of our orders to be most evident and plain, make all haste to restore, as soon as possible, all that belongs to the churches, whether gardens or houses, or anything else, that we may learn

thou hast attended to, and most carefully observed, this our decree.
Farewell most esteemed and beloved Anulinus.”^{f274}

By this it was made evident that the imperial favors were only for the Catholic Church. Nor was it enough that Constantine should decide that all his favors were for the Catholic Church; he must next decidewhich was the Catholic Church. This was brought about by a division which was created in the church at Carthage, having its origin in the late persecution.

The edict issued by Diocletian had commanded the magistrates everywhere to compel the Christians to deliver up the Scriptures. Some Christians did so; others refused and suffered all kinds of punishments rather than to do so. When Constantine formed his alliance with the bishops, Mensurius was bishop of Carthage, and some of his enemies had falsely accused him of being one of those who had delivered up the Scriptures rather than to suffer. They were supported by a certain Donatus, bishop of a city in Numidia, and they separated themselves from communion with Mensurius. When Mensurius died, as the “primacy of the African church was the object of ambition to these two parties” (Milman^{f275}), and as this primacy carried with it imperial patronage, there were several candidates. A certain Caecilianus was elected, however, “in spite of the cabals and intrigues of Botrus and Caelesius, two chief presbyters who aspired to that dignity.” — Bower.^{f276}

Botrus and Caelesius were now joined by Donatus and his party, and these all were further joined and supported by a certain Lucilla, a woman of great qualities, wealth, and interest, and an avowed enemy to Caecilianus. This faction gathered together about seventy of the bishops of Numidia for the purpose of deposing Caecilianus as one having been illegally chosen. When they came together at Carthage, they found that the great majority of the people were in favor of Caecilianus; but they went ahead, nevertheless. They summoned him to the council. He refused to go, and it was well that he did so, because one of them had already said of him, “If he comes among us, instead of laying our hands on him by way of ordination, we ought to knock out his brains by way of penance.” — Bower.^{f277} A council composed of men of this character, it is easy to believe, were readily susceptible to whatever influence might be brought to bear upon them to bring them to a decision. Lucilla, by the free use of money, succeeded in persuading them to declare the election of Caecilianus void, and the bishopric of Carthage vacant. They pronounced him and all who held with

him separated from their communion, and proceeded to elect and ordain a certain Majorinus, who had formerly been one of Lucilla's servants, but was now a reader in the church.

Thus stood matters in the church in Africa when in March, A.D. 313, Constantine sent to the proconsul Anulinus the following edict: —

“Health to thee, most esteemed Anulinus. As it appears from many circumstances that when the religion was despised, in which the highest reverence of the heavenly Majesty is observed, that our public affairs were beset with great dangers, and dangers, and that this religion, when legally adopted and observed, afforded the greatest prosperity to the Roman name and distinguished felicity to all men, as it has been granted by the divine beneficence, we have resolved that those men who gave their services with becoming sanctity and the observance of this law to the performance of divine worship, should receive the recompense for their labors, O most esteemed Anulinus: wherefore it is my will that these men, within the province intrusted to thee in the Catholic Church, over which Caecilianus presides, who give their services to this holy religion. and whom they commonly call clergy, shall be held totally free and exempt from all public offices, to the end that they may not, by any error or sari legious deviation, be drawn away from the service due to the Divinity, but rather may devote themselves to their proper law, without any molestation. So that, whilst they exhibit the greatest possible reverence to the Deity, it appears the greatest good will be conferred on the State. Farewell, most esteemed and beloved Anulinus.” ^{f278}

As will be seen later, this exemption was a most material benefit. And when the party of Majorinus saw themselves excluded from it, they claimed that they were the Catholic Church, and therefore really the ones who were entitled to it. Accordingly, they drew up a petition to the emperor, entitled, “The petition of the Catholic Church, containing the crimes of Caecilianus, by party of Majorinus.” — Bower. ^{f279} This petition requested the emperor to refer to the bishops of Gaul the controversy between them and Caecilianus. The petition, with a bundle of papers containing their charges against Caecilianus, they gave to the proconsul Anulinus, who immediately sent it by a messenger to Constantine, and sent also by the same messenger a letter giving him an account of the dispute. When Constantine received

the petition and the accompanying papers, he appointed three of the principal bishops of Gaul to meet with the bishop of Rome to examine the matter, and sent to Melchiades, the then bishop of Rome, the following letter: —

“Constantine Augustus, to Militates [the same as Melchiades], bishop of Rome, and to Marcus: As many communications of this kind have been sent to me from Anulinus, the most illustrious proconsul of Africa, in which it is contained that Caecilianus, the bishop of Carthage, was accused, in many respects, by his colleagues in Africa; and as this appears to be grievous, that in those provinces which divine Providence has freely intrusted to my fidelity, and in which there is a vast population, the multitude are found inclining to deteriorate, and in a manner divided into two parties, and among others, that the bishops were at variance; I have resolved that the same Caecilianus, together with ten bishops, who appear to accuse him, and ten others, whom he himself may consider necessary for his cause, shall sail to Rome. That you, being present there, as also Reticius, Maternus, and Marinus, your colleagues, whom I have commanded to hasten to Rome for this purpose, may be heard, as you may understand most consistent with the most sacred law. And, indeed, that you may have the most perfect knowledge of these matters. I have subjoined to my own epistle copies of the writings sent to me by Anulinus, and sent them to your aforesaid colleagues. In which your gravity will read and consider in what way the aforesaid cause may be most accurately investigated and justly decided. Since it neither escapes your diligence, that I show such regard for the holy Catholic Church, that I wish you, upon the whole, to leave no room for schism or division. May the power of the great God preserve you many years, most esteemed.” ^{f280}

Several other bishops besides those named in this letter were appointed by the emperor to attend the council, so that when the council met, there were nineteen members of it. According to Constantine's letter, as well as by virtue of his own position, Melchiades presided in the council, and thus began to reap in imperial recognition and joint authority, the fruit of the offers which he made when in A.D. 311 he sent that letter and delegation of bishops to Constantine in Gaul, inviting him to the conquest of Rome and the deliverance of the church.

The council met in the apartments of the empress, in the Lateran Palace in Rome, October 2, 313. Caecilianus appeared in person, and Donatus came as his accuser. The council decided that none of the charges were proved, pronounced Caecilianus innocent, and Donatus a slanderer and the chief author of all the contention. Their decision, with a full account of the proceedings, was immediately sent to Constantine. The Donatists appealed from the council to the emperor, demanding a larger council, on the plea that the bishops who composed this one were partial, prejudiced, and had acted hastily, and, besides this, were too few in number properly to decide a matter of so great importance. Constantine ordered another council to be held at Arles, to be composed of “many bishops.” The following is the letter he sent to one of the bishops who was summoned to Arles, and will show his wishes in the matter: —

“Constantine Augustus, to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse: As there were some already before who perversely and wickedly began to waver in the holy religion and celestial virtue, and to abandon the doctrine of the Catholic Church, desirous, therefore, of preventing such disputes among them, I had thus written, that this subject, which appeared to be agitated among them, might be rectified, by delegating certain bishops from Gaul, and summoning others of the opposite parties from Africa, who are pertinaciously and incessantly contending with one another, that by a careful examination of the matter in their presence, it might thus be decided. But since, as it happens some, forgetful of their own salvation, and the reverence due to our most holy religion, even now do not cease to protract their own enmity, being unwilling to conform to the decision already promulgated, and asserting that they were very few that advanced their sentiments and opinions, or else that all points which ought to have been first fully discussed not being first examined, they proceeded with too much haste and precipitancy to give publicity to the decision. Hence it has happened that those very persons who ought to exhibit a brotherly and peaceful unanimity, rather disgracefully and detestably are at variance with one another, and thus give this occasion of derision to those that are without, and whose minds are averse to our most holy religion. Hence it has appeared necessary to me to provide that this matter which ought to have ceased after the decision was issued by their own voluntary

agreement now, at length, should be fully terminated by the intervention of many.

“Since, therefore, we have commanded many bishops to meet together from different and remote places, in the city of Arles, towards the calends of August, I have also thought proper to write to thee, that taking a public vehicle from the most illustrious Latronianus, corrector of Sicily, and taking with thee two others of the second rank, which thou mayest select, also three servants to afford you services on the way ; I would have you meet them within the same day at the aforesaid place. That by the weight of your authority, and the prudence and unanimity of the rest that assemble, this dispute, which has disgracefully continued until the present time, in consequence of certain disgraceful contentions, may be discussed, by hearing all that shall be alleged by those who are now at variance, whom we have also commanded to be present, and thus the controversy be reduced, though slowly, to that faith and observance of religion, and fraternal concord, which ought to prevail. May Almighty God preserve thee in safety many years.” ^{f281}

This council met according to appointment, August, A.D. 314, and was composed of the bishops from almost all the provinces of the Western division of the empire. Sylvester, who was now bishop of Rome, was summoned to the council, but declined on account of age, sending two presbyters and two deacons as his representatives. This council also declared Caecilianus innocent of the crimes laid against him by the Donatists. The council also decided that whoever should falsely accuse his brethren should be cut off from the communion of the church without hope of ever being received again, except at the point of death. It further decided that such bishops as had been ordained by the Donatists should officiate alternately with the Catholic bishops till one or the other should die.

But the council did not stop with the consideration of the question which it was summoned to consider. The bishops in council now took it upon themselves to legislate in matters of discipline for the world, and to bestow special preference and dignity upon the bishop of Rome. They “ordained that Easter should be kept on the same day, and on a Sunday, by all the churches in the world” (Bower ^{f282}), and that the bishop of Rome should announce to the churches the particular Sunday upon which it should be

celebrated. Before adjourning, the council sent to the bishop of Rome an account of their proceedings, with a copy of the decrees which they had adopted concerning the discipline of the churches, that he might publish them to all the churches.

The Donatists appealed again, not for council, but to the emperor himself. Constantine held a consistory and heard their appeal, and in harmony with the council already held, pronounced in favor of Caecilianus and against the Donatists. Upon this the Donatists claimed that the emperor had been influenced by Hosius, one of his favorite bishops, and denied that he had any jurisdiction in the matter at all, because it was not right for civil magistrates to have anything to do with religion! This claim was true enough, if they had made it at the beginning, and had refused from the first to allow their controversy to be touched upon in any way by the imperial authority. Then they would have stood upon proper ground; but when they themselves were the first to appeal to the civil authority; when they had asked the emperor to consider the matter again and again and again, with the hope of getting the imperial power on their side; and when they had carried to the last extreme, their efforts in this direction, — when they had done all this in vain, and then turned about to protest, their protest was robbed of every shadow of force or merit.

The question as to which was the Catholic Church having now been decided, Constantine, in his next epistle, could add yet another distinguishing title. As we have seen, the Edict of Milan — March, A.D. 313 — ordered that the churches should be restored to the Christians — “the whole body of Christians” — without distinction. When the Catholic Church asserted its sole right to the designation “Christian,” and backed its assertion with political reasons which were then peculiarly cogent, the imperial epistle ran — March, A.D. 313 — “to the Catholic Church of the Christians.” When the emperor wrote to Melchiades appointing the first council under the imperial authority, his epistle ran — autumn, A.D. 313 — the holy Catholic Church.” When he wrote to Chrestus — summer, A.D. 314 — summoning him to the second council under imperial authority, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the “most holy religion.” When it had been decided which was “the most holy Catholic religion,” he addressed an epistle to Caecilianus — A.D. 316 — announcing imperial favors to “the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion,” and empowered Caecilianus to assist the imperial officers in preventing any diversion from the most holy Catholic Church.

The following is that letter: —

“Constantine Augustus, to Caecilianus, bishop of Carthage: As we have determined that in all the provinces of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, something should be granted to certain ministers of the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion to defray their expenses, I have given letters to Ursus, the most illustrious lieutenant-governor of Africa. and have communicated to him, that he shall provide, to pay to your authority, three thousand folles [about one hundred thousand dollars].

“After you shall have obtained this sum, you are to order these monies to be distributed among the aforesaid ministers, according to the abstract addressed to thee from Hosius. But if thou shalt learn, perhaps, that anything shall be wanting to complete this my purpose with regard to all, thou art authorized, without delay, to make demands for whatever thou mayest ascertain to be necessary, from Herbicides, the procurator of our possessions. And I have also commanded him when present, that if thy authority should demand any monies of him, he should see that it should be paid without delay. And as I ascertained that some men, who are of no settled mind, wished to divert the people from the most holy Catholic Church, by a certain pernicious adulteration, I wish thee to understand that I have given, both to the proconsul Anulinus and to Patricius, vicar-general of the perfects, when present, the following injunctions: that, among all the rest, they should particularly pay the necessary attention to this, nor should by any means tolerate that this should be overlooked. Wherefore, if thou seest any of these men persevering in this madness, thou shalt, without any hesitancy, proceed to the aforesaid judges, and report it to them, that they may animadvert upon them as I commanded them when present. May the power of the great God preserve thee many years.”^{f283}

When the Donatists rejected the decision of the emperor himself, and denied his right to say anything in the controversy in which they had invited him over and over again to participate, as announced in the above letter to Caecilianus he carried against them — A.D. 316 — the interference which they had solicited, to the full extent to which it would undoubtedly have been carried against the Catholics if the Donatists had secured the decision in their favor. The Donatists bishops were driven out, and Constantine

ordered all their churches to be delivered to the Catholic party. As this was done in the interests, and by the direct counsel, of the Catholic party through Hosius, the emperor's chief counselor, the imperial authority thus became wholly partisan, and to both parties was given a dignity which was far, far beyond any merit that was in the question at issue. To the Catholic party it gave the dignity of an imperial alliance and the assurance of imperial favor. The Donatist party it elevated to a dignity and clothed with an importance which placed it before the world as worthy of imperial antagonism. Into the Catholic party, it infused more than ever the pride of place, power, and imperial favor. To the Donatist party it gave the dignity and fame of a persecuted people, and increased the evil which it attempted to destroy.

More than this, when the governmental authority, which should be for the protection of all alike from violence, became itself a party to the controversy, it forsook the place of impartial protector, and assumed the place of a partisan. This only deepened the sense of injury felt by the defeated, and the sense of triumph felt by the victorious party; and the antagonism was only the more embittered. "The implacable faction darkened into a sanguinary feud. For the first time, human blood was shed in conflicts between followers of the Prince of peace." — Milman.^{f284} And the government, by becoming a partisan, had lost the power to keep peace. By becoming a party to religious controversy, it had lost the power to prevent civil violence between religious factions. "Each party recriminated on the other, but neither denies the barbarous scenes of massacre and license which devastated the African cities. The Donatists boasted of their martyrs, and the cruelties of the Catholic party rest on their own admission: they deny not, they proudly vindicate, their barbarities: 'Is the vengeance of God to be defrauded of its victims?' and they appeal to the Old Testament to justify, by the examples of Moses, of Phineas, and of Elijah, the Christian duty of slaying by thousands the renegades and unbelievers," — Milman.^{f285} This, though a shameful perversion of Scripture, was but the practical working out of the theocratical theory of government, which was the basis of the whole system of the union of Church and State which had been created by Constantine and the bishops.

Constantine issued an edict commanding peace, but it was all in vain. The tumult went on, constantly increasing in violence, until the only alternative was for the imperial authority either to enter upon the horrors of a protracted war with its own subjects or openly refuse to go any farther.

The latter step was taken. In A.D. 321, upon the advice of the civil officers of Africa, Constantine “repealed the laws against the Donatists, and gave the African people full liberty to follow either of the contending parties, as they liked best.” — Mosheim.^{f286}

The Donatist controversy touched no point of doctrine, but of discipline only, and was confined to the provinces of Africa. The result in this case, however, ought to have convinced Constantine that the best thing for the imperial authority to do was to return, and strictly adhere, to the principles of the Edict of Milan, to let religious questions and controversies entirely alone, and allow each individual “the privilege of choosing and professing his own religion.” Yet, even if this thought had occurred to him, it would have been impossible for him to do so and attain the object of his ambition. The principles of the Edict of Milan had no place in the compact entered into between Constantine and the bishops. As yet he possessed only half the empire; for Licinius still held the East, and Constantine’s position was not yet so secure that he dare risk any break with the bishops. He had bargained to them his influence in religious things for theirs in politics. The contract had been entered into, he had sold himself to the church influence, and he could not go back even if he would. The empire was before him, but without the support of the church party it could not be his.

It is necessary now to notice the material point in that edict issued in A.D. 313, exempting from all public offices the clergy of the Catholic Church. As a benefit to society and that “the greatest good might be conferred on the State,” the clergy of the Catholic Church were to “be held totally free and exempt from all public offices.”

At this time the burdens and expenses of the principal offices of the State were so great that this exemption was of the greatest material benefit. The immediate effect of the edict, therefore, was to erect the clerical order into a distinct and privileged class. For instance, in the days of the systematic governing of the empire, the decurionate was the chief office of the State. “The decurions formed the Senates of the towns; they supplied the magistrates from their body, and had the right of electing them. Under the new financial system introduced by Diocletian, the decurions were made responsible for the full amount of taxation imposed by the cataster, or assessment on the town and district.” — Milman.^{f287}

As the splendor and magnificence of the court display was increased, and as the imperial power became more absolute, the taxation became more and more burdensome. To such an extent indeed was this carried that tenants, and indeed proprietors of moderate means, were well-nigh bankrupted. Yet the imperial power demanded of the decurions the full amount of the taxes that were levied in their town or district. "The office itself grew into disrepute, and the law was obliged to force that upon the reluctant citizen of wealth or character which had before been an object of eager emulation and competition." — Milman.^{f288}

The exemption of the clerical order from all public offices opened the way for all who would escape these burdens, to become, by whatever means possible, members of that order. The effect was, therefore, to bring into the ministry of the church a crowd of men who had no other purpose in view than to be relieved from the burdensome duties that were laid upon the public by the imperial extravagance of Constantine. So promptly did this consequence follow from this edict, and "such numbers of persons, in order to secure this exemption, rushed into the clerical order," that "this manifest abuse demanded an immediate modification of the law." It was therefore ordered that "none were to be admitted into the sacred order except on the vacancy of a religious charge, and then those only whose poverty exempted them from the municipal functions." — Milman.^{f289}

Nor was this all. The order of the clergy itself found that it was required to pay for this exemption a tribute which it had not at all contemplated in the original bargain. Those already belonging to the clerical order who were sufficiently wealthy to exercise the office of decurion, were commanded to "abandon their religious profession" (Milman,^{f290}) in order that they might fill the office which had been deserted by the exemption which had been granted to their particular order. This of course was counted by the clergy as a great hardship. But as they had willingly consented at the first to the interference of the authority of the State when it was exercised seemingly to their profit, they had thereby forfeited their right to protest against that same interference when it was exercised actually to the denial of their natural rights. Yet the resources of dishonest intrigue were still left to them, — especially the plea that their possessions belonged not to themselves but to the church, — and it was exercised to such an extent as virtually to defeat the purpose of this later law. Thus the evil consequences of the original law still flowed on, and "numbers, without any inward call to the spiritual office, and without any fitness for it whatever, now got

themselves ordained as ecclesiastics, for the sake of enjoying this exemption, whereby many of the worst class came to the administration of the most sacred calling.” — Neander.^{f291}

Another scheme adopted by Constantine, was fraught with more evil in the same direction. As he had favored the new religion only on account of its value to him as a political factor, he counted it to his advantage to have as many as possible to profess that religion. He therefore used all the means that could be employed by the State to effect this purpose. He made the principal positions about his palace and court, a gift and reward to the professors of the new imperial religion, and with “the hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smiles, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually fill the apartments of a palace.... As the lower ranks of society are governed by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any eminence of birth, of power, or of riches, was soon followed by dependent multitudes. The salvation of the common people was purchased at an easy rate, if it be true that, in one year, twelve thousand men were baptized at Rome, besides a proportionable number of women and children, and that a white garment, with twenty pieces of gold, had been promised by the emperor to every convert.” — Gibbon.^{f292}

It will be observed that in this statement Gibbon inserts the cautious clause, “if it be true,” but such a precaution was scarcely necessary; because the whole history of the times bears witness that such was the system followed, whether this particular instance was a fact or not. This is proved by the next instance which we shall mention of Constantine’s efforts in gaining converts to the new religion. He wrote letters offering rewards both political and financial to those cities which, as such, would forsake the heathen religion, and destroy or allow to be destroyed their heathen temples. “The cities which signalized a forward zeal, by the voluntary destruction of their temples, were distinguished by municipal privileges, and rewarded with popular donatives.” — Gibbon.^{f293}

In cities that would accept this offer, he would build churches at the public expense, and send there “a complete body of the clergy and a bishop” when “there were as yet no Christians in the place.” Also upon such churches he bestowed “large sums for the support of the poor; so that the conversion of the heathen might be promoted by doing good to their bodies.” — Neander.^{f294} And that this was simply the manifestation of his constant

policy, is shown by the fact that at the Council of Nice, in giving instruction to the bishops as to how they should conduct themselves, he said: —

“In all ways unbelievers must be saved. It is not every one who will be converted by learning and reasoning. Some join us from desire of maintenance; some for preferment; some for presents: nothing is so rare as a real lover of truth. We must be like physicians, and accommodate our medicines to the diseases, our teaching to the different minds of all.”^{f295}

He further enacted “that money should be given in every city to orphans and widows, and to those who were consecrated to the divine service; and he fixed the amount of their annual allowance [of provisions] more according to the impulse of his own generosity, than to the exigencies of their condition.” — Theodoret.^{f296} In view of these things it is evident that there is nothing at all extravagant in the statement that in a single year twelve thousand men, besides women and children, were baptized in Rome.

In addition to all this, he exempted all church property from taxation, which exemption, in the course of time, the church asserted as of divine right; and the example there set is followed to this day, even among people who profess a separation of Church and State.

The only result which could possibly come from such proceedings as these, was, First the great mass of the people, of the pagans, in the empire, with no change either of character or convictions, were drawn into the Catholic Church. Thus the State and the Church became one and the same thing; and that one thing was simply the embodiment of the second result; namely, a solid mass of hypocrisy. “The vast numbers who, from external considerations, without any inward call, joined themselves to the Christian communities, served to introduce into the church all the corruptions of the heathen world. Pagan vices, pagan delusions, pagan superstition, took the garb and name of Christianity, and were thus enabled to exert a more corrupting influence on the Christian life. Such were those who, without any real interest whatever in the concerns of religion, living half in paganism and half in an outward show of Christianity, composed the crowds that thronged the churches on the festivals of the Christians, and the theaters on the festivals of the pagans. Such were those who accounted

themselves Christians, if they but attended church once or twice in a year; while, without a thought of any higher life, they abandoned themselves to every species of worldly pursuit and pleasure.” — Neander. ^{f297}

It could not be otherwise. The course pursued by Constantine in conformity with the political intrigues of the bishops, drew into the Catholic Church every hypocrite in the Roman empire. And this for the simple reason that it could draw no other kind; because no man of principle, even though he were an outright pagan, would allow himself to be won by any such means. It was only to spread throughout all the empire the ambiguous mixture of paganism and apostate Christianity which we have seen so thoroughly exemplified in the life of Constantine himself, who was further inspired and flattered by the ambitious bishops.

There were some honest pagans who refused all the imperial bribes and kept aloof from the wicked system thereby established. There were some genuine Christians who not only kept aloof from the foul mass, but protested against every step that was taken in creating it. But speaking generally, the whole population of the empire was included in the system thus established. “By taking in the whole population of the Roman empire, the church became, indeed, a church of the masses, a church of the people, but at the same time more or less a church of the world. Christianity became a matter of fashion. The number of hypocrites and formal professors rapidly increased; strict discipline, zeal self-sacrifice, and brotherly love proportionally ebbed away; and many heathen customs and usages, under altered names, crept into the worship of God and the life of the Christian people. The Roman State had grown up under the influence of idolatry, and was not to be magically transformed at a stroke. With the secularizing process, therefore, a paganizing tendency went hand in hand.” — Schaff. ^{f298}

The effect of all this was further detrimental to true Christianity in that it argued that Christianity consists in the mere profession of the name, pertaining not to the essential character, nor implying any material change in the general conduct. Consequently, those who had been by this means brought into the church acted worse, and really were worse, than those who remained aloof. When the bishops or clergy of the church undertook to exhort the heathen to become Christians, the pagans pointed to the hypocritical professors who were already members of the church. and replied to the invitation with such arguments as these: “We lead good lives

already: what need have we of Christ? We commit no murder, theft, nor robbery; we covet no man's possessions; we are guilty of no breach of the matrimonial bond. Let something worthy of censure be found in our lives, and whoever can point it out may make us Christians.' Comparing himself with nominal Christians: 'Why would you persuade me to become a Christian? I have been defrauded by a Christian, I never defrauded any man; a Christian has broken his oath to me, and I never broke my word to any man.'“ — Neander.^{f299}

Not only was the church thus rendered powerless to influence those who were without, but she was likewise power-less to influence for any good those who were within. When the vast majority in the church were unconverted and had joined the church from worldly and selfish motives, living only lives of conscious hypocrisy, it was impossible that church discipline should be enforced by church authority.

The next step taken by the bishopric, therefore, was to secure edicts under which they could enforce church discipline. This, too, not only upon the members of the church. but likewise upon those who were not. The church having, out of lust for worldly power and influence, forsaken the power of God, the civil power was the only resource that remained to her. Conscious of her loss of moral power, she seized upon the civil. The account of this further wickedness will be given in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 13.

THE ORIGINAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

THE church was fully conscious of her loss of the power of God before she sought the power of the State. Had she not been, she never would have made any overtures to the imperial authority, nor have received with favor any from it. There is a power that belongs with the gospel of Christ, and is inseparable from the truth of the gospel, that is the power of God. In fact, the gospel is but the manifestation of that power, for the gospel “is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” ~~8016~~ Romans 1:16. As long, therefore, as any order or organization of people professing the gospel of Christ maintains the principle of that gospel in sincerity, so long the power of God will be with them, and they will have no need of any other power to make their influence felt for good wherever known. But just as soon as any person or association professing the gospel loses the spirit of it, so soon the power is gone also. Then, and only then, does such an organization seek for another kind of power to supply the place of that which is lost.

Thus was it with the church at this time. She had fallen, deplorably fallen, from the purity and the truth, and therefore from the power, of the gospel. And having lost the power of God and godliness, she greedily grasped for the power of the State and ungodliness. And to secure laws by which she might enforce her discipline and dogmas upon those whom she had the power either to convince or to persuade, was the definite purpose which the bishopric had in view when it struck that bargain with Constantine, and lent him the influence of the church in his imperial aspirations.

In the chapter on “Constantine and the Bishops,” evidence has been given which shows how diligently the bishops endeavored to convince themselves that in the theocracy which they had framed and of which they were now a part, the kingdom of God was come. But they did not suppose for a moment that the Lord himself would come and conduct the affairs of this kingdom in person. They themselves were to be the representatives of God upon the earth, and the theocracy thus established was to be ruled by the Lord through them. This was but culmination of the evil spirit manifested in the self-exaltation of the bishopric. That is to say, their idea

of a theocracy was utterly false, and the working out of the theory was but the manifestation of the mystery of iniquity.

Yet this is not to say that all ideas of a theocracy have always been false. The government of Israel was a true theocracy. That was really a government of God. At the burning bush, God commissioned Moses to lead his people out of Egypt. By signs and wonders and mighty miracles multiplied, God delivered Israel from Egypt, led them through the Red Sea, and through the wilderness, and finally into the promised land. There he ruled them by judges, to whom "in diverse manners" he revealed his will, "until Samuel the prophet."

In the days of Samuel, the people asked that they might have a king. Their request was granted, but only under the following earnest protest: "And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods, so do they also unto thee. Now therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them.

"And Samuel told all the words of the Lord unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, This will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: He will take your sons, and appoint them for himself, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and some shall run before his chariots, and he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties; and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them and give them to his servants. And he will take the tents of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry

out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the Lord will not hear you in that day.

“Nevertheless the people refused to obey the voice of Samuel; and they said, Nay; but we will have a king over us; that we also may be like all the nations; and that our king may judges us, and go out before us, and fight our battles. And Samuel heard all the words of the people, and he rehearsed them in the ears of the Lord. And the Lord said to Samuel, Harken unto their voice, and make them a king. And Samuel said unto the men of Israel, Go ye every man unto his city.”

God chose Saul, and Samuel anointed him king over Israel. “And Samuel said unto all Israel, Behold, I have hearkened unto your voice in all that ye said unto me, and have made a king over you. And now, behold, the king walketh before you: and I am old and gray-headed; and, behold, my sons are with you: and I have walked before you from my childhood unto this day. Behold, here I am: witness against me before the Lord, and before his anointed: whose ox have I taken? or whose ass have I taken? or whom have I defrauded? whom have I oppressed? or of whose hand have I received any bribe to blind mine eyes therewith? and I will restore it to you. And they said, Thou hast not defrauded us, nor oppressed us, neither hast thou taken ought of any man’s hand. And he said unto them, The Lord is witness against you, and his anointed is witness this day, that ye have not found ought in my hand. And they answered, He is witness.

“And Samuel said unto the people It is the Lord that advanced Moses and Aaron, and that brought your fathers up out of the land of Egypt. Now therefore stand still, that I may reason with you before the Lord of all the righteous acts of the Lord, which he did to you and to your fathers. When Jacob was come into Egypt, and your fathers cried unto the Lord, then the Lord sent Moses and Aaron which brought forth your fathers out of Egypt, and made them dwell in this place. And when they forgot the Lord their God, he sold them into the hands of Sisera, captain of the host of Hazor, and into the hand of the Philistines, and into the hand of the king of Moab, and they fought against them. And they cried unto the Lord, and said, We have sinned, because we have forsaken the Lord, and have served Baalim and Ashtaroth: but now deliver us out of the hand of our enemies, and we will serve thee. And the Lord sent

Jerubbaal, and Bedan, and Jephthah, and Samuel, and delivered you out of the hand of your enemies on every side, and ye dwelt safe. And when ye saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us: when the Lord your God was your king. Now therefore, behold the king whom ye have chosen, and whom ye have desired; and, behold, the Lord hath set a king over you. If ye will fear the Lord, and serve him, and obey his voice, and not rebel against the commandment of the Lord; then shall both ye and also the king that reigneth over you continue following the Lord your God: but if ye will not obey the voice of the Lord, but rebel against the commandment of the Lord, then shall the hand of the Lord be against you, as it was against your fathers.

“Now therefore stand and see this great thing, which the Lord will do before your eyes. Is it not wheat harvest to-day? I will call unto the Lord, and he shall send thunder and rain; that ye may perceive and see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of the Lord, in asking you a king. So Samuel called unto the Lord; and the Lord sent thunder and rain that day: and all the people greatly feared the Lord and Samuel. And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto the Lord thy God, that we die not: for we have added unto all our sins this evil, to ask us a king.

“And Samuel said unto the people, Fear not: ye have done all this wickedness: yet turn not aside from following the Lord, but serve the Lord with all your hearty; and turn ye not aside; for then should ye go after vain things, which cannot profit nor deliver; for they are vain. For the Lord will not forsake his people for his great name’s sake” because it hath pleased the Lord to make you his people. Moreover as for me, God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you: but I will teach you the good and the right way: only fear the Lord, and serve him in truth with all your heart: for consider how great things he hath done for you. But if ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king.” ~~1 Samuel 8,~~ ~~1 Samuel 12.~~

Although the people were allowed to have a king, and although in this movement they had virtually rejected the Lord, as Samuel told them, the

Lord would not forsake them. He still continued to guide the nation, communicating his will by prophets; and although they had done wrong in demanding a king, the Lord made even the kingship to be an additional element in teaching them his eternal purpose; he made it to them a reminder of the eternal kingdom which he would establish in the accomplishment of his purpose concerning the earth.

Saul failed to do the will of God, and as he rejected the word of the Lord, the Lord rejected him from being king, and sent Samuel to anoint David king over Israel; and David's house, and David's throne, God established for evermore.

When Solomon succeeded to the kingdom in the place of David his father, the record is: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father." ^{<1392>}1 Chronicles 29:23. David's throne was the throne of the Lord, and Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king over the earthly kingdom of God. The succession to the throne descended in David's line to Zedekiah, who was made subject to the king of Babylon, that perchance the kingship with the kingdom might stand. Zedekiah entered into a solemn covenant before God that he would remain a faithful subject of the king of Babylon. His name was Mattaniah at first, and when he entered into this covenant, the king of Babylon changed his name to Zedekiah, which means The Justice of Jehovah. Mattaniah gave his hand, and accepted this new name as the seal of the covenant with the king of Babylon, and in so doing pledged that if he should break that covenant, he would incur the judgment of the Lord.

Zedekiah did break this covenant, upon which the Lord said: "As I live, saith the Lord God, surely in the place where the king dwelleth that made him king, whose oath he despised, and whose covenant he brake, even with him in the midst of Babylon he shall die... Seeing he despised the oath by breaking the covenant, when, lo, he had given his hand, and hath done all these things, he shall not escape. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; As I live, surely mine oath that he hath despised, and my covenant that he hath broken, even it will I recompense upon his own head." ^{<3716>}Ezekiel 17:16-19. And in recompensing this evil upon the head of Zedekiah, the word of Samuel to the people was fulfilled when he told them, "If ye shall still do wickedly, ye shall be consumed, both ye and your king." For to Zedekiah, and to the kingdom forever after, God gave this testimony: "Thou profane, wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an

end, thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.” ^{<2125>}Ezekiel 21:25-27.

The kingdom was then subject to Babylon. When Babylon fell, and Medo-Persia succeeded, it was overturned the first time. When Medo-Persia fell, and was succeeded by Grecia, it was overturned the second time. When the Greek empire gave way to Rome it was overturned the third time. And then says the word, “It shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.” And he whose right it is, is thus named: “Thou... shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” ^{<413>}Luke 1:31-33.

But that kingdom is not of this world, nor will he sit upon that throne in this world. While Christ was here as “that prophet,” a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, he refused to exercise any earthly authority or office whatever. When appealed to, to mediate in a dispute between two brothers in regard to their inheritance, he replied, “Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?” ^{<214>}Luke 12:14. And when the people would have taken him and made him a king, he withdrew himself from them, and went to the mountain alone. ^{<415>}John 6:15. The last night he spent on earth before his crucifixion, and in the last talk with Pilate before he went to the cross, he said, “My kingdom is not of this world.” ^{<4136>}John 18:36. Thus the throne of the Lord has been removed from this world, and will be no more in this world nor of this world, until, as King of kings and Lord of lords, he whose right it is shall come again. And that time is the end of this world and the beginning of the world to come. This is shown by many scriptures, some of which it will be in order here to quote.

To the twelve disciples the Saviour said: “I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”

^{<229>}Luke 22:29, 30. As to when this shall be, we are informed by the word in Matthew thus: “In the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” ^{<423>}Matthew 19:23. And the time when he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, is stated by another passage in Matthew thus: “When

the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations.” ⁴¹⁵⁸Matthew 25:31, 32. By these scriptures and all others on the subject, it is evident that the kingdom of Christ, the kingdom of God, is not only not of this world, but is nevermore to be of this world. Therefore while this world stands, a theocracy can never be in it again. From the death of Christ until now, every theory of an earthly theocracy has been a false theory. And from now until the end of the world, every such theory will be a false theory. Yet such was the their of the bishops of the fourth century; and being such, it was utterly false and wicked.

The falsity of this theory of the bishops of the fourth century has been clearly seen by but one of the church historians that is, Neander. And this, as well as the scheme which the bishops had in mind, has been better described by him than by all others put together. The design of the bishops with respect to the civil power is seen in the following statement: —

“There had in fact arisen in the church... a false theocratical theory, originating not in the essence of the gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments, which... brought along with it an unchristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal State, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way.” — Neander. ^{f271a}

That which they had in mind when they joined their interests to Constantine’s, was to use the power which through him they would thus secure, to curry into effect in the State and by governmental authority their theocratical project. The State was not only to be subordinate to the church, but was to be the servant of the church to assist in bringing all the world into the new kingdom of God. The bishops were the channel through which the will of God was to be made known to the State. Therefore the views of the bishops were to be to the government the expression of the will of God, and whatever laws the bishopric might deem necessary to make the principles of their theocracy effective, it was their purpose to secure. This also has been well stated by the same excellent authority just quoted, as follows: —

“This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and... the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent

on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims.” — Neander.^{f272a}

As we have found in the evidence of the previous chapter, the church had become filled with a mass of people who had no respect for religious exercises, and now it became necessary to use the power of the State to assist in preserving respect for church discipline. As the church-members had not religion enough to lead them to do what they professed was their duty to do, the services of the State had to be enlisted to assist them in doing what they professed to believe it was right to do so. In other words, as only worldly and selfish interests had been appealed to in bringing them to membership in the church, and as they therefore had no conscience in the matter, the services of the State were employed as aids to conscience, or rather to supply the lack of conscience.

Accordingly, one of the first, if not the very first, of the laws secured by the bishops in behalf of the church, was enacted, as it supposed, about A.D. 314, ordering that on Friday and on Sunday “there should be a suspension of business at the courts and in other civil offices, so that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion.” — Neander.

^{f273a} To justify this, the specious plea was presented that when the courts and public offices were open and regularly conducted by the State on these church days, the members were hindered from attending to their religious exercises. It was further argued that if the State kept its offices open, and conducted the public business on those days, as the church-members could not conduct the public business and attend to church services both, they could not well hold public offices; and that, therefore, the State was in fact discriminating against the church, and was hindering rather than helping the progress of the kingdom of God.

This was simply to confess that their Christianity was altogether earthly, sensual, and selfish. It was to confess that there was not enough virtue in their profession of religion to pay them for professing it; and they must needs have the State pay them for professing it. This was in fact in harmony with the whole system of which they were a part. They had been paid by the State in the first place to become professors of the new religion, and it was but consistent for them to ask the State to continue to pay them for the continued profession of it. This was consistent with the system there established; but it was totally inconsistent with every idea of

true religion. Any religion that is not of sufficient value in itself to pay men for professing it, is not worth professing, much less is it worth supporting by the State. In genuine Christianity there is a virtue and a value which make it of more worth to him who professes it, than all that the whole world can afford — yea, of more worth than life itself.

This, however, was but the beginning. The State had become an instrument in the hands of the church, and she was determined to use it for all it was worth. As we have seen by many proofs, one of the first aims of the apostate church was the exaltation of Sunday as the chief sacred day. And no sooner had the Catholic Church made herself sure of the recognition and support of the State, than she secured from the emperor an edict setting apart Sunday especially to the purposes of devotion. As the sun was the chief deity of the pagans, and as the forms of sun worship had been so fully adopted by the apostate church, it was an easy task to secure from the sun-loving and church-courting Constantine, a law establishing the observance of the day of the sun as a holy day. Accordingly, March 7, A.D. 321, Constantine issued his famous Sunday edict, which reads as follows:

Constantine, Emperor Augustus, to Helpidius: On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations, the bounty of heaven should be lost. (Given the 7th day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls each of them for the second time.)” ^{f274a}

Schaff attempts to give the Sunday legislation of Constantine a “civil” character; but this is not only an error as to fact, but an anachronism by fifteen hundred and fifty years. There was no such idea in the conception of government entertained by Constantine and the bishops; nor was there any place for any such idea in this piece of legislation. The whole thing was religious. This is seen in at least five distinct counts.

First Count. As we have abundantly shown, the theory of government intended by the bishops and sanctioned by Constantine, was a theocracy; that is, a government of God, which, in itself, could be nothing else than religious. We have shown that the bishops, in behalf of the church, played

the part of oppressed Israel, while Maxentius was made to occupy the place of a second Pharaoh, and Constantine that of a new Moses delivering Israel. We have seen that the new Pharaoh — the horse and his rider — was thrown into the sea, and sunk to the bottom like a stone. We have heard the song of deliverance of the new Israel when the new Moses had crossed the Red Sea — the River Tiber. We have seen that the new Moses, going on to the conquest of the heathen in the wilderness, set up the tabernacle and pitched it far off from the camp, where he received “divine” direction as to how he should conduct “the battles of the Lord.” Thus far in the establishment of the new theocracy, each step in the course of the original theocracy had been imitated.

Now this establishment of Sunday observance by law, was simply another step taken by the creators of the new theocracy in imitation of the original. After the original Israel had crossed the Red Sea, and had gone a considerable journey in the wilderness, God established among them, by a law, too, the observance of the Sabbath, a day of weekly rest. This setting apart of Sunday in the new theocracy, and its observance being established and enforced by law, was in imitation of the act of God in the original theocracy in establishing the observance of the Sabbath. This view is confirmed by the testimony of the same bishop, who has already given us so extensive a view of the workings of the new theocracy. And these are the words: —

“All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord’s day.” — Eusebius. ^{f275a}

Now the Sabbath is wholly religious. The government in which its observance was enforced was the government of God. The law by which its observance was enforced was the law of God. The observance of the Sabbath was in recognition of Jehovah as the true God, and was a part of the worship of him as such. Now when it is declared by one of the chiefest factors in the new theocracy, that all things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Sunday, this in the connection in which it stands, is the strongest possible proof that the observance of the day and the object of the law were wholly, religious, without a single civil element any where even contemplated. This is confirmed by the —

Second Count. In accordance with their idea of theocracy, the governmental system which was now established composed the kingdom of God. We have seen how this idea was entertained by the bishops at the banquet which Constantine gave to them at the close of the Council of Nice. We have seen it further adopted when Constantine's mother sent to him the nails of the "true cross," of which he made a bridle bit, when the bishops declared that the prophecy was fulfilled which says, "In that day [the day of the kingdom of God upon earth] shall there be upon the bridles of the horses, holiness unto the Lord." This idea, however, stands out in its fullness, in an oration which Eusebius delivered in praise of Constantine, and in his presence, on the thirtieth anniversary of the emperor's reign. The flattering bishop announced that God gave to Constantine greater proofs of his beneficence in proportion to the emperor's holy services to him, and accordingly had permitted him to celebrate already three decades, and now was entered upon the fourth. He related how the emperor at the end of each decennial period, had advanced one of his sons to a share of the imperial power; a now in the absence of other sons, he would extend the like favor to other of his kindred. Thus he said: —

"The eldest, who bears his father's name, he received as his partner in the empire about the close of the first decade of his reign: the second, next in point of age, at the second; and the third in like manner at the third decennial period, the occasion of this our present festival. And now that the fourth period has commenced, and the time of his reign is still further prolonged, he desires to extend his imperial authority by calling still more of his kindred to partake his power; and, by the appointment of the Caesars, fulfills the predictions of the holy prophets, according to what they uttered ages before: 'And the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.'" — Eusebius. ^{f276a}

Then as we have seen by so many proofs that the sun was the chief deity in this new kingdom of God, the bishop proceeds to draw for the edification of the Apollo-loving emperor, the following picture of him as the sun in his chariot traversing the world; and positively defines the system of government as a monarchy of God patterned after the divine original: —

"He it is who appoints him this present festival, in that he has made him victorious every enemy that disturbed his peace: he it is who displays him as an example of true godliness to the human race.

And thus our emperor, like the radiant sun, illuminates the most distant subjects of his empire through the presence of the Caesars, as with the far piercing rays of his own brightness. To us who occupy the Eastern regions he has given a son worthy of himself; a second and a third respectively to other departments of his empire, to be, as it were, brilliant reflectors of the light which proceeds from himself. Once more, having harnessed, as it were, under the selfsame yoke the four most noble Caesars as horses in the imperial chariot, he sits on high and directs their course by the reins of holy harmony and concord; and himself everywhere present, and observant of every event, thus traverses every region of the world. Lastly, invested as he is with a semblance of heavenly sovereignty, he directs his gaze above, and frames his earthly government according to the pattern of that divine original, felling strength in its conformity to the monarchy of God.”^{f277a}

This is evidence enough to show that the system of government established by Constantine and the bishops was considered as in very fact, the kingdom of God. The laws therefore being laws of the kingdom of God, would necessarily have a religious character; and that such was held to be the case, is made plain by the following passage: —

“Our emperor, ever beloved by Him, who derives the source of imperial authority from above, and is strong in the power of his sacred title, has controlled the empire of the world for a long period of years. Again: that Preserver of the universe orders these heavens and earth, and the celestial kingdom, consistently with his Father’s will. Even so our emperor whom he loves, by bringing those whom he rules on earth to the only begotten Word and Saviour, renders, them fit subjects of his kingdom.”^{f278a}}

As the object of the emperor was to render the people fit subject for this kingdom of God, the Sunday law was plainly in the interests of the new kingdom of God, and was therefore religious only. This is yet further proved by the —

Third Count. The purpose of the first Sunday law, was “that the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion.” This is Neander’s translation of the statement of Sozomen respecting the first law

closing public offices on Friday and Sunday. ^{f279a} Prof. Walford's translation of the passage is as follows: —

“He also enjoined the observance of the day termed the Lord's day, which the Jews call the first day of the week, and which the Greeks dedicate to the sun, as likewise the day before the seventh, and commanded that no judicial or other business should be transacted on those days, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications.” Sozomen. ^{f280a}

Such, therefore, was the character and intent of the first enactment respecting Sunday. And of the second Sunday law we have a statement equally clear, that such was its purpose also. In praise of Constantine, the episcopal “orator” says: —

“He commanded, too, that one day should be regarded as a special occasion for religious worship.” — Eusebius. ^{f281a}

And in naming the great things which Christ had been enabled to accomplish by the help of Constantine, he shuts out every element upon which a civil claim might be based, by continuing in the following words: —

“Who else has commanded the nations inhabiting the continents and islands of this mighty globe to assemble weekly on the Lord's day, and to observe it as a festival, not indeed for the pampering of the body, BUT for the comfort and invigoration of the soul by instruction in divine truth?” ^{f282a}

As the purpose of the Sunday law was to set apart the day for the purposes of devotion, for the comfort and invigoration of the soul by instruction in divine truth, and for religious worship, it follows inevitably that the legislation was wholly religious. This is yet further supported by the —

Fourth Count. The title which is given to the day by Constantine in the edict, is distinctively religious. It is *venerabili die solis* — venerable day of the sun. This was the pagan religious title of the day, and to every heathen was suggestive of the religious character which attached to the day as the one especially devoted to the sun and its worship. An additional act of the emperor himself in this connection, has left no room for reasonable doubt that the intent of the law was religious only. As the interpreter of his own law, and clearly indicating its intent, he drew up the following prayer,

which he had the soldiers repeat in concert at a given signal every Sunday morning: —

“We acknowledge thee the only God: we own thee as our King, and implore thy succor. By thy favor have the gotten victory: through thee are we mightier than our enemies. We render thanks for thy past benefits, and thee for future blessings. Together we pray to thee, and beseech thee long to preserve to us, safe and triumphant, our emperor Constantine and his pious sons.” — Eusebius. ^{f283a}

If, however, there should be yet in the mind of any person a lingering doubt as to whether Constantine’s Sunday legislation was religious only, with no thought of any civil character whatever, even this must certainly be effectually removed by the —

Fifth Count. It was by virtue of his office and authority as Pontifex Maximus, and not as emperor, that the day was set apart to this use; because it was the sole prerogative of the Pontifex Maximus to appoint holy days. In proof of this, we have excellent authority in the evidence of two competent witnesses. Here is the first: —

“The rescript, indeed, for religious observance of the Sunday... was enacted... for the whole Roman empire. Yet, unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day, it may be doubted whether the act would not be received by the greater part of the empire, as merely adding one more festival to the Fasti of the empire, as proceeding entirely from the will of the emperor, or even grounded on his authority as Supreme Pontiff, by which he had the plenary power of appointing holy-days.” — Milman. ^{f284a}

It is true that this statement is qualified by the clause “unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day;” but this qualification is wholly removed by another statement from the same author, which reads as follows: —

“The rescript commanding the celebration of the Christian Sabbath bears no allusion to its peculiar sanctity as a Christian institution. It is the day of the sun, which is to be observed by the general veneration... But the believer in the new paganism, of which the

solar worship was the characteristic, might acquiesce without scruple in the sanctity of the first day of the week.”^{f285a}

This is confirmed by another authority as follows: —

“There is no reference whatever in his law either to the fourth commandment or the resurrection of Christ.” — Schaff.^{f286a}

Therefore, as it is admitted that unless we had direct proof that the decree set forth the Christian reason for the sanctity of the day, it was merely adding one more festival to the Fasti of the empire, the appointment of which lay in the plenary power of the Pontifex Maximus, and as it is plainly stated that there is no such proof, this plainly proves that the authority for the appointment of the day lay in the office of the Pontifex Maximus, and that authority was wholly religious.

Our second witness testifies as follows: —

“A law of the year 321 ordered tribunals, shops, and workshops to be closed on the day of the sun, and he [Constantine] sent to the legions, to be recited upon that day, a form of prayer which could have been employed by a worshiper of Mithra, of Serapis, or of Apollo, quite as well as by a Christian believer. This was the official sanction of the old custom of addressing a prayer to the rising sun. In determining what days should be regarded as holy, and in the composition of a prayer for national use, CONSTANTINE EXERCISED ONE OF THE RIGHTS BELONGING TO HIM AS PONTIFEX MAXIMUS; and it caused no surprise that he should do this.” — Duruy.^{f287a}

In the face of such evidence as this, to attempt to give to the Sunday legislation of Constantine a civil character, to say the very least, seems to spring from a wish to have it so, rather than from a desire to give the facts simply as they are.

The Council of Nice in A.D. 325 gave another impetus to the Sunday movement. It decided that the Roman custom of celebrating Easter on Sunday only should be followed throughout the whole empire. The council issued a letter to the churches, in which is the following passage on this subject: —

“We have also gratifying intelligence to communicate to you relative to unity of judgment on the subject of the most holy feast

of Easter: for this point also has been happily settled through your prayers; so that all the brethren in the East who have heretofore kept this festival when the Jews did, will henceforth conform to the Romans and to us, and to all who from the earliest time have observed our period of celebrating Easter.” ^{f288a}

This was followed up by a letter from “Constantine Augustus to the Churches,” in which upon this point he said: —

“The question having been considered relative to the most holy day of Easter, it was determined by common consent that it would be proper that all should celebrate it on one and the same day everywhere.... And in the first place it seemed very unsuitable in the celebration of this sacred feast, that we should follow the custom of the Jews, a people who, having imbrued their hands in a most heinous outrage, and thus polluted their souls, are deservedly blind.... Let us then have nothing in common with that most hostile people the Jews.... Surely we should never suffer Easter to be kept twice in one and the same year. But even if these considerations were not laid before you, it became your prudence at all times to take heed, both by diligence and prayer, that the purity of your soul should in nothing have communion, or seem to have accordance with the customs of men so utterly depraved....

“Since then it was desirable that this should be so amended that we should have nothing in common with that nation of parricides, and of those who slew their Lord; and since the order is a becoming one which is observed by all the churches of the western, southern, and northern parts, and by some also in the eastern; from these considerations all have on the present occasion thought it to be expedient, and I pledged myself that it would be satisfactory to your prudent penetration, that what is observed with such general unanimity of sentiment in the city of Rome, throughout Italy, Africa, all Egypt, Spain, France, Britain, Libya, the whole of Greece, and the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Cilicia, your intelligence also would readily concur in. Reflect, too, that not only is there a greater number of churches in the places before mentioned, but also that this in particular is a most sacred obligation, that all should in common desire whatever strict reason

seems to demand, and which has no communion with the perjury of the Jews.

“But to sum up matters briefly, it was determined by common consent that the most holy festival of Easter should be solemnized on one and the same day; for in such a hallowed solemnity any difference is unseemly, and it is more commendable to adopt that opinion in which there will be no intermixture of strange error, or deviation from what is right. These things therefore being thus ordered, do you gladly receive this heavenly and truly divine command; for whatever is done in the sacred assemblies of the bishops is referable to the divine will.”

This throws much light upon the next move that was made, as these things were made the basis of further action by the church.

At every step in the course of the apostasy, at every step taken in adopting the forms of sun worship, and against the adoption and the observance of Sunday itself, there had been constant protest by all real Christians. Those who remained faithful to Christ and to the truth of the pure word of God observed the Sabbath of the Lord according to the commandment, and according to the word of God which sets forth the Sabbath as the sign by which the Lord, the Creator of the heavens and the earth, is distinguished from all other gods. These accordingly protested against every phase and form of sun worship. Others compromised, especially in the East, by observing both Sabbath and Sunday. But in the west under Roman influences and under the leadership of the church and the bishopric of Rome, Sunday alone was adopted and observed.

Against this Church and State intrigue throughout, there had been also against every other step in the course of the apostasy, earnest protest by all real Christians. But when it came to the point where the church would enforce by the power of the State the observance of Sunday, this protest became stronger than ever. And additional strength was given to the protest at this point, by the fact that it was urged in the words of the very arguments which the Catholic Church had used when she was antagonized rather than courted by the imperial authority. This, with the strength of the argument upon the merit of the question as to the day which should be observed, greatly weakened the force of the Sunday law. But when, in addition to these considerations, the exemption was so broad, and when, in

addition to these who observed the Sabbath positively refused to obey the Sunday law, its effect was virtually nullified.

In order, therefore, to the accomplishment of her original purpose, it now became necessary for the church to secure legislation extinguishing all exemption, and prohibiting the observance of the Sabbath so as to quench that powerful protest. And now, coupled with the necessity of the situation, the “truly divine command” of Constantine and the Council of Nice that “nothing” should be held “in common with the Jews,” was made the basis and the authority for legislation, utterly to crush out the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, and to establish the observance of Sunday only in its stead. Accordingly, the Council of Laodicea enacted the following canon: —

“Canon 29. Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord’s day they shall especially honor, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ.” ^{f289a}

The report of the proceedings of the Council of Laodicea is not dated. A variety of dates has been suggested, of which A.D. 364 seems to have been the most favored. Hefele allows that it may have been as late as 380. But whatever the date, before A.D. 380, in the political condition of the empire, this could not be made effective by imperial law. In A.D. 364 Valens and Valentinian became emperors, the former of the East and the latter of the West. For six years, Valens was indifferent to all parties; but in A.D. 370 he became a zealous Arian, and so far as in him lay, established the Arian doctrine throughout his dominion. Valentinian, though a Catholic, kept himself aloof from all differences or controversies among church parties. This continued till 375, when Valentinian died, and was succeeded by his two sons, one aged sixteen, the other four, years. In 378 the reign of Valens ended, and Theodosius, a Spanish soldier, was appointed emperor of the East. In 380 he was baptized into the Catholic Church, and immediately an edict was issued in the name of the three emperors commanding all subjects of the empire, of whatever party or name, to adopt the faith of the Catholic Church, and assume the name of “Catholic Christians.”

As now “the State itself recognized the church as such, and endeavored to uphold her in the prosecution of her principles and the attainment of her ends” (Neander ^{f290a}); and as Theodosius had already ordered that all his subjects “should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans, which faithful tradition” had preserved, and which was then “professed by the pontiff, Damasus” of Rome; and that they should all “assume the title of Catholic Christians;” it was easy to bring the imperial power to the support of the decrees of the church, and make the Laodicean Canon effective. Now was given the opportunity for which the church had waited so long, and she made use of it. At the earliest possible moment she secured the desired law; for, says the record: —

“By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced; and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege.” — Neander. ^{f291a}

As the direct result of this law, there soon appeared an evil which, under the circumstances and in the logic of the case, called for further legislation in the same direction. The law forbade all work. But as the people had not such religion as would cause them to devote the day to pious and moral exercises, the effect of the law was only to enforce idleness. Enforced idleness only multiplied opportunity for dissipation. As the natural consequence, the circuses and the theaters throughout the empire were crowded every Sunday. But the object of the law, from the first one that was issued, was that the day might be used for the purposes of devotion, and that the people might go to church. But they had not sufficient religion to lead them to church, when there was opportunity for amusement. Therefore, the record is: —

“Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had ben consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hinderance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart.” — Neander. ^{f292a}

Assuredly! An open circus or theater will always prove a great hinderance to the devotion of those Christians whose Christianity is the least an affair of the life and of the heart. In other words, an open circus or theater will always be a great hinderance to the devotion of those who have not religion enough to keep them from going to it, but who only want to use the profession of religion to maintain their popularity, and to promote their selfish interests. On the other hand, to the devotion of those whose Christianity is really an affair of the life and of the heart, an open circus or theater will never be a particle of hinderance, whether open at church time or all the time. With the people there, however, if the circus and theater were open at the same time as the church, the church-members, as well as others, not being able to go to both places at once, would go to the circus or the theater instead of to the church.

But this was not what the bishops wanted. This was not that for which all work had been forbidden. All work had been forbidden in order that the people might go to church; but instead of that, they crowded to the circus and the theater, and the audiences of the bishops were rather slim. This was not at all satisfying to their pride; and they took care to let it be known.

“Church teachers... were, in truth, often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church.” — Neander.^{f293a}

And the church was now in a condition in which she could not bear competition. She must have a monopoly. Therefore the next step to be taken, and the logical one, too, was to have the circuses and theaters closed on Sundays and other special church days, so that the churches and the theaters should not be open at the same time.

There was another feature of the case which gave the bishops the opportunity to make their new demands appear plausible by urging in another form the selfish and sophistical plea upon which they had asked for the first edict respecting church days. In the circuses and the theaters large numbers of men were employed, among whom many were church-members. But, rather than give up their places, the church-members would work on Sunday. The bishops complained that these were compelled to work, and were prohibited to worship: they pronounced it persecution, and demanded more Sunday laws for “protection.”

As a consequence, therefore, and in the logic of the situation, at a council held at Carthage in June, A.D. 401, the following canon was enacted: —

“Canon 5. On Sundays and feast-days, no plays may be performed.” ^{f294a}

That this canon might also be made effective, the bishops in the same council passed a resolution, and sent up a petition to the Emperor Honorius, praying — “That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast-days, to some other days of the week.” — Neander. ^{f295a}

The reason given in support of the petition was, not only as above, that those who worked in government offices and employments at such times, were persecuted, but that — “The people congregate more to the circus than to the church.” ^{f296a}

The church-members had not enough religion or love of right to do what they professed to believe was right; therefore the State was asked to take away from them all opportunity to do wrong: then they would all be Christians! The devil himself could be made that kind of Christian in that way — and he would be the devil still!

The petition of the Council of Carthage could not be granted at once, but in 425 the desired law was secured; and to this also there was attached the reason that was given for the first Sunday law that ever was made; namely, —

“In order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance.” ^{f297a}

It must constantly be borne in mind, however, that the only way in which “the devotion of the faithful” was “disturbed” by these things, was that when the circus or the theater was open at the same time that the church was open, the “faithful” would go to the circus or the theater instead of church, and therefore, their “devotion” was “disturbed.” And of course the only way in which the “devotion” of such “faithful” ones could be freed from all disturbance, was to close the circuses and the theaters at church time.

In the logic of this theory, there was one more step to be taken. To see how logically it came about, let us glance at the steps taken from the first

one up to this point: First, the church had all work on Sunday forbidden, in order that the people might attend to things divine: work was forbidden, that the people might worship. But the people would not worship: they went to the circus and the theater instead of to church. Then the church had laws enacted closing the circuses and the theaters, in order that the people might attend church. But even then the people would not be devoted, nor attend church; for they had no real religion. The next step to be taken, therefore, in the logic of the situation, was to compel them to be devoted — to compel them to attend to things divine. This was the next step logically to be taken, and it was taken. The theocratical bishops were equal to the occasion. They were ready with a theory that exactly met the demands of the case; and one of the greatest of the Catholic Church Fathers and Catholic saints was the father of this Catholic saintly theory. He wrote: —

“It is, indeed, better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected.... Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain the highest grade of religious development.” — Augustine. ^{f298a}

Of this theory, the author who of all the church historians has best exposed the evil workings of this false theocracy, justly observes: —

“It was by Augustine, then that a theory was proposed and founded, which... contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition.” — Neander. ^{f299a}

The history of the Inquisition is only the history of this infamous theory of Augustine's. But this theory is only the logical sequence of the theory upon which the whole series of Sunday laws was founded.

In closing his history of this particular subject, the same author says: —

“In this way the Church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends.” — Neander. ^{f300}

This statement is correct. Constantine did many things to favor the bishops. He gave them money and political preference. He made their decisions in disputed cases final, as the decision of Jesus Christ. But in nothing that he

did for them did he give them power over those who did not belong to the church, to compel them to act as though they did, except in the one thing of the Sunday law. In the Sunday law, power was given to the church to compel those who did not belong to the church, and who were not subject to the jurisdiction of the church, to obey the commands of the church. In the Sunday law there was given to the church control of the civil power, that by it she could compel those who did not belong to the church to act as though they did. The history of Constantine's time may be searched through and through, and it will be found that in nothing did he give to the church any such power, except in this one thing — the Sunday law. Neander's statement is literally correct, that it was "in this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

That this may be set before the reader in as clear a light as possible, we shall here summarize the facts stated by Neander in their direct bearing. He says of the carrying into effect of the theocratical theory of the apostate bishops, that they made themselves dependent upon Constantine by their disputes, and "by their determination to use the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims." Then he mentions that first and second Sunday laws of Constantine, the Sunday law of A.D. 386, the Carthaginian council, resolution, and petition of 401, and the law of 425 in response to this petition; and then, without a break, and with direct reference to these Sunday laws, he says: "In this way the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends."

She started out with the determination to do it; she did it; and "In this way" she did it. And when she had secured control of the power of the state, she used it for the furtherance of her own aims, and that in her own despotic way, as announced in the inquisitorial theory of Augustine. The first step logically led to the last. And the theocratical leaders in the movement had the cruel courage to follow the first step unto the last, as framed in the words of Augustine, and illustrated in the horrors of the Inquisition during the fearful record of the dreary ages in which the bishopric of Rome was supreme over kings and nations.

CHAPTER 14.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

THE Donatist dispute had developed the decision and established the fact that it was “the Catholic Church of Christians” in which was embodied the Christianity which was to be recognized as the imperial religion.

Constantine had allied himself with the church only for political advantage. The only use he had for the church, was in a political way. Its value for this purpose lay entirely in its unity. If the church should be all broken up and divided into separate bodies, its value as a political factor would be gone.

The Catholic Church, on her part, had long asserted the necessity of unity with the bishopric, a unity in which the bishopric should be possessed of authority to prohibit, as well as power to prevent, heresy. The church had supported and aided Constantine in the overthrow of Maxentius and the conquest of Rome. She again supported and materially aided him in the overthrow of Licinius and the complete conquest of the whole empire. She had received a rich reward for her assistance in the first political move; and she now demanded her pay for services rendered in the second and final one.

The Catholic Church demanded assistance in her ambitious aim to make her power and authority absolute over all; and for Constantine’s purposes it was essential that the church should be a unit. These two considerations combined to produce results both immediate and remote, that proved a curse to the time then present and to ages to follow. The immediate result was that Constantine had no sooner compassed the destruction of Licinius in A.D. 323, than he issued an edict against the Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, Cataphrygians, and “all who devised and supported heresies by means of private assemblies,” denouncing them and their heresies, and commanding them all to enter the Catholic Church. The edict runs as follows: —

“Victor Constantinus Maximus Augustus, to the heretics:
Understand now, by this present statute, ye Novatians,
Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, ye who are called
Cataphrygians, and all ye who devise and support heresies by
means of your private assemblies, with what a tissue of falsehood

and vanity, with what destructive and venomous errors, your doctrines are inseparably interwoven; so that through you the healthy soul is stricken with disease, and the living becomes the prey of everlasting death. Ye haters and enemies of truth and life, in league with destruction: All your counsels are opposed to the truth, but familiar with deeds of baseness; fit subjects for the fabulous follies of the stage: and by these ye frame falsehoods, oppress the innocent, and withhold the light from them that believe. Ever trespassing under the mask of godliness, ye fill all things with defilement: ye pierce the pure and guileless conscience with deadly wounds, while ye withdraw, one may almost say, the very light of day from the eyes of men. But why should I particularize, when to speak of your criminality as it deserves, demands more time and leisure than I can give? For so long and unmeasured is the catalogue of your offenses, so hateful and altogether atrocious are they, that a single day would not suffice to recount them all. And indeed it is well to turn one's ears and eyes from such a subject, lest by a description of each particular evil, the pure sincerity and freshness of one's own faith be impaired. Why then do I still bear with such abounding evil; especially since this protracted clemency is the cause that some who were sound are become tainted with this pestilent disease? Why not at once strike, as it were, at the root of so great a mischief by a public manifestation of displeasure?

“Forasmuch, then, as it is no longer possible to bear with your pernicious errors, we give warning by this present statute that none of you henceforth presume to assemble yourselves together. We have directed, accordingly, that you be deprived of all the houses in which you are accustomed to hold your assemblies: and our care in this respect extends so far as to forbid the holding of your superstitious and senseless meetings, not in public merely, but in any private house or place whatsoever. Let those of you, therefore, who are desirous of embracing the true and pure religion, take the far better course of entering the Catholic Church, and uniting with it in holy fellowship, whereby you will be enabled to arrive at the knowledge of the truth. In any case, the delusions of your perverted understandings must entirely cease to mingle with and mar the felicity of our present times; I mean the impious and wretched doublemindedness of heretics and schismatics. For it is an object

worthy of that prosperity which we enjoy through the favor of God, to endeavor to bring back those who in time past were living in the hope of future blessing, from all irregularity and error, to the right path, from darkness to light, from vanity to truth, from death to salvation. And in order that this remedy may be applied with effectual power, we have commanded (as before said), that you be positively deprived of every gathering point for your superstitious meetings; I mean all the houses of prayer (if such be worthy of the name) which belong to heretics, and that these be made over without delay to the Catholic Church; that any other places be confiscated to the public service, and no facility whatever be left for any future gathering; in order that from this day forward none of your unlawful assemblies may presume to appear in any public or private place. Let this edict be made public.”^{f301}

Some of the penal regulations of this edict “were copied from the edicts of Diocletian; and this method of conversion was applauded by the same bishops who had felt the hand of oppression, and had pleaded for the rights of humanity.” — Gibbon.^{f302}

The Donatist dispute resulted in the establishment of the Catholic Church. Yet that dispute involved no question of doctrine, but of discipline only. Just at this time, however, there sprang into prominence the famous Trinitarian Controversy, which involved, and under the circumstances demanded, an imperial decision as to what was the Catholic Church in point of doctrine — what was the Catholic Church in deed and in truth, and which plunged the empire into a sea of tumult and violence that continued as long as the empire itself continued, and afflicted other nations after the empire had perished.

A certain Alexander was bishop of Alexandria. Arius was a presbyter in charge of a parish church in the same city. Alexander attempted to explain “the unity of the Holy Trinity.” Arius dissented from the views set forth by Alexander. A sort of synod of the presbyters of the city was called, and the question was discussed. Both sides claimed the victory, and the controversy spread. Then Alexander convened a council of a hundred bishops, by the majority of which the views of Alexander were indorsed. Upon this, Arius was commanded to abandon his own opinions, and adopt Alexander’s. Arius refused, and Alexander excommunicated him and all

who held with him in opinion, of whom there were a considerable number of bishops and other clergy, and many of the people.

The partisans of Arius wrote to many bishops a statement of their views, with a request that if those views were considered correct, they would use their influence to have Alexander receive them again to communion; but if they thought the views to be wrong in any particular, they would signify it, and show them what were the correct opinions on the question. Arius for himself wrote a book entitled “Thalia,” — Songs of Joy — a collection of songs in which he set forth his views. This expedient took well, for in the excited state of the parties, his doctrinal songs were hummed everywhere. Alexander on his part, likewise, sent circular letters to the principal bishops round about. The controversy spread everywhere, and as it spread, it deepened.

One of the chief reasons for the rapid and wide-spread interest in the controversy was that nobody could comprehend or understand the question at issue. “It was the excess of dogmatism founded upon the most abstract words in the most abstract region of human thought.” — Stanley.^{f303} There was no dispute about the fact of there being a Trinity, it was about the nature of the Trinity. Both parties believed in precisely the same Trinity, but they differed upon the precise relationship which the Son bears to the Father. Alexander declared: —

“The Son is immutable and unchangeable, all-sufficient and perfect, like the Father, differing only in this one respect, that the Father is unbegotten. He is the exact image of his Father. Everything is found in the image which exists in its archetype; and it was this that our Lord taught when he said, ‘My Father is greater than I.’ And accordingly we believe that the Son proceeded from the Father; for he is the reflection of the glory of the Father, and the figure of his substance. But let no one be led from this to the supposition that the Son is unbegotten, as is believed by some who are deficient in intellectual power: for to say that he was, that he has always been, and that he existed before all ages, is not to say that he is unbegotten.”^{f305}

Arius said: —

“We say and believe, and have taught, and do teach, that the Son is not unbegotten, nor in any way unbegotten, even in part; and that

he does not derive his subsistence from any matter; but that by his own will and counsel he has subsisted before time, and before ages, as perfect God, and only begotten and unchangeable, and that he existed not before he was begotten, or created, or purposed, or established. For he was not unbegotten. We are persecuted because we say that the Son had a beginning, but that God was without beginning. This is really the cause of our persecution, and likewise, because we say he is from nothing. And this we say, because he is neither part of God, nor of any subjacent matter.”^{f306}

From these statements by the originators of the respective sides of this controversy, it appears that with the exception of a single point, the two views were identical, only being stated in different ways. The single point where the difference lay was that Alexander held that the Son was begotten of the very essence of the Father, and is therefore of the same substance with the Father, while Arius held that the Son was begotten by the Father, not from his own essence, but from nothing; but that when he was thus begotten, he was, and is, of precisely the like substance with the Father.

Whether the Son of God, therefore, is of the same substance, or only of like substance, with the Father, was the question in dispute. The controversy was carried on in Greek, and as expressed in Greek the whole question turned upon a single letter. The word which expressed Alexander's belief, is *Homoousion*. The word which expressed the belief of Arius, is *Homoiousion*. One of the words has two “i’s” in it, and the other has but one; but why the word should or should not have that additional “i,” neither party could ever exactly determine. Even Athanasius himself, who succeeded Alexander in the bishopric of Alexandria, and transcended him in every other quality, “has candidly confessed that whenever he forced his understanding to meditate upon the divinity of the Logos, his toilsome and unavailing efforts recoiled on themselves; that the more he thought, the less he comprehended; and the more he wrote, the less capable was he of expressing his thoughts.” — Gibbon.^{f307}

It could not possibly be otherwise, because it was an attempt of the finite to measure, to analyze, and even to dissect, the Infinite. It was an attempt to make the human superior to the divine. God is infinite. No finite mind can comprehend him as he actually is. Christ is the Word — the expression of the thought — of God; and none but he knows the depth of the meaning of that Word. “He had a name written that no man knew but he himself;...

and his name is called The Word of God.” ^{<66912>}Revelation 19:12, 13. Neither the nature nor the relationship of the Father and the Son can ever be measured by the mind of man. “No man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” ^{<4117>}Matthew 11:27. This revelation of the Father by the Son cannot be complete in this world. It will require the eternal ages for man to understand “the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus.” ^{<4117>}Ephesians 2:7. Therefore, no man’s conception of God can ever be fixed as the true conception of God. God will still be infinitely beyond the broadest comprehension that the mind of man can measure. The true conception of God can be attained only through “the Spirit of revelation in the knowledge of Him.” ^{<4117>}Ephesians 1:17. Therefore the only thing for men to do to find out the Almighty to perfection, is, by true faith in Jesus Christ, to receive the abiding presence of this Spirit of revelation, and then quietly and joyfully wait for the eternal ages to reveal “the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God.”

One who lived near the time of, and was well acquainted with, the whole matter, has well remarked that the discussion “seemed not unlike a contest in the dark; for neither party appeared to understand distinctly the grounds on which they calumniated one another. Those who objected to the word ‘consubstantial’ [Homooousion, of the same substance], conceived that those who approved it, favored the opinion of Sabellius and Montanus; they therefore called them blasphemers, as subverters of the existence of the Son of God. And again the advocates of this term, charging their opponents with polytheism, inveighed against them as introducers of heathen superstitions.... In consequence of these misunderstandings, each of them wrote volumes, as if contending against adversaries: and although it was admitted on both sides that the Son of God has a distinct person and existence, and all acknowledged that there is one God in a Trinity of persons, yet, from what cause I am unable to divine, they could not agree among themselves, and therefore were never at peace.” — Socrates. ^{f308}

That which puzzled Socrates need not puzzle us. Although he could not divine why they should not agree when they believed the same thing, we may very readily do so, with no fear of mistake. The difficulty was that each disputant required that all the others should not only believe what he believed, but that they should believe this precisely as he believed it, whereas just how he believed it, he himself could not define. And that

which made them so determined in this respect was that “the contest was now not merely for a superiority over a few scattered and obscure communities: it was agitated on a far vaster theater — that of the Roman world. The proselytes whom it disputed were sovereigns.... It but but judging on the common principles of human nature to conclude that the grandeur of the prize supported the ambition and inflamed the passions of the contending parties; that human motives of political power and aggrandizement mingled with the more spiritual influence of the love of truth, and zeal for the purity of religion.” — Milman.^{f309}

It is but just to Arius, however, to say that he had nothing to do with the political aspect of the question. He defended his views in the field of argument, and maintained his right to think for himself. Others took up the argument with more ambitious motives, and these soon carried it far beyond the power or the guidance of Arius. The chief of these and really the leader of the Arian party in the politicotheological contest, was Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia. This Eusebius is to be distinguished always from Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, who was Constantine’s favorite, although both were Arians.

The controversy spread farther and farther, and raged more fiercely as it spread. “All classes took part in it, and almost all took part with equal energy. ‘Bishop rose against bishop, district against district, only to be compared to the Symplegades dashed against each other on a stormy day.’ So violent were the discussions that they were parodied in the pagan theaters, and the emperor’s statues were broken in the public squares in the conflicts which took place. The common name by which the Arians and their system were designated (and we may conclude they were not wanting in retorts), was the Maniacs, — the Ariomaniacs, the Ariomania; and their frantic conduct on public occasions afterwards goes far to justify the appellation. Sailors, millers, and travelers sang the disputed doctrines at their occupations or on their journeys. Every corner, every alley of the city [this was said afterwards of Constantinople, but must have been still more true of Alexandria] was full of these discussions — the streets, the market-places, the drapers, the money-changers, the victualers. Ask a man ‘how many oboli?’ he answers by dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread, and you are told, ‘The Son is subordinate to the Father.’ Ask if the bath is ready, and you are told, ‘The Son arose out of nothing.’” — Stanley.^{f310}

Constantine's golden dream of a united Christendom was again grievously disturbed. The bow of promise — of the bishops — which had so brilliantly irradiated all the political prospect when his alliance was formed with the church party, was rudely dissipated by the dark cloud of ecclesiastical ambition, and the angry storm of sectarian strife. He wrote a letter to Alexander and Arius, stating to them his mission of uniting the world under one head, and his anxious desire that there should be unity among all, and exhorted them to lay aside their contentions, forgive one another, use their efforts for the restoration of peace, and so give back to him his quiet days and tranquil nights. The letter is long, but it is worth giving in full, not only on account of the present question, but because it so clearly shows the views and the hopes of Constantine, as to the unity of the church; and which controlled him in his alliance with the church party.

“Victor Constantinus Maximus Augustus, to Alexander and Arius: I call that God to witness (as well I may), who is the helper of my endeavors, and the Preserver of all men, that I had a twofold reason for undertaking that duty which I have now effectually performed.

“My design then was, first, to bring the diverse judgments formed by all nations respecting the Deity to a condition, as it were, of settled uniformity; and, secondly, to restore a healthy tone to the system of the world, then suffering under the malignant power of a grievous distemper. Keeping these objects in view, I look forward to the accomplishment of the one with the secret gaze of the mental eye, while the other I endeavored to secure by the aid of military power. For I was aware that, if I should succeed in establishing, according to my hopes, a common harmony of sentiment among all the servants of God, the general course of affairs would also experience a change correspondent to the pious desires of them all.

“Finding, then, that the whole of Africa was pervaded by an intolerable spirit of madness and folly, through the influences of those whose wanton temerity had presumed to rend the religion of the people into diverse sects, I was anxious to allay the virulence of this disorder, and could discover no other remedy equal to the occasion, except in sending some of yourselves to aid in restoring mutual harmony among the disputants, after I had removed that common enemy of mankind [Licinius] who had interposed his lawless sentence for the prohibition of your holy synods.

“For since the power of divine light, and the rule of our holy religion, which have illumined the world by their sacred radiance, proceeded in the first instance, through the favor of God, from the bosom, as it were, of the East, I naturally believed that you would be the first to promote the salvation of other nations, and resolved with all energy of purpose and diligence of inquiry to seek your aid. As soon, therefore, as I had secured my decisive victory and unquestionable triumph over my enemies, my first inquiry was concerning that object which I felt to be of paramount interest and importance.

“But, O glorious providence of God! How deep a wound did not my ears only, but my very heart, receive in the report that divisions existed among yourselves more grievous still than those which continued in that country, so that you, through whose aid I had hoped to procure a remedy for the errors of others, are in a state which demands even more attention than theirs. And yet, having made a careful inquiry into the origin and foundation of these differences. I find the cause to be of a truly insignificant character, and quite unworthy of such fierce contention. Feeling myself, therefore, compelled to address you in this letter, and to appeal at the same time to your unanimity and sagacity, I call on Divine Providence to assist me in the task, while I interrupt your dissensions in the character of a minister of peace. And with reason: for if I might expect (with the help of a higher power) to be able without difficulty, by a judicious appeal to the pious feelings of those who heard me, to recall them to a better spirit, how can I refrain from promising myself a far easier and more speedy adjustment of this difference, when the cause which hinders general harmony of sentiment is intrinsically trifling and of little moment?

“I understand, then, that the occasion of your present controversy is to be traced to the following circumstances: that you, Alexander, demanded of the presbyters what opinion they severally maintained respecting a certain passage in the divine law, or rather, I should say, that you asked them something connected with an unprofitable question: and then that you, Arius, inconsiderately gave utterance to objections which ought never to have been conceived at all, or if conceived, should have been buried in profound silence. Hence it was that a dissension arose between you; the meeting of the synod

was prohibited; and the holy people, rent into diverse parties, no longer preserved the unity of the one body. Now, therefore, do ye both exhibit an equal degree of forbearance, and receive the advice which your fellow-servant feels himself justly entitled to give.

“What then is this advice? It was wrong in the first instance to propose such questions as these, or to reply to them when propounded. For those points of discussion which are enjoined by the authority of no law, but rather suggested by the contentious spirit which is fostered by misused leisure, even though they may be intended merely as an intellectual exercise, ought certainly to be confined to the region of our own thoughts, and neither hastily produced in the public assemblies of the saints, nor unadvisedly intrusted to the general ear. For how very few are there able either accurately to comprehend, or adequately to explain, subjects so sublime and abstruse in their nature? Or, granting that one were fully competent for this, in how few ordinary minds will he succeed in producing conviction? Or who, again, in dealing with questions of such subtle nicety as these, can secure himself against a dangerous declension from the truth? It is incumbent, therefore, on us in these cases to be sparing of our words, lest, in case we ourselves are unable, through the feebleness of our natural faculties, to give a clear explanation of the subject before us, or, on the other hand, in case the slowness of our hearers’ understandings disables them from arriving at an accurate apprehension of what we say, from one or other of these causes we reduce the people to the alternative either of blasphemy or schism.

“Let therefore both the unguarded questions and the inconsiderate answer receive your mutual forgiveness. For your difference has not arisen on any leading doctrines or precepts of the divine law, nor have you introduced any new dogma respecting the worship of God. You are in truth of one and the same judgment: you may therefore well join in that communion which is the symbol of united fellowship.

“For as long as you continue to contend about these truly insignificant questions, it is not fitting that so large a portion of God’s people should be under the direction of your judgment, since you are thus divided between yourselves. I believe it indeed to be

not merely unbecoming, but positively evil, that such should be the case. But I will appeal to your good sense by a familiar instance to illustrate my meaning: You know that philosophers, while they all adhere to the general tenets of their respective sects, are frequently at issue on some particular assertion or statement: and yet, though they may differ as to the perfection of a principle, they are recalled to harmony of sentiment by the uniting power of their common doctrines. If this be true, is it not far more reasonable that you, who are the ministers of the supreme God, should be of one mind respecting the profession of the same religion?

“But let us still more thoughtfully and with closer attention examine what I have said, and see whether it be right that, on the ground of some trifling and foolish verbal difference between ourselves, brethren should assume towards each other the attitude of enemies, and the august meeting of the synod be rent by profane disunion, because we will wrangle together on points so trivial and altogether unessential. Surely this conduct is unworthy of us, and rather characteristic of childish ignorance, than consistent with the wisdom of priests and men of sense. Let us withdraw ourselves with a good will from these temptations of the devil. Our great God and common Saviour has granted the same light to us all. Permit me, who am his servant, to bring my task to a successful issue, under the direction of his Providence, that I may be enabled through my exhortations, and diligence, and earnest admonition, to recall his people to the fellowship of one communion. For since you have, as I said, but one faith, and one sentiment respecting our religion, and since the divine commandment in all its parts enjoins on us all the duty of maintaining a spirit of concord, let not the circumstance which has led to a slight difference between you, since it affects not the general principles of truth, be allowed to prolong any division or schism among you.

“And this I say without in any way desiring to force you to entire unity of judgment in regard to this truly idle question, whatever its real nature may be. For the dignity of your synod may be preserved, and the communion of your whole body maintained unbroken, however wide a difference may exist among you as to unimportant matters. For we are not all of us like-minded on every subject, nor is there such a thing as one disposition and judgment common to all

alike. As far then as regards the divine Providence, let there be one faith, and one understanding among you, one united judgment in reference to God. But as to your subtle disputations on questions of little or no significance, though you may be unable to harmonize in sentiment, such differences should be consigned to the secret custody of your own mind and thoughts. And now let the precious bonds of common affection, let faith in the truth, let the honor due to God, and the observance of his law, continue immovably established among you. Resume, then, your mutual feelings of affection and regard; permit the whole body of the people once more to unite in that embrace which should be natural to all: and do ye yourselves, having purified your souls, as it were, from every angry thought, once more return to your former fellowship. For it often happens that when a reconciliation is affected by the removal of the causes of enmity, friendship becomes even sweeter than it was before.

“Restore me then my quiet days and untroubled nights, that henceforth the joy of light undimmed by sorrow, the delight of a tranquil life, may continue to be my portion. Else must I needs mourn, with copious and constant tears, nor shall I be able to pass the residue of my days without disquietude. For while the people of God, whose fellowservant I am, are thus divided amongst themselves by an unreasonable and pernicious spirit of contention, how is it possible that I shall be able to maintain tranquillity of mind? And I will give you a proof how great my sorrow has been on this behalf. Not long since I had visited Nicomedia, and intended forthwith to proceed from that city to the East. It was while I was on the point of hastening towards you, and was already among you in thought and desire, that the news of this matter arrested my intended progress, that I might not be compelled to witness that which I felt myself scarcely able even to hear. Open then for me henceforward by your unity of judgment that road to the regions of the East which your dissensions have closed against me, and permit me speedily to see the happiness both of yourselves and of all other provinces, and to render due acknowledgment to God in the language of praise and thanksgiving for the restoration of general concord and liberty to all.”^{f311}

This letter he sent by the hand of Hosius, whom he made his ambassador to reconcile the disputants. But both the letter and the mission of Hosius were in vain; and yet the more so, by the very fact that the parties were now assured that the controversy had attracted the interested attention of the imperial authority. As imperial favor, imperial patronage, and imperial power, were the chief objects of the contest; and as this effort of the emperor showed that the reward was almost within the grasp of whichever party might prove successful; the contention was deepened rather than abated.

It had already been decided that the imperial favor and patronage was for the Catholic Church. Each of these parties claimed to be the orthodox and only Catholic Church. The case of the Donatists had been referred to a council of bishops for adjudication. It was but natural that this question should be treated in the same way. But whereas the case of the Donatists affected only a very small portion of the empire, this question directly involved the whole East, and greatly concerned much of the West. More than this, the Catholic religion was now the religion of the empire. This dispute was upon the question as to what is the truth of the Catholic religion. Therefore if the question was to be settled, it must be settled for the whole empire. These considerations demanded a general council. Therefore, a general council was called, A.D. 325, which met at the city of Nice, the latter part of May or the first part of June, in that year.

The number of bishops that composed the council was three hundred and eighteen, while the number of “the presbyters and deacons, in their train, and the crowd of acolytes and other attendants, was altogether beyond computation” (Eusebius^{f312}), all of whom traveled and were entertained to and from the council, and while there, at the public expense. “They came as fast as they could run, in almost a frenzy of excitement and enthusiasm; the actual crowd must have been enough to have metamorphosed the place.” And “shrill above all other voices, vehement above all other disputants, ‘brandishing their arguments like spears, against those who sat under the same roof and ate off the same tables as themselves,’ were the combatants from Alexandria, who had brought to its present pass the question which the council was called to decide.” — Stanley.^{f313}

The emperor did not arrive at Nice for several days after the others had reached that place; but when he came, “He had no sooner taken up his quarters in the palace of Nicaea, than he found showered in upon him a

number of parchment rolls, or letters, containing complaints and petitions against each other from the larger part of the assembled bishops. We cannot ascertain with certainty whether they were collected in a single day, or went on accumulating day after day. It was a poor omen for the unanimity which he had so much at heart.... We are expressly told both by Eusebius and Sozomen, that one motive which had drawn many to the council was the hope of settling their own private concerns, and promoting their own private interests.... There, too, were the pent-up grudges and quarrels of years, which now for the first time had an opportunity of making themselves heard. Never before had these remote, often obscure, ministers of a persecuted sect come within the range of imperial power. He whose presence was for the first time so close to them, bore the same authority of which the apostle had said that it was the supreme earthly distributor of justice to mankind. Still after all due allowance, it is impossible not to share in the emperor's astonishment that this should have been the first act of the first Ecumenical Assembly of the Christian Church." — Stanley.^{f314}

The council met in a large hall in the palace of the emperor, which had been arranged for the purpose. In the center of the room on a kind of throne, was placed a copy of the gospels; at one end of the hall was placed a richly carved throne, which was to be occupied by Constantine. The day came for the formal opening of the assembly. The bishops were all assembled with their accompanying presbyters and deacons; but as it was an imperial council, it could not be opened but by the emperor himself; and they waited in silence for him to come. "At last a signal from without — probably a torch raised by the 'cursor' or avaut-courier — announced that the emperor was close at hand. The whole assembly rose and stood on their feet; and then for the first time set their admiring gaze on Constantine, the conqueror, the august, the great.

"He entered. His towering stature, his strong-built frame, his broad shoulders, his handsome features, were worthy of his grand position. There was a brightness in his look and mingled expression of fierceness and gentleness in his lion-like eye, which well became one who, as Augustus before him, had fancied, and perhaps still fancied, himself to be the favorite of the sun-god Apollo. The bishops were further struck by the dazzling, perhaps barbaric, magnificence of his dress. Always careful of his appearance, he was so on this occasion in an eminent degree. His long hair, false or

real, was crowned with the imperial diadem of pearls. His purple or scarlet robe blazed with precious stones and gold embroidery. He was shod no doubt in the scarlet shoes then confined to emperors, now perpetuated in the pope and cardinals. Many of the bishops had probably never seen any greater functionary than a remote provincial magistrate, and gazing at his splendid figure as he passed up the hall between their ranks, remembering too what he had done for their faith and for their church, — we may well believe that the simple and the worldly both looked upon him, as though he were an angel of God, descended straight from heaven.” — Stanley. ^{f315}

He paraded thus up the whole length of the hall to where the seat of wrought gold had been set for him; then he turned, facing the assembly, and pretended to be so abashed by the presence of so much holiness, that he would not take his seat until the bishops had signalled to him to do so; then he sat down, and the others followed suit. On one side of Constantine sat Hosius, on the other, Eusebius. As soon as all had taken their seats after the entrance of Constantine, Eusebius arose and delivered an oration in honor of the emperor, closing with a hymn of thanksgiving to God, for Constantine’s final victory over Licinius. Eusebius resumed his seat, and Constantine arose and delivered to the assembly the following address: —

“It has, my friends, been the object of my highest wishes, to enjoy your sacred company, and having obtained this, I confess my thankfulness to the King of all, that in addition to all my other blessings, he has granted to me this greatest of all — I mean, to receive you all assembled together, and to see one common, harmonious opinion of all. Let, then, no envious enemy injure our happiness, and after the destruction of the impious power of the tyrants by the might of God our Saviour, let not the spirit of evil overwhelm the divine law with blasphemies; for to me far worse than any war or battle is the civil of the church of God; yes, far more painful than the wars which have raged without. As, then, by the assent and co-operation of a higher power I have gained my victories over my enemies, I thought that nothing remained but to give God thanks, and to rejoice with those who have been delivered by us. But since I learned of your divisions, contrary to all expectations, I gave the report my first consideration; and praying that this also might be healed through my assistance, I called you all together without delay. I rejoice at the mere sight of your assembly;

but the moment that I shall consider the chief fulfillment of my prayers, will be when I see you all joined together in heart and soul, and determining on one peaceful harmony for all, which it should well become you who are consecrated to God, to preach to others. Do not, then, delay, my friends; do not delay, ministers of God, and good servants of our common Lord and Saviour, to remove all grounds of difference, and to wind up by laws of peace every link of controversy. Thus will you have done what is most pleasing to the God who is over all, and you will render the greatest boon to me, your fellow-servant.” ^{f316}

Thus the council was formally opened, and then the emperor signified to the judges of the assembly to go on with the proceedings. “From this moment the flood-gates of debate were opened wide; and from side to side recriminations and accusations were bandied to and fro, without regard to the imperial presence. He remained unmoved amid the clatter of angry voices, turning from one side of the hall to the other, giving his whole attention to the questions proposed, bringing together the violent partisans.” — Stanley. ^{f317} To end their personal spites, and turn their whole attention to the question which was to come properly before the assembly, he took from the folds of his mantle the whole bundle of their complaints and recriminations against one another, which they had submitted to him immediately upon his arrival. He laid the bundle out before the assembly bound up, and sealed with the imperial ring. Then, after stating that he had not read one of them, he ordered a brazier to be brought in, and at once burned them in the presence of the whole assembly. As they were burning, he addressed the authors of them in the following words: —

“‘You have been made by God priests and rulers, to judge and decide,... and have even been made gods, so highly raised as you are above men; for it is written, “I have said ye are gods, and ye are all the children of the Most High;” “and God stood in the congregation of the gods, and in the midst he judges the gods.” You ought really to neglect these common matters, and devote yourselves to the things of God. It is not for me to judge of what awaits the judgment of God only.’ And as the libels vanished into ashes, he urged them, ‘Never to let the faults of men in their consecrated offices be publicly known to the scandal and temptation of the multitude.’ ‘Nay,’ he added, doubtless spreading

out the folds of his imperial mantle as he spoke, ‘even though I were with my own eyes to see a bishop in the act of gross sin, I would throw my purple robe over him, that no one might suffer from the sight of such a crime.’”^{f318}

Then the great question that had caused the calling of the council was taken up. There were three parties in the council — those who sided with Alexander, those who sided with Arius, and those who were non-committal, or, through hope of being mediators, held the middle ground. Arius, not being a bishop, could not hold an official seat in the council, but he had come at the express command of Constantine, and “was frequently called upon to express his opinions.” Athanasius, who was more responsible for the present condition of the dispute than was Alexander himself, though only a deacon, came with his bishop Alexander. He, likewise, though not entitled to an official place in the council, played not a small part in the discussion and in bringing about the final result of the council.

The party of Alexander and Athanasius, it was soon discovered, could depend upon the majority of the council; and they determined to use this power in the formulation of such a statement of doctrine as would suit themselves first, and if it should be found impossible for the party of Arius honestly to accept it, so much the better they would be pleased.

In the discussion, some of the songs which Arius had written, were read. As soon as Alexander’s party heard them, they threw up their hands in horror, and then clapped them upon their ears and shut their eyes, that they might not be defiled with the fearful heresy.

Next the draft of a creed was brought in, signed by eighteen bishops of the party of Arius; but it was not suffered to exist long enough for anybody ever to obtain a copy. Their opponents broke into a wild uproar, tore the document to pieces, and expelled Arius from the assembly.

Next, Eusebius of Caesarea, — Constantine’s panegyrist — thought to bring the parties together by presenting a creed that had been largely in use before this dispute ever arose. He stated that this confession of faith was one which he had learned in his childhood, from the bishop of Caesarea, and one which he accepted at his baptism, and which he had taught through his whole career, both as a presbyter and as a bishop. As an additional argument, and one which he intended to be of great weight in

the council, he declared that “it had been approved by the emperor, the beloved of heaven, who had already seen it.” It read as follows: —

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things both visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the First-born of every creature, begotten of the Father before all worlds, by whom also all things were made. Who for our salvation was made flesh, and lived amongst men, and suffered, and rose again on the third day, and ascended to the Father, and shall come in glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in one Holy Ghost. Believing each of them to be and to have existed, the Father, only the Father; and the Son, only the Son; and the Holy Ghost, only the Holy Ghost: as also our Lord sending forth his own disciples to preach, said, ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:’ concerning which things we affirm that it is so, and that we so think, and that it has long so been held, and that we remain steadfast to death for this faith, anathematizing every godless heresy. That we have thought these things from our heart and soul, from the time that we have known ourselves, and that we now think and say thus in truth, we testify in the name of Almighty God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, being able to prove even by demonstration, and to persuade you that in the past times also thus we believed and preached.”^{f319}

As soon as this was read in the council, the party of Arius all signified their willingness to subscribe to it. But this did not suit the party of Alexander and Athanasius; it was rather the very thing that they did not want, for “they were determined to find some form of words which no Arian could receive.” They hunted about, therefore, for some point or some word, upon which they could reject it. It will be noticed that this creed says nothing about the substance of the Son of God, while that was the very question which had brought the council together. Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, was chief of the Arians who held seats in the council. At this point a letter was brought forth. which he had formerly written, in which he had stated that “to assert the Son to be uncreated, would be to say that he was ‘of one substance’ — Homoousion — with the Father, and to say that ‘He was of one substance’ was a proposition evidently absurd.”

This gave to the party of Alexander and Athanasius the very opportunity which they desired; it supplied from the opposite party the very word upon which they had all the time insisted, and one of the chiefs of that party had declared that the use of the word in that connection was evidently absurd. If they, therefore, should insist upon the use of that very word, it would certainly exclude the Arian party. "The letter produced a violent excitement. There was the very test of which they were in search; the letter was torn in pieces to mark their indignation, and the phrase which he had pledged himself to reject became the phrase which they pledged themselves to adopt." — Stanley. ^{f320}

As Constantine had approved the creed already read by Eusebius, the question of the party of Alexander now was whether he would approve it with the addition of this word, and the hopes of both parties now hung trembling upon the emperor. Hosius and his associates, having the last consultation with him, brought him over to their side. At the next meeting of the assembly, he again presented the creed of Eusebius, approved it, and called upon all to adopt it. Seeing, however, that the majority would not accept the creed of Eusebius as it was, Constantine decided to "gain the assent of the orthodox, that is, the most powerful, part of the assembly," by inserting the disputed word. "He trusted that by this insertion they might be gained, and yet that, under the pressure of fear and favor, the others might not be altogether repelled. He therefore took the course the most likely to secure this result, and professed himself the patron and also the interpreter of the new phrase." — Stanley. ^{f321}

Constantine ordered the addition of the disputed word. The party of Alexander and Athanasius, now assured of the authority of the emperor, required the addition of other phrases to the same purpose, so that when the creed was finally written out in full, it read as follows: —

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible.

"And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is to say, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things in earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down, and was made flesh, and

was made man, suffered, and rose again on the third day , went up into the heavens, and is to come again to judge the quick and dead.

“And in the Holy Ghost.

“But those that say, ‘There was when he was not,’ and ‘Before he was begotten he was not, and that he came into existence from what was not,’ or who profess that the Son of God is of a different person or ‘substance.’ or that he is created, or changeable, or variable, are anathematized by the Catholic Church.”^{f322}

Thus came the original Nicene Creed. Constantine’s influence carried with it many in the council, but seventeen bishops refused to subscribe to it. The emperor then commanded all to sign it under penalty of banishment. This brought to terms all of them but five. Eusebius of Caesarea, the panegyrist and one of the counselors of Constantine, took a whole day to “deliberate.” In his deliberation he consulted the emperor , who so explained the term Homoousion that it could be understood as Homoiousion. He “declared that the word, as he understood it, involved no such material unity of the persons of the God-head as Eusebius feared might be deduced from it.” — Stanley.^{f323} In this sense, therefore, Eusebius adopted the test, and subscribed to the creed.

Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice subscribed to the body of the creed, but refused to subscribe to the curse which it pronounced upon the Arian doctrines. Sentence of banishment was pronounced; then they yielded and subscribed, yet they were removed from their bishoprics, and Catholics were put in their places. Two of the other bishops, however, — Theonas of Marmarica in Libya, and Secundus of Ptolemais, — absolutely refused from first to last to sign the creed, and they were banished. As for Arius, he seems to have departed from Nice soon after he was expelled from the council. Sentence of banishment was pronounced against him with the others. But as he was the chief expositor of the condemned doctrines, Constantine published against him the following edict: —

“Victor Constantine Maximus Augustus, to the bishops and people: Since Arius has imitated wicked and impious persons, it is just that he should undergo the like ignominy. Wherefore as Porphyry, that enemy of piety, for having composed licentious treatises against religion, found a suitable recompense, and such as thenceforth branded him with infamy overwhelming him with deserved

reproach, his impious writings also having been destroyed; so now it seems fit both that Arius and such as hold his sentiments should be denominated Porphyrians, that they may take their appellation from those whose conduct they have imitated. And in addition to this, if any treatise composed by Arius should be discovered, let it be consigned to the flames, in order that not only his depraved doctrine may be suppressed, but also that no memorial of him may be by any means left. This therefore I decree, that if any one shall be detected in concealing a book compiled by Arius, and shall not instantly bring it forward and burn it, the penalty for this offense shall be death; for immediately after conviction the criminal shall suffer capital punishment. May God preserve you.”^{f324}

“His book, ‘Thalia,’ was burnt on the spot; and this example was so generally followed, that it became a very rare work.” — Stanley.

^{f325} The decree banishing Arius was shortly so modified as simply to prohibit his returning to Alexandria.

When the council finally closed its labors, Constantine gave, in honor of the bishops, the grand banquet before mentioned, in which it was pretended that the kingdom of God was come, and at which he loaded them with presents.

He then exhorted them to unity and forbearance, and dismissed them to return to their respective places.

It was intended that the decision of this council, in the creed adopted, should put an end forever to all religious differences. “It is certain that the Creed of Nicaea was meant to be an end of theological controversy.” — Stanley.^{f325} Constantine published it as the inspiration of God. In a letter to the “Catholic Church of the Alexandrians,” announcing the decision of the council, he said: —

“That which has commended itself to the judgment of three hundred bishops cannot be other than the doctrine of God; seeing that the Holy Spirit dwelling in the minds of so many dignified persons has effectually enlightened them respecting the divine will. Wherefore let no one vacillate or linger, but let all with alacrity return to the undoubted path of duty.”^{f326}

Another, expressing the views of the Catholic Church in this same century, ascribes absolute and irresistible infallibility to the decisions of the council. He flatly declares that even if those who composed the council had been “idiots, yet, as being illuminated by God and the grace of his Holy Spirit, they were utterly unable to err from the truth.” — Socrates.^{f327} And Athanasius declared: —

“The word of the Lord, which was given in the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, remaineth forever.”^{f328}

Those who had formed the creed were exalted as the Fathers of Nicaea, and then to the creed was applied the scripture, “Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set.”^{f329} From that time forth the words, “Stand by the landmark,” were considered a sufficient watchword to put every Catholic on his guard against the danger of heresy. “From this period we may date the introduction of rigorous articles of belief, which required the submissive assent of the mind to every word and letter of an established creed, and which raised the slightest heresy of opinion into a more fatal offense against God, and a more odious crime in the estimation of man, than the worst moral delinquency or the most flagrant deviation from the spirit of Christianity.” — Milman.^{f330}

In the unanimity of opinion attained by the council, however, the idea of inspiration from any source other than Constantine, is a myth, and even that was a vanishing quantity, because a considerable number of those who subscribed to the creed, did so against their honest convictions, and with the settled determination to secure a revision or a reversal just as soon as it could possibly be brought about: and to bring it about they would devote every waking moment of their lives.

Yet more than this, this theory proceeds upon the assumption that religious truth and doctrine are subject to the decision of the majority, than which nothing could possibly be farther from the truth. Even though the decision of the Council of Nicaea had been absolutely, and from honest conviction, spontaneously unanimous, it never could rest with the slightest degree of obligation or authority upon any soul, who had not arrived at the same conclusion from honest conviction derived from the free exercise of his own power of thought. There is no organization, nor tribunal, on earth that has any right to decide for anybody what is the truth upon any religious question. “The head of every man is Christ.” ~~1~~¹ 1 Corinthians 11:3. “One

is your Master, even Christ.” ^{<4238>}Matthew 23:8. “Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.... So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.” ^{<5144>}Romans 14:4, 12.

In the quest for truth every man is free to search, to believe, and to decide for himself alone. And his assent to any form of belief or doctrine, to be true, must spring from his own personal conviction that such is the truth. “The truth itself, forced on man otherwise than by its own inward power, becomes falsehood.” — Neander. ^{f331a} And he who suffers anything to be so forced upon him, utters a lie against himself and against God.

The realm of thought is the realm of God. Whosoever would attempt to restrict or coerce the free exercise of the thought of another, usurps the dominion of God, and exercises that of the devil. This is what Constantine did at the Council of Nice. This is what the majority of the Council of Nice itself did. In carrying out the purpose for which it was met, this is the only thing that it could do, no matter which side of the controversy should prove victorious. What Constantine and the Council of Nice did, was to open the way and set the wicked precedent for that despotism over thought, which continued for more than fourteen hundred dreary years, and which was carried to such horrible lengths when the pope succeeded to the place of Constantine as head over both Church and State.

To say that the Holy Spirit had anything whatever to do with the council either in discussing or deciding the question or in any other way, is but to argue that the Holy Spirit of God is but the subject and tool of the unholy passions of ambitious and wicked men.

CHAPTER 15.

ARIANISM BECOMES ORTHODOX.

AS before remarked, those who against their will had subscribed to the creed of the Council of Nice, were determined to redeem themselves as soon as possible, and by whatever means it could be accomplished. And they did accomplish it. The story is curious, and the lessons which it teaches are valuable.

Shortly after the dismissal of the Council of Nice, but in A.D. 326, Alexander died, and Athanasius succeeded to the episcopal seat of Alexandria. He, much more than Alexander, had been the life and soul of the controversy with Arius. It was he who had continually spurred on Alexander in the extreme and uncompromising attitude which he had maintained toward Arius. And now when, at the age of thirty years, he became clothed with the power and the prerogatives of the archbishopric of Alexandria, the controversy received a new impulse from both sides — from the side of the Catholics, by the additional pride and intensity of dogmatism of Athanasius; from the side of the Arians in a determination to humble the proud and haughty Athanasius. To this end the Arians at once began to apply themselves diligently to win over Constantine to their side, or at least to turn him against Athanasius.

In A.D. 327 died Constantine's sister, Constantia. She had held with the Arian party, having an Arian presbyter as her spiritual adviser. This presbyter had convinced her that Arius had been unjustly condemned by the council. In her dying moments "she entreated the emperor to reconsider the justice of the sentence against that innocent, as she declared, and misrepresented man." Constantine soon afterward sent a message to Arius, recalling him from banishment, and promising to send him back to Alexandria. Arius came and presented a confession of faith which proved satisfactory to the emperor. About the same time Constantine also restored to favor the other two leading Arians, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Ptolemais. "They returned in triumph to their dioceses, and ejected the bishops who had been appointed to their place." — Milman.^{f331} Hosius having returned to his place in Spain, Constantine fell under strong

Arian influences, and the Arian bishops began to use him for the accomplishment of their purposes.

In A.D. 328, Constantine made a journey to Jerusalem to dedicate the church that he had built there, and Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis both accompanied him. Eustathius, the bishop of Antioch, was a Catholic. In their journey, Eusebius and Theognis passed through Antioch, and set on foot a scheme to displace him; and when they returned, a council was hastily called, and upon charges of immorality and heresy, “Eustathius was deposed and banished by the imperial edict, to Thrace.... The city was divided into two fierce and hostile factions. They were on the verge of a civil war; and Antioch, where the Christians had first formed themselves into a Christian community, but for the vigorous interference of civil power and the timely appearance of an imperial commissioner, might have witnessed the first blood shed, at least in the East, in a Christian quarrel.”
— Milman.^{f332}

Next the Arian prelates exerted their influence to have the emperor fulfill his promise of restoring Arius to his place in Alexandria. They tried first by friendly representations and petitions, and at last by threats, to induce Athanasius to admit Arius again to membership in the church, but he steadily refused. Then they secured from the emperor a command that Athanasius should receive Arius and all his friends who wished to be received, to the fellowship of the church of Alexandria, declaring that unless he did so he should be deposed and exiled. Athanasius refused; and Constantine neither deposed him nor exiled him. Then the Arians invented against him many charges. Constantine summoned him to Nicomedia to answer. He came, and was fully acquitted, and the emperor sent him back with a letter to the church of Alexandria, in which he pronounced him a “man of God.”

The Arians then brought new accusations against him, this time even to the extent of murder. A synod of bishops was appointed to meet at Tyre to investigate these charges. As the synod was wholly Arian, Athanasius declined to appear; but at the positive command of the emperor he came, and succeeded in clearing himself of all the charges that could be tried in the synod. But as there were certain other charges which required to be investigated in Egypt, a committee was appointed for the purpose. Yet it was decreed by the synod that no one who belonged to the party of Athanasius should be a member of the committee. The committee reported

against Athanasius, as it was expected to do; and by the synod he was deposed from the archbishopric of Alexandria.

Athanasius appealed to the emperor, and went to Constantinople to present his plea. As Constantine rode along the street, he was met by a band of ecclesiastics, in the midst of which he recognized Athanasius. "The offended emperor, with a look of silent contempt, urged his horse onward," when Athanasius loudly exclaimed, "God shall judge between thee and me; since thou espousest the cause of my calumniators, I demand only that my enemies be summoned any my cause heard in the imperial presence." — Milman.^{f333} Constantine consented, and the Arian accusers were summoned to appear. At the head of the accusers were both Eusebius of Nicomedia and Eusebius of Caesarea, who were now in high favor with Constantine. When the investigation was opened, however, all the old charges were abandoned, and one entirely new was brought which was much more likely to have weight with the emperor than all the others put together. Constantinople, as well as Rome, was dependent upon Egypt for the wheat which supplied bread to its inhabitants. Athanasius was now accused of threatening to force Constantine to support him, by stopping the supplies of grain from the port of Alexandria. Whether Constantine really believed this charge or not, it accomplished its purpose. Athanasius was again condemned, and banished to Treves in Gaul, February, A.D. 336.

The return of Arius to Alexandria was the cause of continued tumult, and he was called to Constantinople. At the request of the emperor, Arius presented a new confession of faith, which proved satisfactory, and Constantine commanded the bishop of Constantinople to receive Arius to the fellowship of the church on a day of public worship — "it happened to be a Sabbath (Saturday) — on which day, as well as Sunday, public worship was held at Constantinople." — Neander.^{f334} The bishop absolutely refused to admit him. The Arians, under the authority of the emperor, threatened that the next day, Sunday, they would force their way into the church, and compel the admission of Arius to full membership in good and regular standing. Upon this the Athanasian party took refuge in "prayer;" the bishop prayed earnestly that, rather than the church should be so disgraced, Arius might die; and, naturally enough, Arius died on the evening of the same day. "In Constantinople, where men were familiar with Asiatic crimes, there was more than a suspicion of poison. But when Alexander's party proclaimed that his prayer had been answered, they

forgot what then that prayer must have been, and that the difference is little between praying for the death of a man and compassing it.” — Draper. ^{f335}
 The bishop of Constantinople conducted a solemn service of thanksgiving. “Athanasius, in a public epistle, alludes to the fate of Judas, which had befallen the traitor to the co-equal dignity of the Son. His hollow charity ill disguises his secret triumph,” and to Athanasius, ever afterward, the death of Arius was a standing argument and a sufficient evidence that in the death of the heretic, God had condemned the heresy. — Milman. ^{f336}

Petition after petition was presented to Constantine for the return of Athanasius to his place in Alexandria, but the emperor steadily denounced him as proud, turbulent, obstinate, and intractable, and refused all petitions. In 337, in the presence of death, Constantine was baptized by an Arian bishop; and thus closed the life of him upon whom a grateful church has bestowed the title of “the Great,” though, “tested by character, indeed, he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet has in ancient or modern times been applied.” — “Encyclopedia Britannica.” ^{f337}

Constantine was succeeded by his three sons; Constantine, aged twenty-one years; Constantius, aged twenty; and Constans, aged seventeen. They apportioned the empire amongst themselves. Constantine II had Constantinople and some portions of the West, with pre-eminence of rank; Constantius obtained Thrace, Egypt, and all the East; and Constans held the greater part of the West. Constantius was a zealous Arian, Constantine and Constans were no less zealous Catholics. The religious parties now had another element added to their strifes — they could use the religious differences of the emperors in their own interests. Athanasius being an exile at Treves, was in the dominions of Constans, his “fiery defender;” while the place of his bishopric was in the dominions of Constantius, his fiery antagonist. The Athanasian party, through Constantine II, succeeded in persuading Constantius to allow the return of Athanasius and all the other bishops who had been banished.

The return of these bishops again set all the East ablaze. The leaders of the Arian party addressed letters to the emperors, denouncing Athanasius. They held another council at Tyre, A.D. 340, in which they brought against him new charges, and condemned him upon them all. Immediately afterward a rival council was held at Alexandria, which acquitted Athanasius of all things in which the other council had condemned him. In this same year Constantine II was killed in a war with his brother Constans.

This left the empire and the religion to the two brothers — Constantius in Constantinople and the East, Constans in the West. In the dominions of Constans all Arians were heretics; in the dominions of Constantius all Catholics were heretics. The religious war continued, and increased in violence. In A.D. 341, another council, consisting of ninety bishops, was held at Antioch, in the presence of the emperor Constantius. This council adopted a new creed, from which the Homoousion was omitted; they ratified the decrees of the Council of Tyre of the preceding year, in which Athanasius was condemned; and they appointed in his place a bishop of their own party, named Gregory.

At the command of Constantius, the imperial prefect issued an edict announcing the degradation of Athanasius, and the appointment of Gregory. With an escort of five thousand heavy-armed soldiers, Gregory proceeded to Alexandria to take possession of his bishopric. It was evening when he arrived at the church at which Athanasius officiated, and the people were engaged in the evening service. The troops were posted in order of battle about the church; but Athanasius slipped out, and escaped to Rome, and Gregory was duly and officially installed in his place. The Athanasians, enraged at such proceedings, set the church afire; “scenes of savage conflict ensued, the churches were taken as it were by storm,” and “every atrocity perpetrated by unbridled multitudes, embittered by every shade of religious faction.” — Milman. ^{f338}

Similar scenes were soon after enacted in Constantinople, A.D. 342. In 338 died Alexander, the bishop of Constantinople, who had prayed Arius to death. The Arians favored Macedonius, the Athanasians favored Paul, for the vacant bishopric. Paul succeeded. This was while Constantius was absent from the city, and as soon as he returned, he removed Paul, and made Eusebius of Nicomedia, bishop of Constantinople. Eusebius died in 342. The candidacy of Paul and Macedonius, was at once revived. The partisans of Paul claimed that he, having been unjustly deposed, was lawful bishop by virtue of his previous ordination. The supporters of Macedonius claimed, of course, that Paul had been justly deposed, and that therefore a new election was in order. “The dispute spread from the church into the streets, from the clergy to the populace; blood was shed; the whole city was in arms on one part or the other.” — Milman. ^{f339}

Constantius was in Antioch. As soon as he heard of the tumult in Constantinople, he ordered Hermogenes, commander of the cavalry in

Thrace, to go with his troops to Constantinople and expel Paul. In the attempt to do so, Hermogenes was met by such a desperate attack, that his soldiers were scattered, and he was forced to take refuge in a house. The house was immediately set on fire. Hermogenes was seized and dragged by the feet through the streets of the city till he was torn to pieces, and then his mangled body was cast into the sea. As soon as this news reached Constantius, he went to Constantinople and expelled Paul, without confirming the election of Macedonius, and returned to Antioch.

Paul went to Rome and laid his case before Julius. The bishop of Rome, glad of the opportunity to exert the authority thus recognized in him, declared Paul re-instated, and sent him back with a letter to the bishops of the Eastern churches, rebuking those who had deposed him, and commanding his restoration. With this Paul returned to Constantinople, and resumed his place. As soon as Constantius learned of it, he commanded Philip, the praetorian prefect, to drive out Paul again, and establish Macedonius in his place. The prefect, bearing in mind the fate of Hermogenes, did not attempt to execute his order openly, but on pretense of public business, sent a respectful message to Paul, requesting his assistance. Paul went alone, and as soon as he arrived, the prefect showed him the emperor's order, carried him out through the palace a back way, put him on board a vessel that was waiting, and sent him away to Thessalonica.

Paul was out of the way, but Macedonius was not yet in his place. This part of the program must now be carried out. The prefect in his chariot, surrounded by a strong body of guards with drawn swords, with Macedonius at his side in full pontifical dress, started from the palace to the church to perform the ceremony of consecration. By this time the rumor had spread throughout the city, and in a wild tumult both parties rushed to the church. "The soldiers were obliged to hew their way through the dense and resisting crowd to the altar," and over the dead bodies of three thousand one hundred and fifty people, "Macedonius passed to the episcopal throne of Constantinople." — Milman.^{f340}

About the time that Athanasius reached Rome, when he fled from the invasion of Gregory, three messengers from the council that had condemned him, also arrived there. The bishop of Rome summoned the accusers of Athanasius to appear before a council which he would hold in Rome; but they disclaimed his jurisdiction, and denied his right to rejudge

the cause of a bishop who had already been condemned by a council. Julius proceeded, however, with the council, which was composed of fifty bishops. They unanimously pronounced Athanasius innocent of all the charges laid against him, and declared his deposition unlawful; but this instead of settling the difficulty, rather increased it. Another council was held shortly afterwards at Milan, in the presence of the emperor Constans, which confirmed the decision of the council at Rome, A.D. 343.

As the original council at Antioch had been held in the presence of Constantius, and as this one was now held in the presence of Constans, both divisions of the empire were now involved. The next step, therefore, was to call for a general council; accordingly, at the joint command of the two emperors, a general council was ordered, which met at Sardica, A.D. 345-6. The number of bishops was one hundred and seventy; ninety-six from the West, and seventy-four from the East. Among the bishops came Athanasius and some others who had been condemned in the East. The Eastern bishops, therefore, demanded that they should be excluded from the council: the Western bishops refused, upon which the Eastern bishops all withdrew, and met in rival council at Philippopolis. "In these two cities sat the rival councils, each asserting itself the genuine representative of Christendom, issuing decrees, and anathematizing their adversaries." — Milman.^{f341}

The bishops who remained at Sardica complained that the Arians had inflicted upon them deeds of violence by armed soldiers, and by the populace with cudgels; had threatened to prosecute them before the magistrates; had forged letters against them; had stripped virgins naked; had burnt churches; and had imprisoned the servants of God.

Those assembled at Philippopolis retorted against Athanasius and his followers, that with violence, slaughter, and war, they had wasted the churches of the Alexandrians and had stirred up the pagans to commit upon them assaults and slaughter. They declared that the assembly at Sardica, from which they had seceded, was composed of a multitude of all kinds of wicked and corrupt men from Constantinople and Alexandria, who were guilty of murder, bloodshed, slaughter, highway robbery, pillaging and despoiling; of breaking altars, burning churches, plundering the houses of private citizens, profaning the sacred mysteries, of betraying their solemn obligations to Christ, and of cruelly putting to death most

learned elders, deacons, and priests of God. ^{f342} There is little doubt that the statements of both parties were correct:

The bishops who remained at Sardica, had everything their own way. As they were all zealous supporters of Athanasius, they unanimously revoked the decision of the Council of Antioch, and confirmed the acts of the Council of Rome. Athanasius and three other bishops who had been deposed at the same time with him, were pronounced innocent; and those who had been put in their places, were declared deposed and accursed, and entirely cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church.

They also enacted a series of canons, of which three, “full of pure love,” bestowed special dignity upon the bishop of Rome, as the source of appeal. One of these ordered that “if any bishop shall think himself unjustly condemned, his judges, in honor of the memory of the holy apostle Peter — Sancti, Petri apostoli memoriam honoremus, — shall acquaint the bishop of Rome therewith, who may either confirm the first judgment, or order the cause to be re-examined by such of the neighboring bishops as he shall think fit to name.” Another ordered “that the see of the deposed bishop shall remain vacant till his cause shall be judged by the bishop of Rome.” A third ordered “that if a bishop condemned in his own province, shall choose to be judged by the bishop of Rome, and desires him to appoint some of his presbyters to judge him in his name, together with the bishops, the bishop of Rome may grant him his request.” — Bower. ^{f343} The effect of this was only to multiply and intensify differences and disputes amongst bishops, and infinitely to magnify the power of the bishop of Rome.

Athanasius, though fully supported by the council, preferred to remain under the protection of Constans, rather than to risk the displeasure of Constantius by returning to Alexandria. He remained two years in the West, during which time he was often the guest of the emperor Constans, and made such use of these opportunities that in A.D. 349 Constans “signified, by a concise and peremptory epistle to his brother Constantius, that unless he consented to the immediate restoration of Athanasius, he himself, with a fleet and army, would seat the archbishop on the throne of Alexandria.” — Gibbon. ^{f344} Constantius was just at this time threatened with war with Persia, and fearing the result if war should be made upon him at the same time by his brother, he yielded, and became as effusive in

his professed friendship for Athanasius as he had formerly been in his genuine hatred.

Constantius invited Athanasius to Antioch, where the two secret enemies met with open professions of friendship, and even with manifestations of “mutual respect and cordiality.” Constantius ordered all the accusations against Athanasius to be erased from the registers of the city, and with a letter of commendation, couched in terms of courtly flattery, he sent the archbishop on his way to Alexandria. “The Arian bishop, Gregory, was dead; and Athanasius, amid the universal joy, re-entered the city. The bishops crowded from all parts to salute and congratulate the prelate who had thus triumphed over the malice of even imperial enemies. Incense curled up in all the streets; the city was brilliantly illuminated.” — Milman.

f345

In February, A.D. 350, Constans was murdered by the usurper Magnentius, and in 353 Constantius became sole emperor by the final defeat and death of the usurper. Constantius no sooner felt himself assured of the sole imperial authority, than he determined to execute vengeance upon Athanasius, and make the Arian doctrine the religion of the whole empire. Yet he proposed to accomplish this only in orthodox fashion, through a general council. As it was thus that his father had established the Athanasian doctrine, which was held by all the Catholics to be strictly orthodox, to establish the Arian doctrine by a like process, assuredly could be no less orthodox.

The way was already open for the calling of a general council, by the disputes which had arisen over the standing of the Council of Sardica. That council, when it was called, was intended to be general; but when the Eastern bishops seceded, they, with all the other Arians in the empire, denied that those who remained could by any fair construction be termed a general council. More than this, when the Eastern bishops seceded, there were but ninety-four remaining at Sardica; whereas the Council of Antioch, whose acts the bishops at Sardica had condemned, was composed of ninety bishops, who acted with the direct approval of Constantius himself. Upon this it was argued that the Council of Sardica was no more entitled to the dignity of a general council, than was that of Antioch. Further, Liberius, who became bishop of Rome, May 22, A.D. 352, had already petitioned Constantius for a general council.

Constantius summoned the council to meet at Arles, A.D. 353. Liberius was not present in person, but he sent as his representatives two bishops in whom he reposed entire confidence. We know not how many bishops were in this council, but when they assembled, it was found that the Arian bishops were in the majority; and they insisted first of all upon the condemnation of Athanasius. The Catholic bishops argued that the question of faith ought to be discussed, before they should be required to condemn him; but the Arians insisted upon their point.

Constantius came to the support of the Arians with an edict sentencing to banishment all who would not sign the condemnation of Athanasius. The representatives of Liberius proposed a compromise, to the effect that they would sign the condemnation of Athanasius, if the Arians would likewise condemn as heresy the doctrine of Arius. The Arians had them reduce this proposition to writing, that they might have it as a testimony afterward; and then, knowing the advantage which they held by this concession, and under the edict of Constantius, they insisted more strenuously than ever upon the unconditional condemnation of Athanasius. Finding that there was no escape, the representatives of Liberius and all the other Athanasian bishops but one, signed the document. The one bishop who refused was Paulinus of Treves. He was accordingly banished, and died in exile five years afterward.

Liberius refused to confirm the action of his representatives, and utterly rejected the action of the council. In fact, he was so scandalized by the disgraceful surrender of his legates, that in a letter to Hosius, he expressed himself as willing to wash out “with his blood the stain which the scandalous conduct of his legates had brought upon his character.” — Bower.^{f346} To relieve him from his distress, Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, advised him to ask the emperor for another council, offering to go himself to Arles and present the request to Constantius. Liberius accepted the proposition, and Lucifer, accompanied by a presbyter and a deacon of the church of Rome, went to Constantius, and presented the letter of Liberius. Constantius granted his request, and appointed a council to meet at Milan, in the beginning of the year 355.

The council met, accordingly, to the number of more than three hundred bishops of the West, but only a few from the East. This council was but a repetition on a larger scale, of that at Arles. Constantius insisted, without any qualification, that the bishops should sign the condemnation of

Athanasius. He took a personal interest in all the proceedings. Like his father at the Council of Nice, he had the meetings of the council held in the imperial palace, and presided over them himself.

Constantius not only demanded that the Catholic bishops should sign the condemnation of Athanasius, but that they should also sign an Arian formula of faith. They pleaded that the accusers of Athanasius were unreliable. Constantius replied, "I myself am now the accuser of Athanasius, and on my word, Valens and the others [the accusers] must be believed." They argued that this was against the canon of the church. Constantius replied, "My will is the canon," and appealed to the Eastern bishops, who all assented that this was correct. He then declared that whoever did not sign might expect banishment. At this the orthodox bishops lifted up their hands beseechingly towards heaven, and prayed the emperor "to fear God, who had given him the dominion, that it might not be taken from him; also to fear the day of judgment, and not to confound the secular power with the law of the church, nor to introduce into the church the Arian heresy." — Hefele.^{f347}

They forgot that they themselves, many of them at least, had unanimously approved in Constantine at the Council of Nice the identical course which now they condemned in Constantius at the Council of Milan. In their approval of the action of Constantine in forcing upon others what they themselves believed, they robbed themselves of the right to protest when Constantius or anybody else should choose to force upon them what somebody else believed. They ought not to have thought it strange that they should reap what they had sown.

Constantius, yet further to imitate his father, claimed to have had a vision, and that thus by direct inspiration from heaven, he was commissioned "to restore peace to the afflicted church." At last, by the "inspiration" of "flatteries, persuasions, bribes, menaces, penalties, exiles" (Milman^{f348}), the Council of Milan of was brought to a greater unanimity of faith than even the Council of Nice had been. For there, out of the three hundred and eighteen bishops, five were banished; while here, out of a greater number, only five were banished. Surely if a general council is of any authority, the Council of Milan must take precedence of the Council of Nice, and Arianism be more orthodox than Athanasianism.

The banished ones were Dionysius of Milan, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer, and two other representatives of Liberius, Pancratius and Hilary. Hilary was cruelly beaten with rods before he was sent away.

The documents which had been signed, “all the other Western bishops, like their colleagues at Milan, were to be forced to sign, and the whole West compelled to hold communion with the Arians.” — Hefele.^{f349} Liberius rejected the decisions of the council, and still defended Athanasius.

Constantius sent one of his chief ministers with presents to bribe, and a letter to threaten, him. Liberius rejected the bribes and disregarded the threats, and in return cursed all Arian heretics and excommunicated Constantius. The officer returned to Milan, and reported his failure; upon this the emperor sent peremptory orders to the prefect of Rome to arrest Liberius, and bring him to Milan. The prefect, dreading the violence of the populace, took the precaution to arrest Liberius by night.

Arrived at Milan, the captive bishop was brought before Constantius, and there also he maintained his refusal to indorse the action of the council. Constantius told him that he must either sign or go into exile, and he would give him three days to decide. Liberius answered that he had already decided, and that he should not change his mind in three days nor in three months; therefore, the emperor might as well send him that minute to whatever place he wanted him to go. Nevertheless, Constantius gave him the three days, but before they were past, sent for him again, hoping to persuade him to yield. Liberius stood fast, and the emperor pronounced sentence of banishment, and sent him to Berea in Thrace. Before Liberius was gone out of the palace, the emperor sent him a present of five hundred pieces of gold, as he said, to pay his expenses. Liberius sent it back, saying he had better keep it to pay his soldiers. The empress also sent him a like sum; this he returned with the same answer, with the additional message to the emperor that, if he did not know what to do with so much money, he might give it to Epictetus or Auxentius, his two favorite Arian bishops.

As soon as it was known in Rome that Liberius was banished, the people assembled, and bound themselves by an oath not to acknowledge any other bishop as long as Liberius lived. The Arian party, however, were determined to have a bishop in Rome. They selected a deacon of that church, Felix by name, who was willing to be bishop of Rome. The clergy would not receive him, and the people collected in mutinous crowds, and refused to allow the Arians to enter any of the churches. The imperial

palace in Rome was chosen as the place of ordination. Three of the emperor's eunuchs were appointed to represent the people, and they duly elected Felix. Three bishops of the court were appointed to represent the clergy, and they ordained the new bishop. "The intrusion of Felix created a great sedition, in which many lost their lives." — Bower. ^{†350}

Another bishop, whose indorsement of the creed of Milan was scarcely less important than that of Liberius himself, was Housius of Cordova, who had been one of the chief factors in forming the union of Church and State. He was one of the bishops who visited Constantine in Gaul in A.D. 311, and was one of Constantine's chief advisers afterward in all his course, until after the Council of Nice. It was upon his advice and motion, more than any other, that the Council of Nice was called; it was his influence more than any other, that caused Constantine to command that "Homooousion" should be inserted in the Nicene Creed. His name was the first that was set to the creed of Nice; his name likewise was the first that was set to the decrees of the Council of Sardica, over which he presided, and it was he who secured the adoption in that council, of the canons which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal. He was now about one hundred years old.

Constantius determined to have the signature of Hosius to the decisions of the Council of Milan. The emperor summoned him to Milan, and when he came, entertained him for several days before suggesting his purpose. As soon as he did suggest it, however, Hosius declared that he was ready to suffer now under Constantius, as he had suffered sixty years before under his grandfather Maximian; and in the end made such an impression upon Constantius, that he allowed him to return unmolested to Cordova. But it was not long before the favorites of Constantius prevailed upon him to make another attempt to bring Hosius to terms. He first sent him flattering and persuasive letters, and when these failed, he proceeded to threats; but all were unavailing, and Hosius was banished to Sirmium. His relations were stripped of all their estates and reduced to beggary, but all without avail. Next he was closely imprisoned — still he refused. Then he was cruelly beaten, and finally put to the rack and most inhumanly tortured. Under these fearful torments, the aged bishop yielded at last, A.D. 356.

"The case of Hosius deserves, without all doubt, to be greatly pitied; but it would be still more worthy of our pity and compassion, had he been himself an enemy to all persecution. But it must be observed that he was

the author and promoter of the first Christian persecution; for it was he who first stirred up Constantine against the Donatists, many of whom were sent into exile, and some even sentenced to death: nay, and led to the place of execution.” — Bower.^{f351} The surrender of Hosius was counted as the most signal of victories; it was published throughout the whole East, and caused the greatest rejoicing among the Arians everywhere.

The next step was for Constantius to remove Athanasius from the archbishopric of Alexandria. It was now twenty six months from the close of the Council of Milan, during which time Constantius had been paving the way for his final expulsion. As soon as the council had closed, an order was sent to the prefect of Alexandria, to deprive Athanasius of the imperial revenue, and give it to the Arians. At the same time, all who held public office were commanded wholly to abandon the cause of Athanasius, and to communicate with the Arians only. Messengers were sent into the provinces, bearing the emperor’s authority to compel the bishops to communicate with the Arians, or to go into exile. Now he sent two of his secretaries and some other officials of the palace, to Alexandria, to banish Athanasius. These officers, with the governor of Egypt and the prefect, commanded Athanasius to leave the city. He demanded that they produce the written authority of the emperor; but Constantius had sent no written order. Athanasius, supported by the people, refused to obey any verbal order.

A truce was agreed upon, until an embassy could be sent to Constantius to bring a written command; but on the part of the officers, this truce was granted merely for the purpose of disarming the vigilance of the supporters of Athanasius. The officers immediately began with the greatest possible secrecy to gather the necessary troops into the city. Twenty-three days were thus spent, and a force of five thousand troops held possession of the most important parts of the city. The night before a solemn festival day of the church, Athanasius was conducting the services in the church of St. Theonas. Suddenly, at midnight, there was all about the church the sound of trumpets, the rushing of horses, and the clash of arms; the doors were burst open, and with the discharge of a cloud of arrows, the soldiers, with drawn swords, poured in to arrest Athanasius. “The cries of the wounded, the groans of those who were trampled down in attempting to force their way out through the soldiery, the shouts of the assailants, mingled in wild and melancholy uproar.” — Milman.^{f352} In the tumult, Athanasius again escaped. “Counts, prefects, tribunes, whole armies, were successively

employed to pursue a bishop and a fugitive; the vigilance of the civil and military powers was excited by the imperial edicts; liberal rewards were promised to the man who should produce Athanasius either alive or dead, and the most severe penalties were denounced against those who should dare to protect the public enemy.” — Gibbon.^{f353} Yet Athanasius succeeded in so perfectly concealing himself for more than six years, that Constantius died without ever finding him.

Athanasius was gone. The next thing was to install an Arian bishop in his place. Their choice fell this time on George of Cappadocia, who was more savage and cruel than Gregory, the Arian bishop who had been appointed to this place before. George’s original occupation was that of “a parasite,” by which means he secured the contract for supplying the army with bacon. “His employment was mean; he rendered it infamous. He accumulated wealth by the basest arts of fraud and corruption,” which finally became so notorious that he had to flee from justice. The Arian bishop of Antioch made him a priest and a church-member at the same time. Surrounded by armed troops, he was placed on the episcopal throne, “and during at least four months, Alexandria was exposed to the insults of a licentious army, stimulated by the ecclesiastics of a hostile faction.” Every kind of violence was committed. “And the same scenes of violence and scandal which had been exhibited in the capital, were repeated in more than ninety episcopal cities of Egypt. The entrance of the new archbishop was that of a barbarian conqueror; and each moment of his reign was polluted by cruelty and avarice.” — Gibbon.^{f354}

In A.D. 357 Constantius visited Rome and celebrated a triumph. The leading women of the church determined to take advantage of the opportunity thus offered to present a petition for the recall of Liberius. They first tried to press their husbands into the service of approaching the emperor, by threatening to leave and go in a body to Liberius, and share his exile. The husbands replied that the emperor would be much less likely to be offended by the visit of a delegation of women than of men, and that thus there would be more hope of really securing the recall of the banished bishop.

The women agreed that the suggestion was a wise one, and “having adorned themselves in the most splendid attire, that their rank might be evident from their appearance” (Theodoret)^{f355}, they proceeded to the imperial palace. Constantius received them courteously. They earnestly

pleaded with him to take pity on that great city and its numerous flock “bereft of its shepherd, and ravaged by wolves.” The emperor replied, “I thought you had a pastor. Is not Felix as capable of exercising the pastoral office as any other?” The women answered that Felix was detested and avoided by all, and that none would attend service so long as Liberius was absent. Constantius smiled and said, “If so, you must have Liberius again: I shall without delay dispatch the proper orders for his return.”

The next day the edict of recall was read in the circus, but it provided that the two bishops should rule jointly. It happened to be the most interesting and decisive moment of a horse-race, but the excited feelings of the multitude were turned in an instant to the more absorbing question of the orthodox faith. Some cried in ridicule that the edict was just, because there were two factions in the circus, and now each one could have its own bishop. Others shouted, “What, because we have two factions in the circus, are we to have two factions in the church?” Then the whole multitude set up one universal yell, “There is but one God, one Christ, one bishop!” Upon which Theodoret devoutly remarks, “Some time after this Christian people had uttered these pious and just acclamations, the holy Liberius returned, and Felix retired to another city.” ^{f356}

It is true that Liberius returned soon after this, but Constantius had made it the condition of his return that he should sign the decisions of the Council of Milan. Two years’ sojourn in cold and barbarous Thrace, while a rival bishop was enjoying the splendors of the episcopal office in Rome, exerted a strong tendency to convince Liberius that Athanasius was rightly condemned, and that the Arian doctrine might be true. He therefore signed both the condemnation of Athanasius and the Arian creed of Milan. Upon this Constantius called him to Sirmium. But as in the meantime the emperor had changed his views and adopted the Semi-Arian doctrine, he would not allow Liberius to return to Rome unless he would first subscribe to the same. Liberius signed this also, and was allowed to go on his way to Rome. The people poured out through the gates to meet him, and escorted him in triumph to the episcopal palace, August 2, 358. “The adherents of Felix were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the public places, in the baths, and even in the churches; and the face of Rome, upon the return of a Christian bishop, renewed the horrid image of the massacres of Marius and the proscriptions of Sylla.” — Gibbon. ^{f357} Felix escaped, but returned not long afterward, and attempted to hold services in a church beyond the Tiber, but was again driven out.

As stated above, Constantius had again changed his opinions as to the nature of Christ, adopting the Semi-Arian view. The Semi-Arian party was a third one that had grown up between the strictly Arian and the Athanasian, based upon a third mental abstraction as elusive as either of the others. The three doctrines now stood thus: —

The Athanasians declared the Son of God to be of the same substance, the same existence, and the same essence, with the Father.

The strict Arians declared the Son to be like the Father, but rather by grace than by nature, — as like as a creature could be to the Creator.

The Semi-Arians declared the Son to be like the Father in nature, in existence, in essence, in substance, and in everything else.

The Athanasian doctrine was expressed in Homoousion; the strict Arian in Anomean; and the Semi-Arian in Homoiousion. It will be seen that the Semi-Arian was nearer to the original doctrine of Arius than was the Arian, of the present period. This was owing to the followers of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who in the bitterness of their opposition to the Athanasians, were carried away from the original Arian doctrine — from the Homoiousion to the Anomean.

The Homoousion was the doctrine of the Council of Nice; the Anomean was the doctrine of the Council of Milan; the Homoiousion was the doctrine now held by Constantius, and a company that actually outnumbered the Arians.

In furtherance of his “visionary” commission to give peace to the church, Constantius determined to call a general council, and have the Semi-Arian doctrine adopted. The council was first appointed to meet at Nicomedia, A.D. 358, but while the bishops were on the way there, an earthquake destroyed that city. The appointment was then changed to Nice in early summer, 359. But before that time arrived, he decided to have two councils instead of one, that all might more easily attend. The bishops of the East were to meet at Seleucia in Isauria; those of the West at Rimini on the Adriatic Sea in Italy.

The emperor issued an order commanding all bishops without exception to attend one or the other, as they might choose, and the civil officers in the provinces were commissioned to see that the command was obeyed. “The bishops therefore set out from all parts; the public carriages, roads, and

houses were everywhere crowded with them, which gave great offense to the catechumens, and no small diversion to the pagans, who thought it equally strange and ridiculous that men who had been brought up from their infancy in the Christian religion, and whose business it was to instruct others in that belief, should be constantly hurrying, in their old age, from one place to another, to know what they themselves should believe.” — Bower. ^{f358} To make sure that the two councils should act as one, it was ordered that each should appoint two deputies to report to the emperor the decisions arrived at, “that he might himself know whether they had come to an understanding in accordance with the Holy Scriptures, and might decide according to his own judgment what was best to be done.” ^{f359}

In the summer of A.D. 359, more than four hundred bishops assembled at Rimini, of whom eighty were Arians. One hundred and sixty assembled at Seleucia, of whom one hundred and five were Semi-Arians; about forty were Arians, while the Catholics were still fewer in number. A civil officer of high rank was appointed to represent the emperor at each council, and the one appointed to Rimini was directed not to allow any bishop to go home until all “had come to one mind concerning the faith.” That there might be as little difficulty as possible in coming to one mind, a creed was drawn up and sent to the council to be signed. There were at that time present with the emperor at Sirmium five bishops, one of whom was George of Alexandria, and all of whom were Arians or Semi-Arians. They drew up a creed, the main points of which were as follows: —

“We believe in one only and true God, the Father and Ruler of all, Creator and Demiurge of all things, and in one only begotten Son of God, who was begotten of the Father without change before all ages, and all beginning, and all conceivable time, and all comprehensible substance.... God from God, similar to the Father, who has begotten him according to the Holy Scriptures, whose generation no one knows [understands] but the Father who has begotten.... The words *ousia*, because it was used by the Fathers in simplicity [that is, with good intention], but not being understood by the people, occasion scandal, and is not contained in the Scriptures, shall be put aside, and in future no mention shall be made of the *Usia* with regard to God... But we maintain that the Son is similar to the Father in all things, as also the Holy Scriptures teach and say.” ^{f360}

The emperor sent a letter to each council, commanding that the bishops should settle the question of the faith before they should have anything to do with an investigation of any of their own private differences. The council at Rimini was already met, and was earnestly discussing the faith, when the bishops arrived from Srimium with the above creed, which they read aloud to the assembly, and “declared that it was already confirmed by the emperor, and was now to be universally accepted without discussion, as to the sense which individuals might attach to its words.” To this all the Arians in the council readily agreed, but the Catholics, with loud voices, proclaimed their dissent. They declared that any new formula of faith was wholly unnecessary; that the Council of Nice had done all that was necessary in regard to the faith; and that the business of the council was not to find out what was the true faith, but to put to confusion all its opponents. They demanded that the bishops who brought this creed should with them unanimously curse all heresies, and especially the Arian. This demand was refused by the Arians. Then the Catholics took everything into their own hands. They unanimously approved the Nicene Creed, especially the Homooousion; and then declared heretical the creed which had come from the emperor. They next took up the doctrine of Arianism, and pronounced a curse upon each particular point; denounced by name the bishops who had come from the emperor as “ignorant and deceitful men, imposters, and heretics; and declared them deposed.” Finally, they unanimously pronounced a curse upon all heresies in general, and that of Arius in particular.

All this they put in writing; every one of them signed it July 21, A.D. 359, and sent it by the ten deputies, to the emperor, accompanied by a request that he would allow them to return to their churches. At the same time the Arians of the council also sent ten deputies to Constantius, who reached the emperor before the others, and made their report. When the others arrived, Constantius refused even to see them so much as to receive their report, but sent an officer to receive it, and under the pretext of being overwhelmed with public business, kept them waiting. After they had waited a long time, they were directed to go to Adrianople and await the emperor’s pleasure, and at the same time he sent a letter to the bishops at Rimini, commanding them to wait there the return of their deputies.

Shortly afterwards the deputies were ordered to go to a small town called Nice, not many miles from Adrianople. This was a trick of the Arians and Semi-Arians, by which they proposed to have their creed signed there, and

then pass it off upon the uninitiated, as the original creed of the Council of Nice in Bithynia. There the creed was presented, but with the omission “in all things,” so that it read, “the Son is like to the Father,” instead of, “like to the Father in all things.” This the deputies were required to sign, which of course they refused to do, but were finally forced to sign it, and to reverse all the acts and proceedings of the Council of Rimini.

The emperor was highly pleased at this result, and calling it a good omen of like success with the whole council, gave the ten deputies leave to return to Rimini. At the same time he sent letters to the prefect, commanding him anew not to allow a single bishop to leave until all had signed, and to exile whoever should persist in a refusal, provided the number did not exceed fifteen.

The bishops were “eager to return to their sees; the emperor was inflexible; Taurus took care to render the place both inconvenient and disagreeable to them. Some therefore fell off, others followed their example, the rest began to waver, and being so far got the better of, yielded soon after, and went over to the Arian party in such crowds that in a very short time the number of the orthodox bishops who continued steady, was reduced to twenty.”
Bower. ^{f361}

At the head of these twenty was a certain Phaebadius, and they determined invincibly to hold their position. Nevertheless they were caught by a trick that the veriest tyro ought to have seen. Two bishops in particular, Ursacius and Valens, had charge of the creed, and they pretended in the interests of peace to be willing to make a concession, and to insert such alterations and additions as might be agreeable to Phiaebadius, who exulted over the proud distinction which would thus be his as the preserver of orthodoxy.

They came together, and began to reconstruct the creed: first were inserted some curses against the Arian heresy, then an addition, declaring the Son to be “equal to the Father, without beginning, and before all things.” When this was written, Valens proposed that in order to leave no room whatever for any new disputes or any question upon this point, there should be added a clause declaring that “the Son of God is not a creature like other creatures.” To this the twenty bishops assented, blindly overlooking the fact that in admitting that the Son was not a creature like other creatures, they did indeed place him among the creatures, and admitted the very point

upon which the Arians had all the time insisted. Thus all were brought to “the unity of the faith.” The council broke up, and the bishops departed to their homes.

The council was past, and no sooner did the Arians find themselves secure, than they loudly proclaimed the victory which they had gained. They gloried in the fact that the great council of Rimini had not declared that the Son was not a creature, but only that he was not like other creatures. They affirmed that it was, and always had been, their opinion that the “Son was no more like the Father than a piece of glass was like an emerald.” Upon examination of the creed, the twenty bishops were obliged to confess that they had been entrapped. They renounced the creed, and publicly retracted “all they had said, done, or signed, repugnant to the truths of the Catholic Church.” — Bower.^{f362}

The companion council which was called at Seleucia, met September 27, 359, but as there were three distinct parties, besides individuals who differed from all, there was amongst them such utter confusion, tumult, and bitterness, that after four days of angry debate, in which the prospect became worse and worse, the imperial officer declared that he would have nothing more to do with the council, and told them they could go to the church if they wanted to, and “indulge in this vain babbling there as much as they pleased.” The parties then met separately, denounced, condemned, and ex-communicated one another, and sent their deputies to Constantius, who spent a whole day and the greater part of the night, December 31, 359, in securing their signatures to the confession of faith which he had approved. The emperor’s confession was then published throughout the whole empire, and all bishops were commanded to sign it, under penalty of exile upon all who refused. “This order was executed with the utmost rigor in all the provinces of the empire, and very few were found who did not sign with their hands what they condemned in their hearts. Many who till then had been thought invincible, were overcome, and complied with the times; and such as did not, were driven, without distinction, from their sees into exile, and others appointed in their room, the signing of that confession being a qualification indispensably requisite both in obtaining and keeping the episcopal dignity. Thus were all the sees throughout the empire filled with Arians, insomuch that in the whole East not an orthodox bishop was left, and in the West but one; namely, Gregory, bishop of Elvira in Andalusia, and he, in all likelihood, obliged to absent himself from his flock and lie concealed.” — Bower.^{f363}

Thus Constantius had succeeded much more fully than had his father, in establishing “the unity of the faith.” That faith was the original Arian. And Arianism was now as entirely orthodox, and, if the accommodated sense of the word be used, as entirely Catholic, as the Athanasian had ever been.

Having like his father, by the aid of the bishops, united the world “under one head,” and brought the opinions respecting the Deity to a condition of “settled uniformity,” the emperor Constantius died the following year, A.D. 361.

CHAPTER 16.

THE CATHOLIC FAITH RE-ESTABLISHED.

THE emperor Constantius was succeeded by Julian, who restored paganism as the religion of the emperor and the empire, and exerted his influence, though not his power, in favor of its restoration as the religion of the people.

Julian refused to take any part whatever in the strifes of the church parties, “saying that as he was not so well acquainted with the nature of their disputes as a just and impartial judge ought to be, he hoped they would excuse him, lest he should be guilty of some injustice.” — Bower.^{f371} He therefore directed them to settle their differences among themselves. To this end he issued an edict of toleration to all classes of Christians, and recalled from banishment all the bishops and clergy who had been banished by Constantius.

Thus there was restored to the afflicted empire a condition of peace and quietness such as had not been for fifty years. And because of his refusal to allow himself and his authority to be made the tool of the riotous and bigoted church parties — to this more than to any other one thing, is to be attributed the spiteful epithet of “the apostate,” which ever since has been affixed to his name. Pagan though he was, if he had like Constantine assumed the hypocritical mask and had played into the hands of the dominant church party, there is no room for doubt that he might, like Constantine, have been an orthodox emperor, with the title of “the great.”

Under the circumstances, it would be almost surprising if Julian had been anything else than what he was. His own father, an uncle, and seven of his cousins, were the victims of a murder instigated by the dying Constantine and faithfully carried out by Constantius. Julian himself, though only six years of age, by the care of some friends barely escaped the same fate. Constantius was his cousin, and, as emperor, assumed the place of his guardian. “His place of education had been a prison, and his subsequent liberty was watched with suspicious vigilance.” — Milman.^{f372} He had seen the streets of the chief cities of the empire run with blood, in the savage strifes of church parties. Over the bodies of slaughtered people he had seen bishops placed upon thrones of episcopal ambition. Such impressions

forced upon his young mind, confirmed by more than twenty years' observation of the violent and unchristian lives of Constantius, and hundreds of ecclesiastics, and multitudes of the populace, all professing to be living repositories of the Christian faith, — all this was not the best calculated to convince him of the virtues of the imperial religion.

It is indeed charged that, in issuing the edict of toleration, and the recall of the exiled ecclesiastics, Julian's motive was to vent his spite against Christianity, by having the church parties destroy one another in their contentions. Even if this be true, if he was to be guided by the experience and observations of his whole life, he is hardly to be blamed for thinking that there was some prospect of such a result. No such result followed, however, because when the prospect of imperial favor, and patronage, and power, was gone, the church parties had nothing to contend for; because "party passions among the Christians would, undoubtedly, never have risen to so high a pitch, had it not been for the interference of the State. As this disturbing and circumscribing influence of a foreign power now fell away of itself, ' and the church was left to follow out naturally its own development from within itself, the right relations were every-where more easily restored." — Neander ^{f373}

Julian died June 26, A.D. 363, beyond the River Tigris, of a wound received in a war with Persia, after a reign of one year, eight months, and twenty-three days. Upon his death, the army in the field elected Jovian emperor, and returned to Antioch. The emperor was no sooner arrived at Antioch than the ecclesiastical commotion was again renewed. The leaders of the church parties endeavored to out-do one another in their eager haste to secure his support; "for the heads of each party assiduously paid their court to the emperor, with a view of obtaining not only protection for themselves, but also power against their opponents." — Socrates. ^{f374}

Among the first of these came the party of Macedonius of Constantinople, with a petition that the emperor would expel all the Arians from their churches, and allow them to take their places. To this petition Jovian replied, "I abominate contentiousness; but I love and honor those who exert themselves to promote unanimity." This somewhat checked the factious zeal. Another attempt was made, but Jovian declared "that he would not molest any one on account of his religious sentiments, and that he should love and highly esteem such as would zealously promote the unity of the church." A pagan philosopher in an oration in honor of the

emperor, rebuked these parties with the observation that such persons worshiped the purple and not the Deity, and resembled the uncertain waves of the sea, sometimes rolling in one direction and again in the very opposite way; and praised the emperor for his liberality in permitting every one freely to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. ^{f375}

Jovian, though guaranteeing a general toleration, himself professed the Nicene Creed, and a particular preference for Athanasius, who at his invitation visited Antioch, and after having settled the faith of the emperor, and promised him “a long and peaceful reign,” returned to his episcopal seat at Alexandria. The long and peaceful reign assured by the zealous ecclesiastic continued only about two months from this time, and ended in the death of Jovian, February 17, A.D. 364. after a total reign of seven months and twenty one days from the death of Julian.

Ten days after the death of Jovian, Valentinian was chosen emperor, and thirty days after this he bestowed upon his brother Valens an equal share in the imperial dignity. Valens assumed the jurisdiction of the whole East, with his capital at Constantinople. Valentinian retained the dominion of the West, with his capital at Milan. Both of these emperors pursued the tolerant policy of Jovian, so far as paganism and the church parties were concerned; but they let loose a cruel persecution upon the profession of “magic.”

The practice of magic was made treason, and under the accusations of sorcery and witchcraft, an infinite number and variety of individual spites and animosities were let loose, and it seemed as though the horrors of the days of Tiberius and Domitian were returned. Rome and Antioch were the two chief seats of the tribunals of this persecution, and “from the extremities of Italy and Asia, the young and the aged were dragged in chains to the tribunals of Rome and Antioch. Senators, matrons, and philosophers expired in ignominious and cruel tortures. The soldiers who were appointed to guard the prisons, declared, with a murmur of pity and indignation, that their numbers were insufficient to oppose the flight or resistance of the multitude of captives. The wealthiest families were ruined by fines and confiscations; the most innocent citizens trembled for their safety.” — Gibbon. ^{f376}

In 370 Valens cast his influence decidedly in favor of the Arian faith, by receiving baptism at the hands of the Arian bishop of Constantinople. The

tumults of the religious parties again began, and “every episcopal vacancy was the occasion of a popular tumult... as the leaders both of the Homoousians and of the Arians believed that if they were not suffered to reign, they were most cruelly injured and oppressed. . . In every contest, the Catholics were obliged to pay the penalty of their own faults, and of those of their adversaries. In every election, the claims of the Arian candidate obtained the preference, and if they were opposed by the majority of the people, he was usually supported by the authority of the civil magistrate, or even by the terrors of a military force.” — Gibbon.^{f377}

In 373 Athanasius died, and the emperor Valens commanded the prefect of Egypt to install in the vacant bishopric an Arian Prelate by the name of Lucius, which was done, but not without the accompaniment of riot and bloodshed which was now hardly more than a part of the regular ceremony of induction into office of the principal bishoprics of the empire.

In the West, after the death of Constantius, the bishops returned to the faith established by the Council of Nice, which so largely prevailed there that the differences springing from the Arian side caused no material difficulty. As before stated, Valentinian suffered all religious parties, even the pagan, to continue unmolested; yet he himself was always a Catholic. About the year 367 he greatly increased the dignity and authority of the bishop of Rome by publishing a law empowering him to examine, and sit as judge, upon the cases of other bishops. In 375 Valentinian died, and was succeeded by his two sons, Gratian, aged sixteen years, and Valentinian II, aged four years.

Gratian was but the tool of the bishops. Ambrose was at that time bishop of Milan, and never was episcopal ambition more arrogantly asserted than in that insolent prelate. Soon the mind of the bishop asserted the supremacy over that of the boy emperor, and Ambrose “wielded at his will the weak and irresolute Gratian.” — Milman.^{f378} But above all things else that Gratian did, that which redounded most to the glory of the Catholic Church was his choice of Theodosius as associate emperor. Valens was killed in a battle with the Goths, A.D. 378. A stronger hand than that of a youth of nineteen was required to hold the reins of government in the East.

In the establishment of the Catholic Church, the place of Theodosius is second only to that of Constantine. About the beginning of the year 380 he

was baptized by the Catholic bishop of Thessalonica, and immediately afterward he issued the following edict: —

“It is our pleasure that the nations which are governed by our clemency and moderation, should steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans, which faithful tradition has preserved, and which is now professed by the pontiff Damasus, and by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness. According to the discipline of the apostles, and the doctrine of the gospel, let us believe the sole deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: under an equal majesty, and a pious Trinity. We authorize the followers of this doctrine to assume the title of Catholic Christians; and as we judge that all others are extravagant madmen, we brand them with the infamous name of “heretics,” and declare that their conventicles shall no longer usurp the respectable appellation of churches. Besides the condemnation of divine justice, they must expect to suffer the severe penalties which our authority, guided by heavenly wisdom, shall think proper to inflict upon them.” ^{f379}

This law was issued in the names of the three emperors, Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius. “Thus the religion of the whole Roman world was enacted by two feeble boys and a rude Spanish soldier.” — Milman. ^{f380}

In Constantinople the Catholics were so few that at the accession of Theodosius they had no regular place of meeting, nor had they any pastor. No sooner was the new emperor proclaimed, however, than they called to their aid Gregory, bishop and native of Nazianzum, and hence called Gregory Nazianzen. A room in a private house was fitted up as the place of meeting, and Gregory began his ministry in the imperial city. The quarrel between the religious parties again broke out into open riot. A great crowd led on by monks and women, with clubs, stones, and fire-brands, attacked the meeting-place of the Catholics, broke down the doors, and ravaged the place inside and outside. Blood was shed, lives were lost, and Gregory was accused before the magistrate; but upon the strength of the imperial edict establishing the Catholic religion, he secured his acquittal.

And now the contentions began among the Catholics themselves. The occasion of it was this: As soon as Constantine had become sole emperor

by the murder of Licinius, he proceeded to complete the organization of the government of the empire which had been planned, and in a manner begun, by Diocletian. He divided the empire into prefectures, dioceses, and provinces. Of the prefectures there were one hundred and sixteen, of the dioceses, thirteen, of the provinces, four.

The heads of the prefectures were entitled prefects. The heads of the dioceses were entitled vicars or vice-prefects. The heads of the provinces were designated by different titles, of which the term “governor” will be sufficiently exact.

The governors were subject to the jurisdiction of the vicars, or vice-prefects; the vicars or vice-prefects were subject to the jurisdiction of the prefects; and the prefects were subject to the immediate jurisdiction of the emperor himself.

Now when the Church and the State became one, the organization of the church was made to conform as precisely as possible to that of the empire. In fact, so far as the provinces and the dioceses, the organization of the church was identical with that of the empire. There was a gradation in the order and dignity of the bishoprics according to the political divisions thus formed.

The dignity of the chief bishop in a province or diocese was regulated by the chief city. The bishop of the chief city in a province was the principal bishop of that province, and all the other bishops in the province, were subject to his jurisdiction; to him pertained the ordination to vacant bishoprics and all other matters. The bishop of the principal city in the diocese was chief bishop of that diocese, and all other bishops within said diocese were subject to his jurisdiction.

The chief bishop of the province was called “Metropolitan,” from the metropolis or chief city, or “primate” from *primus*, first. The chief bishop of a diocese was called “exarch.” Above these were four bishops corresponding to the four prefects, and were called “patriarchs,” yet these were not apportioned according to the lines of the prefectures, but were bishops of the four chief cities of the empire, — Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople.

This was the general plan of the organization of the church, though through the mutual ambitions and jealousies of the whole hierarchy, there

were many exceptions; and as time went on, titles and jurisdictions overran the limits defined in this general plan.

The bishopric of Alexandria had always been held as second only to that of Rome in dignity, since Alexandria was the second city of the empire. Constantinople was now an imperial city, and its bishopric was fast assuming an importance which rivaled that of Alexandria for second place. To this the archbishop of Alexandria did not propose to assent. That Peter, bishop of Alexandria, whom the edict of Theodosius had advertised and indorsed as a man of apostolic holiness, asserted his episcopal jurisdiction over Constantinople. He sent up seven Alexandrians, who ordained a certain Maximus to be bishop of Constantinople. A tumult was raised, and Maximus was driven out by the party of Gregory. He fled to Theodosius, but his claim was rejected by the emperor also.

Theodosius soon came to Constantinople, and immediately on his arrival, summoned to his palace Damophilus, the Arian bishop of the city, and commanded him to subscribe to the Nicene Creed, or else surrender to the Catholics the episcopal palace, the cathedral, and all the churches of the city, which amounted to fully a hundred. Damophilus refused, and November 24, A.D. 380, an edict was issued expelling all the Arians from all their houses of worship, and forfeiting the same to the Catholics, who in fact were barely able to fill the single house of worship which they already owned.

Damophilus was exiled, and Gregory, accompanied by the emperor and surrounded by armed troops, was conducted to the cathedral, which was already occupied by a body of imperial guards, where he was regularly installed in the office of bishop of Constantinople. "He beheld the innumerable multitude of either sex and of every age, who crowded the streets, the windows, and the roofs of the houses; he heard the tumultuous voice of rage, grief, astonishment, and despair; and Gregory fairly confesses, that on the memorable day of his installation, the capital of the East wore the appearance of a city taken by storm, in the hands of a barbarian conqueror." — Gibbon.^{f381}

At the beginning of the year 381 Theodosius issued an edict expelling from all the churches within his dominions, all the bishops and other ecclesiastics who should refuse to subscribe to the creed of Nice. By a commissioned officer with a military force, the edict was executed in all the provinces of

the East. Having thus established his religion throughout the empire, the next thing to do was to have a general council indorse his action, compose the disputes which disturbed the Catholic party itself, and again settle the faith of the Catholic Church. To this end a general council was called to meet at Constantinople this same year, A.D. 381.

The council met in the month of May, and was composed of one hundred and eighty-six bishops — one hundred and fifty Catholics, and thirty-six Macedonians. The first question considered was the disputed bishopric of Constantinople. For that Maximus who had been ordained at the direction of Peter of Alexandria, though disallowed by the emperor, still claimed to be the regular bishop of Constantinople, and exercised the office by ordaining other bishops. The council, however, adjudged his ordination to be irregular; declared that he was not, and had never been, a bishop; and that therefore all the ordinations performed by him were null and void. The appointment of Gregory Nazianzen was then confirmed, by regular services of installation.

The next question that was considered by the council was of the same nature as the foregoing, but one of much more far-reaching consequences, as it involved both the East and the West. Just fifty years before — A.D. 331 — Eustathius, the Catholic bishop of Antioch, had been displaced by an Arian, who was received by the greater part of the Catholics as well as the Arians; but a small party still adhered to his cause, and declared they would acknowledge no other bishop, and have no fellowship with any of the others, as long as he lived. From this they acquired the name of Eustathians. Thirty years afterward — A.D. 360 — the see of Antioch became vacant by the translation of its bishop to that of Constantinople, and the two parties agreed upon a certain Meletius to fill the vacant bishopric. No sooner had he been installed, than he openly declared for the Homoousion, and excommunicated “as rotten and incurable members,” all who held the contrary doctrine. The bishops round about plead with him to conduct his office in the spirit in which he had been elected to it, instead of making matters worse by his extreme position.

It was all of no avail. He declared that “nothing should, and nothing could, make him desist from, or relent in, the work he had undertaken, till he had utterly extirpated the Arian heresy, without leaving the least shoot of so poisonous a weed in the field, which by divine appointment he was to

guard and cultivate.” — Bower.^{f382} The Arians then applied to Constantius, and had Meletius banished thirty days after his installation.

The partisans of Meletius then separated entirely from the Arians, and clung so tenaciously to this course, that they acquired the name of Meletians. This created a third party, because the Eustathians refused to have anything at all to do with either the Meletians or the Arians — with the Arians because they were Arians; with the Meletians because they had communicated with the Arians, and because they still acknowledged Meletius, who had been chosen with the help of the Arians. Thus there were two parties of the Catholics, each arrayed against the other.

In 363 Lucifer of Cagliari, the same who had been the messenger of Liberius to Constantius at Milan, attempted to reconcile the two Catholic factions; but being more anxious to display authority than to promote real peace, he made the matter worse by ordaining as bishop a certain Paulinus, who was the leader of the Eustathians, and the most bitter opponent of the Meletians. From this the schism spread yet farther. Lucifer was not only a Western bishop, but had been a confidant of the bishop of Rome. Athanasius indorsed his action by communicating with Paulinus, and not with Meletius; and all the bishops of Egypt, Cyprus, and the West followed his example, while all the rest of the Catholic bishops in the East espoused the cause of Meletius.

Basil, the Catholic bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, finding it impossible to moderate the schism in any other way, thought to do so by applying to the bishop of Rome. He therefore — A.D. 371 — wrote a letter to Damasus, and with it sent another signed by many of the Eastern bishops, asking him to lend his assistance. “He added that it was from his zeal alone they expected relief, from that zeal which he had made so eminently appear on other occasions; that Dionysius, one of his predecessors, had afforded them a seasonable assistance, when their wants were less pressing, and their condition not so deplorable; and therefore that there was no room left to doubt of his readily conforming to so glorious an example.” — Bower.

^{f383}

It was some time before Damasus took any notice of this request, and when he did, it was only to assume the office of dictator and judge, rather than that of mediator. He declared Paulinus lawful bishop of Antioch, and Meletius “a transgressor of the canons, an intruder, a schismatic, and even

a heretic.” — Bower. ^{f384} Basil repented of his application to Rome, with the wise observation that “the more you flatter haughty and insolent men, the more haughty and insolent they become.” He should have thought of that before, and indulged in neither flattery nor appeal.

Such was the grave question, and thus that question arose, which now engaged the serious attention of the Council of Constantinople; and Meletius presided at the council. Before they reached this subject, however, Meletius died. He and Paulinus had previously agreed that when either of them should die, the other should be sole bishop of the two factions; but he was no sooner dead than some of the bishops in the council moved for the election of a successor.

Gregory Nazianzen was now president of the council, and he exerted all his influence to persuade the council to put an end to the schism by having nothing more to do with it, but to let Paulinus end his days in peace, according to the arrangement with Meletius. He was joined by other members of the council, but the vast majority loved discussion more than they loved anything else than power, and as disputes and schisms were the way to power, they could not bear to let slip such an opportunity to show that the East was not subject to the West — especially as the Western bishops, with the bishop of Rome at their head, had already assumed the authority to dictate in the matter. They declared that they would not betray to the West the dignity which of right belonged to the East, from its being the scene of the birth and death of the Son of God. They therefore elected Flavianus as successor to Meletius, and thus only aggravated the schism which they attempted to heal, and which continued for eighteen years longer.

Gregory Nazianzen having done all he could to prevent this act of the council, and knowing that what they had done could only strengthen the contentions already rife, resigned his bishopric, and left both the council and the city of Constantinople. He likened a church council to a nest of wasps, or a flock of magpies, cranes, or geese; declared that no good ever came of one; and refused ever more to have anything to do with them. ^{f385} Had a few other men been as wise as Gregory Nazianzen showed himself to be in this case, what miseries the world might have escaped! how different history would have been ! As Gregory has been, for ages, a Catholic saint, even the Catholic Church ought not to blame any one for adopting his estimate of the value of church councils.

Gregory's resignation made it necessary to elect a new bishop of Constantinople. The choice fell upon Nectarius, a senator and praetor of the city, who had never yet been baptized. He was first elected bishop, next baptized into membership of the church, and then by the bishops of the council was installed in his new office.

Having "settled" these things, the council proceeded to settle the Catholic faith again. The same question which had been so long discussed as to the nature of Christ, was up now in regard to the nature of the Holy Spirit. Now, the question was whether the Holy Spirit is Homousion with the Father and the Son. The Macedonians held that it is not. The council decided that it is. The Macedonians left the assembly, and the remaining one hundred and fifty bishops framed the following creed: — "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all times [ages], Light from Light, very God from very God, begotten, not created, of the same substance with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; who was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And in one Holy Catholic and apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. We look for a resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."^{f386} They also established seven canons, in one of which they attempted to settle the question of dignity between the bishops of Alexandria and Constantinople by ordaining as follows: —

"Canon 3. The bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."

^{f387}

This, however, like every other attempt to settle their ecclesiastical disputes, only bred new and more violent contentions. For, by a trick in words, and a casuistical interpretation, this canon was afterward made the

ground upon which was claimed by the bishopric of Constantinople, superiority over that of Rome. It was argued that the words “the first rank after the bishop of Rome,” did not mean the second in actual rank, but the first, and really carried precedence over Old Rome; that the real meaning was that hitherto Rome had held the first rank, but now Constantinople should hold the first rank, i, e., after Rome had held it !

The bishops in council, having finished their labors, sent to Theodosius the following letter: —

“In obedience to your letters, we met together at Constantinople, and having first restored union among ourselves, we then made short definitions confirming the faith of the Fathers of Nicaea, and condemning the heresies which have risen in opposition to it. We have also, for the sake of ecclesiastical order, drawn up certain canons; and all this we append to our letter. We pray you now, of your goodness, to confirm by a letter of your piety the decision of the synod, that, as you have honored the church by your letters of convocation, you would thus seal the decisions.” ^{f388}

Accordingly, the emperor confirmed and sealed their decisions in an edict issued July 30, 381, commanding that “all the churches were at once to be surrendered to the bishops who believed in the oneness of the Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. and were in communion with Nectarius of Constantinople; in Egypt with Timotheus of Alexandria; in the East with Pelagius of Laodicea and Diodorus of Tarsus; in proconsular Asia and the Asiatic diocese with Amphilochius of Iconium and Optimus of Antioch (in Pisidia); in the diocese of Pontus with Helladius of Caesarea, Otreius of Melitene, and Gregory of Nyssa; lastly (in Moesia and Scythia) with Terentius, the bishop of Scythia (Tomi), and with Martyrius, bishop of Marcianople (now Preslaw in Bulgaria). All who were not in communion with the above-named, should, as avowed heretics, be driven from the church.” — Hefele. ^{f389}

While the council of Constantinople was sitting, the emperor Gratian called a council at Aquileia in Italy. This was presided over by the bishop of Aquileia, but Ambrose, bishop of Milan, “was the most active member and soul of the whole affair.” The object of this council was, in unison with the Council of Constantinople, to establish the unity of the faith throughout the whole world. There happened to be three bishops in all the West who were

accused of being Arians. They would not acknowledge that they were such; but the accusation of heresy was sufficient foundation upon which to call a council.

The council met in August, and after several preliminary meetings, met in formal session, the third of September. A letter which Arius had written to his bishop, Alexander, about sixty years before, was read, and the three accused bishops were required to say “yes” or “no,” as to whether or not they agreed to “these blasphemies against the Son.” They would not give a direct answer, choosing rather to speak for themselves than to answer by an emphatic “yes” or “no,” questions that were framed by their accusers. The council next spun out a string of curses upon all the leading points of the Arian doctrine; and because the three bishops would not join in these curses, the council, at the proposal of Ambrose, and as early as one o’clock on the afternoon of the first day, pronounced its curse upon the three bishops as heretics, declaring them deposed from office, and immediately sent a circular letter to this effect to all the bishops of the West. They next sent a full account of their proceedings, according to their own view, “to the emperors Gratian, Valentinian, II, and Theodosius, and prayed them to lend the aid of the secular arm, in the actual deposition of the condemned, and the appointment of orthodox bishops in their stead.” They also asked the emperor Theodosius to make it impossible for the teacher of one of these condemned bishops any “further to disturb the peace of the church or to travel about from one town to another.” — Hefele. ^{f390}

With Damasus, bishop of Rome, this council disagreed with that of Constantinople, upon the dispute between the Eustathians and Meletians, and a letter was therefore sent to the emperor, asking for another general council to be held at Alexandria, to decide this, with other disputes among the Catholics themselves.

The condemned bishops complained that they were misrepresented in the letters of the council, and protested against being confounded with the Arians. They likewise demanded another council, to be held at Rome. When these letters reached Theodosius, the Council of Constantinople was over, and the bishops had gone home. But instead of calling the council to meet at Alexandria, he recalled the bishops to Constantinople. He sent two special invitations to Gregory Nazianzen to attend the council, but Gregory, still retaining the wisdom he had acquired at the preceding council, positively refused, with the words, “I never yet saw a council of

bishops come to a good end. I salute them from afar off, since I know how troublesome they are.” ^{f391}

By the time the bishops were again got together at Constantinople, it was early in the summer of 382. They there received another letter from a council which had just been held under the presidency of Ambrose, at Milan, asking them to attend a general council at Rome. The bishops remained at Constantinople, but sent three of their number as their representatives, and also a letter affirming their strict adherence to the Nicene Creed. Lack of time and space alike forbid that the proceedings of these councils should be followed in detail. Council after council followed; another one at Constantinople in 383, at Bordeaux in 384, at Treves in 385, at Rome in 386, at Antioch in 388, at Carthage in 389, Rome again in 390, Carthage again in 390, Capua in 391, at Hippo in 393, at Nismes in 394, and at Constantinople again in 394.

On his part Theodosius was all this time doing all he could to second the efforts of the church to secure unanimity of faith, and to blot out all heresy. “In the space of fifteen years he promulgated at least fifteen severe edicts against the heretics, more especially against those who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity.” — Gibbon. ^{f392} In these edicts it was enacted that any of the heretics who should usurp the title of bishop or presbyter, should suffer the penalty of exile and confiscation of goods, if they attempted either to preach the doctrine or practice the rites of their “accursed” sects. A fine of about twenty thousand dollars was pronounced upon every person who should dare to confer, or receive, or promote, the ordination of a heretic. Any religious meetings of the heretics, whether public or private, whether by day or by night, in city or country, were absolutely prohibited; and if any such meeting was held, the building or even the ground which should be used for the purpose, was declared confiscated. “The anathemas of the church were fortified by a sort of civil excommunication,” which separated the heretics from their fellow-citizens by disqualifying them from holding any public office, trust, or employment. The heretics who made a distinction in the nature of the Son from that of the Father, were declared incapable of either making wills or receiving legacies. The Manichaean heretics were to be punished with death, as were also the heretics “who should dare to perpetrate the atrocious crime” of celebrating Easter on a day not appointed by the Catholic Church. ^{f393}

That these laws might not be vain, the office of “inquisitor of the faith,” was instituted, and it was not long before capital punishment was inflicted upon “heresy,” though not exactly under Theodosius himself. Gratian was killed in A.D. 383, by command of a certain Maximus, who had been declared emperor by the troops in Britain, and acknowledged by the troops in Gaul. A treaty of peace was formed between him and Theodosius, and the new emperor Maximus stepped into the place both in Church and State, which had been occupied by Gratian.

A certain Priscillian and his followers were condemned as heretics by the Council of Bordeaux in A.D. 384. They appealed to the emperor Maximus, under whose civil jurisdiction they were; but by the diligence of three bishops — Ithacius, Magnus, and Rufus — as prosecutors, they were there likewise condemned. Priscillian himself, two presbyters, two deacons, Latronian a poet, and Euchrocia the widow of an orator of Bordeaux, — seven in all, — were beheaded, while others were banished.

Thus the union of Church and State, the clothing of the church with civil power, bore its inevitable fruit. It is true that there were some bishops who condemned the execution of the Priscillianists, but the others fully justified it. Those who condemned it, however, did so more at the sight of actual bloodshed, than for any other reason; because they fully justified, and in fact demanded, every penalty short of actual death. And those who persecuted the Priscillianists, and who advocated, and secured, and justified, their execution, were never condemned by the church nor by any council. In fact their course was actually indorsed by a council; for “the synod at Treves, in 385, sanctioned the conduct of Ithacius” (Hefele^{f394}), who was the chief prosecutor in the case. Even the disagreement as to whether it was right or not, was silenced when, twenty years afterward, Augustine set forth his principles, asserting the righteousness of whatever penalty would bring the incorrigible to the highest grade of religious development; and the matter was fully set at rest for all time when, in A.D. 447, Leo, bishop of Rome, justified the execution of Priscillian and his associate heretics, and declared the righteousness of the penalty of death for heresy.

In re-establishing the unity of the Catholic faith, Theodosius did not confine his attention to professors of Christianity only. In his original edict, it will be remembered that all his subjects should be Catholic Christians. A good many of his subject were pagans, and still conformed to the pagan

ceremonies and worship. In 382 Gratian, at the instance of Ambrose, had struck a blow at the pagan religion by rejecting the dignity of Pontifex Maximus, which had been borne by every one of his predecessors; and had also commanded that the statue and altar of Victory should be thrown down. Maximus was killed in 388, and on account of the youth of Valentinian II, Theodosius, as his guardian, became virtually ruler of the whole empire; and at Rome the same year, he assembled the Senate and put to them the question whether the old or the new religion should be that of the empire.

By the imperial influence, the majority of the Senate, as in the church councils, adopted the will of the emperor, and “the same laws which had been originally published in the provinces of the East, were applied, after the defeat of Maximus, to the whole extent of the Western empire.... A special commission was granted to Cynegius, the praetorian prefect of the East, and afterwards to the counts Jovius and Gaudentius, two officers of distinguished rank in the West, by which they were directed to shut the temples, to seize or destroy the instruments of idolatry, to abolish the privileges of the priests, and to confiscate the consecrated property for the benefit of the emperor, of the church, or of the army.” — Gibbon.^{f395}

Thus was the Catholic faith finally established as that of the Roman empire, thus was that empire “converted,” and thus was Pagan Rome made Papal Rome.

CHAPTER 17.

MARY IS MADE THE MOTHER OF GOD.

By the pious zeal of Theodosius, “the unity of the faith” had been once more secured, and the empire had been made Catholic. As all his efforts in this direction had been put forth to secure the peace of the church, it might be supposed that this result should have been assured. But peace was just as far from the church now as it ever had been, and a good deal farther from the State than it had ever yet been.

By this time, among the chief bishoprics of the empire, the desire for supremacy had become so all-absorbing that each one was exerting every possible influence to bring the others into subjection to himself. The rivalry, however, was most bitter between the bishopric of Alexandria and that of Constantinople. Of the great sees of the empire, Alexandria had always held the second place. Now, however, Constantinople was the chief imperial city; and, as already related, the Council of Constantinople had ordained that the bishop of Constantinople should hold the first rank after the bishop of Rome. The Alexandrian party argued that this dignity was merely honorary, and carried with it no jurisdiction. Rome, seeing to what the canon might lead, sided with Alexandria. Constantinople, however, steadily insisted that the canon bestowed jurisdiction to the full extent of the honor. The bishop of Constantinople therefore aspired to the complete occupancy of the second place, and Alexandria was supremely jealous of the aspiration.

It will be remembered that when Gregory Nazianzen was first called to the bishopric of Constantinople, Peter of Alexandria had caused Maximus to be ordained, and now this same spirit showed itself again and much more violently than before.

Theodosius died A.D. 395, and was succeeded by his two sons, Arcadius and Honorius, by whom the empire was permanently divided. Arcadius became emperor of the East and Honorius of the West. Although Arcadius occupied the throne and bore the name of “emperor,” “the East was now governed by women and eunuchs.” — Milman.^{f401} Eutropius, the eunuch, was prime minister to Arcadius. At the death of Nectarius, Eutropius had brought from Antioch and made bishop of Constantinople, a presbyter,

John surnamed Chrysostom — the golden-mouthed. By the exercise of discipline, Chrysostom undertook to purify the bishopric. He “exposed with unsparing indignation the vices and venality of the clergy, and involved them all in one indiscriminate charge of simony and licentiousness.” — Milman.^{f402} In an episcopal progress through Lydia and Phrygia, he deposed thirteen bishops. He declared his free opinion “that the number of bishops who might be saved, bore a very small proportion to those who would be damned.” — Gibbon.^{f403} In addition to this, and with much more danger to himself, he incurred the enmity of the monks, who now existed in swarms throughout the East, by declaring with evident truth that they were “the disgrace of their holy profession.”

These measures set the whole ecclesiastical order against him, and they began to intrigue for his overthrow. This opened the way for the bishop of Alexandria again to assert his authority.

Theophilus, a violent and unscrupulous prelate, was now bishop of Alexandria, and he immediately espoused the cause of the malcontents, who proudly accepted him as their leader. Another new element was now added: Chrysostom had not confined his denunciations to the clergy and the monks, but had uttered them against the women of the court, and especially the empress Eudoxia, a young and beautiful woman of violent disposition, “who indulged her passions, and despised her husband.” — Gibbon.^{f404} Her, Chrysostom reviled as another Jezebel. She was not the kind of woman who would take this without making reply. She called Theophilus to Constantinople to preside over a council to depose Chrysostom. He came with a “stout body of Egyptian mariners” to protect him, and a train of bishops to sit in the council.

Theophilus and his followers joined with the enemies of Chrysostom, numbering thirty-six bishops in all, and held their council at a place or estate Ad Quercem — at the Oak. Four times the council summoned Chrysostom to appear, and sent the following letter: —

“The holy synod at the Oak to John: Letters complaining of countless offenses committed by you have been delivered to us. Appear, therefore, and bring with you the priests Serapion and Tigrius, for they are wanted.”^{f405}

Chrysostom on his part assembled a council of forty bishops, and sent three of the bishops and two priests with a letter to Theophilus, telling him that

he should not disturb the church, and that if in spite of the Nicene Canon, he wanted to settle a dispute beyond his diocese, he should come to Constantinople itself, and “not like Cain entice Abel into the field.” In the letter he also declared that as there was an indictment against Theophilus containing seventy charges, he was the one who ought really to be called to account rather than to be presiding in a council to try another; and besides this that there were more bishops in the council at Constantinople than there were with Theophilus at the Oak. At the same time he wrote privately to other bishops at the Oak telling them that if they would exclude from the council his avowed enemies, he would appear, whenever they desired; but if not, he would not appear, even if they sent ten thousand times for him. In answer to this letter, a notary was sent to Chrysostom with an imperial decree that he “must appear at the synod,” and at the same time a priest and a monk brought a fresh summons from the synod at the Oak. Chrysostom then sent authorized representatives to the Oak. “They were roughly treated, and the process against him was put into full swing.” — Hefe^{f406}le.

The council sat for two weeks, during which time they framed twenty-nine different charges, amongst which those considered the very gravest were that he had “administered baptism after he had eaten,;” and another, that he had “administered the sacrament to those who had in like manner broken their fast.” — Milman.^{f407} He was unanimously condemned, and as there had been accessions to their number, there were forty-five bishops who subscribed to the decree.

Having deposed him, it was necessary to execute the sentence, but on account of the watchfulness of the populace, this had to be done at night. To prevent a riot, he secretly surrendered himself to the imperial officers, who conducted him across the Bosphorus and landed him at a place near the entrance of the Black Sea. Theophilus and his followers had come into the city, and the next day when the populace learned that Chrysostom had been carried off, “they suddenly rose with unanimous and irresistible fury. Theophilus escaped; but the promiscuous crowd of monks and Egyptian mariners were slaughtered without pity in the streets of Constantinople.” — Gibbon.^{f408}

The next night there was a harmless earthquake, but it was readily seized upon and made to do service as evidence of the wrath of Heaven against the deposition of Chrysostom. Eudoxia herself, as superstitious as the rest,

was frightened by it, and when the mob crowded about the palace asserting the vengeance of Heaven and demanding the return of Chrysostom, she went herself to Arcadius, asked for his recall, and, to appease the populace, published a letter “disclaiming all hostility to the banished prelate, and protesting that she was ‘innocent of his blood.’” — Milman.^{f409}

Chrysostom returned in triumph. The whole city, men, women, and children, turned out to meet him. The shores were crowded; the Bosphorus was covered with vessels, and both shores were grandly illuminated. When he landed, with hymns of thanksgiving and chants of praise they escorted him to the cathedral. Chrysostom mounted the pulpit, and made the following speech: —

“What shall I say? Blessed be God! These were my last words on my departure, these the first on my return. Blessed be God! because he permitted the storm to rage. Blessed be God! because he has allayed it. Let my enemies behold how their conspiracy has advanced my peace, and redounded to my glory. Before, the church alone was crowded, now the whole forum is become a church. The games are celebrating in the circus, but the whole people pour like a torrent to the church. Your prayers in my behalf are more glorious than a diadem, — the prayers both of men and women; for in Christ there is neither male nor female.”^{f410}

Thus exultant in his victory over his opponents, he broke out more violently than ever in denunciation of the empress. The statue of Eudoxia was about to be set up in front of the cathedral. It seems that this was to be performed on a festival day, and on such occasions dances, pantomimes, and all sorts of theatricals were indulged in. Chrysostom uttered a loud protest against this celebration, as his zeal “was always especially directed against these idolatrous amusements which often, he confesses, drained the church of his hearers.” — Milman.^{f411} His denunciations were reported to the empress, as personal insults to her. She threatened to call another council, and have him deposed again. He replied with a sermon yet bolder than all before, in which he likened her to Herodias, exclaiming: —

“Again Herodias raves; again she is troubled; she dances again; and again desires to receive John’s head in a charger.”^{f412}

The emperor immediately suspended him, and a council was appointed, which, under the guidance of Theophilus, again condemned him, but upon

the charges that he had resisted the decrees of the former synod, and that he had violated the canons of the church in resuming and exercising the office of bishop, while yet under condemnation of a council. The sentence of exile was again pronounced, and a detachment of barbarian troops was brought into the city to assist the imperial officers in executing the sentence. "In the midst of the solemn celebration of Good Friday, in the great church of Santa Sophia, the military forced their way, not merely into the nave, but up to the altar, on which were placed the consecrated elements. Many worshipers were trodden under foot; many wounded by the swords of the soldiers: the clergy were dragged to prison; some females, who were about to be baptized, were obliged to fly with their disordered apparel: the waters of the font were stained with blood; the soldiers pressed up to the altar; seized the sacred vessels as their plunder; the sacred elements were scattered about!... Constantinople for several days had the appearance of a city which had been stormed. Wherever the partisans of Chrysostom were assembled, they were assaulted and dispersed by the soldiery; females were exposed to insult, and one frantic attempt was made to assassinate the prelate." — Milman. ^{f413}

Chrysostom was concealed by his friends, but after awhile he escaped from them, and gave himself up again. Again he was taken from the city by night; and now he was banished — A.D. 404 — to a town called Caucasus in the mountains of Armenia. And "on the very day of his departure, some of John's friends set fire to the church, which by means of a strong easterly wind, communicated with the Senate-house." — Socrates. ^{f414}

As soon as Chrysostom had been permanently sent away, Theophilus sent to the bishop of Rome the information that he had deposed the bishop of Constantinople, but without telling him why. Chrysostom also from his place of exile addressed the bishop of Rome, giving an account of the proceedings against him, and asking Innocent "to declare such wicked proceedings void and null, to pronounce all who had any share in them, punishable according to the ecclesiastical laws, and to continue to him the marks of his charity and communion." — Bower. ^{f415}

As was to be expected, Chrysostom also asked the bishop of Rome to use his influence to have a general council called to settle the matter. Letters were also sent from the clergy of Constantinople and the bishops who sided with Chrysostom, asking Innocent to take an interest in the case. Innocent answered both with the statement that he admitted the bishops of

both parties to his communion, and thus left no room for complaints on either side; and that the council which was contemplated might not be biased beforehand. Innocent applied to the Emperor Honorius, asking him to persuade Arcadius to agree to the calling of a general council, to settle the dispute and contention between Chrysostom and Theophilus. Honorius wrote three letters to Arcadius, the last of which was as follows: —

“This is the third time I write to your Meekness entreating you to correct and rectify the iniquitous proceedings that have been carried on against John, bishop of Constantinople. But nothing, I find, has been hitherto done in his behalf. Having therefore much at heart the peace of the church, which will be attended with that of our empire, I write to you anew by these holy bishops and presbyters, earnestly desiring you to command the Eastern bishops to assemble at Thessalonica. The Western bishops have sent five of their body, two presbyters of the Roman Church, and one deacon, all men of strictest equity, and quite free from the bias of favor and hatred. These I beg you would receive with that regard which is due to their rank and merit. If they find John to have been justly deposed, they may separate me from his communion; and you from the communion of the orientals, if it appears that he has been unjustly deposed. The Western bishops have very plainly expressed their sentiments, in the many letters they have written to me on the subject of the present dispute. Of these I send you two, the one from the bishop of Rome, the other from the bishop of Aquileia; and with them the rest agree. One thing I must above all beg of your Meekness: that you oblige Theophilus of Alexandria to assist at the council, how averse soever he may be to it; for he is said to be the first and chief author of the present calamities. Thus the synod, meeting with no delays or obstructions, will restore peace and tranquillity in our days.”^{f416}

Not only were the letters of Honorius disregarded, but his ambassadors were insulted and abused; which when he learned, he was about to declare war, but was prevented by an invasion of the barbarians.

Thus the efforts to obtain a general council upon this question came to naught. When Innocent learned this, he determined to take the side of Chrysostom. He therefore published a letter announcing the fact, and separating from his communion Theophilus and all who were of his party.

Chrysostom died in 407; but the quarrel was continued by the bishop of Rome, who refused to communicate with the new bishop of Constantinople, unless he would acknowledge that Chrysostom was lawful bishop of that city until the day of his death. As this would be to acknowledge that his own election to the bishopric of Constantinople was unlawful, Atticus refused; and the contention was kept up seven years longer, but was finally compromised in 414.

The empress Eudoxia died about A.D. 405. The emperor Arcadius died May 1, A.D. 408, leaving a son — Theodosius II — seven years of age, heir to the throne, and a daughter, Pulcheria, ten years of age, who, after A.D. 414, held the most important place in the affairs of the empire for forty years. At the age of twenty and by the arts of Pulcheria, Theodosius II was married to Eudocia, who was nearly eight years older than himself, and the incapable youth was kept in a “perpetual infancy, encompassed only with a servile train of women and eunuchs,” and ruled by women, eunuchs, and monks.

The war with Chrysostom was ended, yet the roots of bitterness and seeds of strife still remained between Alexandria and Constantinople. And though the two men who were bishops of these two cities were in harmony so far as the confusion about Chrysostom was concerned, the same jealousy as to the dignity of their respective sees still existed, and soon broke out more violently than ever before. The subject of the next dispute was a question of doctrine, and, like that over the Homoousion, was so illusive, and the disputants believed so nearly alike and yet were so determined not to believe alike, and the men who led in it were so arrogant and cruel, that from the beginning the contention was more violent than any that had yet been.

In A.D. 412, Cyril, the nephew of Theophilus, became bishop of Alexandria. He was one of the very worst men of his time. He began his episcopacy by shutting up the churches of the Novatians, “the most innocent and harmless of the sectaries,” and taking possession of all their ecclesiastical ornaments and consecrated vessels, and stripping their bishop, Theopemptus, of all his possessions. Nor was Cyril content with the exercise of such strictly episcopal functions as these: he aspired to absolute authority, civil as well as ecclesiastical.

He drove out the Jews, forty thousand in number, destroyed their synagogues, and allowed his followers to strip them of all their possessions. Orestes, the prefect of Egypt, displeased at the loss of such a large number of wealthy and industrious people, entered a protest, and sent up a report to the emperor. Cyril likewise wrote to the emperor. No answer came from the court, and the people urged Cyril to come to a reconciliation with the prefect, but his advances were made in such a way that the prefect would not receive them. The monks poured in from the desert to the number of about five hundred, to champion the cause of Cyril.

Orestes was passing through the streets in his chariot. The monks flocked around him, insulted him, and denounced him as a heathen and an idolater. Orestes, thinking that perhaps they thought this was so, and knowing his life to be in danger, called out that he was a Christian, and had been baptized by Atticus, bishop of Constantinople. His defense was in vain. In answer, one of the monks threw a big stone which struck him on the head, and wounded him so that his face was covered with blood. At this all his guards fled for their lives; but the populace came to the rescue, and drove off the monks, and captured the one who threw the stone. His name was Ammonius, and the prefect punished him so severely that shortly afterward he died. "Cyril commanded his body to be taken up; the honors of a Christian martyr were prostituted on this insolent ruffian, his panegyric was pronounced in the church, and he was named Thaumasius — the wonderful." — Milman.^{f417}

But the party of Cyril proceeded to yet greater violence than this. At that time there was in Alexandria a teacher of philosophy, a woman, Hypatia by name. She gave public lectures which were so largely attended by the chief people of the city, that Cyril grew jealous that more people went to hear her lecture than came to hear him preach. She was a friend of Orestes, and it was also charged that she, more than any other, was the cause why Orestes would not be reconciled to Cyril. One day as Hypatia was passing through the street in a chariot, she was attacked by a crowd of Cyril's partisans, whose ring-leader was Peter the Reader. She was torn from her chariot, stripped naked in the street, dragged into a church, and there beaten to death with a club, by Peter the Reader. Then they tore her limb from limb, and with shells scraped the flesh from her bones, and threw the remnants into the fire, March, A.D. 414.

This was Cyril, — now Saint Cyril, — bishop of Alexandria. And in addition to his naturally tyrannical and murderous disposition, “jealousy and animosity toward the bishop of Constantinople was a sacred legacy bequeathed by Theophilus to his nephew, and Cyril faithfully administered the fatal trust.” — Milman.^{f418}

In 428, there was appointed to the bishopric of Constantinople a monk of Antioch, Nestorius by name, who in wickedness of disposition was only second to Cyril of Alexandria. In his ordination sermon before the great crowd of people, he personally addressed to the emperor these words: —

“Give me, my prince, the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven as a recompense. Assist me in destroying heretics, and I will assist you in vanquishing the Persians.”^{f419}

The fifth day afterward, in accordance with this proposition, Nestorius began his part in purging the earth of heretics. There was a little company of Arians who met in a private house for worship; these were surprised and attacked, and as they saw the house being torn to pieces and sacked, they set fire to it, which burned that building and many others adjoining. On account of this, Nestorius received from both parties the appropriate nickname of the “Incendiary.” This attack upon the Arians was followed furiously upon the Quarto-Decimans, who celebrated Easter on a day other than the Catholic Sunday; and also upon the Novatians. The authority of the emperor somewhat checked his fury against the Novatians, but it raged unmolested against the Quarto-Decimans throughout Asia, Lydia, and Caria, and multitudes perished in the tumults which he stirred up, especially at Miletus and Sardis.

And now these two desperate men, Nestorius and Cyril, became the respective champions of the two sides of a controversy touching the faith of the Catholic Church, as to whether Mary was the Mother of God or not. In the long contention and the fine-spun distinctions as to whether the Son of God is of the same substance, or only of like substance with the Father, Christ had been removed entirely beyond the comprehension of the people. And owing to the desperate character and cruel disposition of the men who carried on the controversy as the representatives of Christ, the members of the church were made afraid of him. And now, instead of Jesus standing forth as the mediator between men and God, he was removed so far away and was clothed with such a forbidding aspect, that it became necessary to

have a mediator between men and Christ. And into this place the Virgin Mary was put.

This gave rise to the question as to what was the exact relationship of Mary to Christ. Was she actually the mother of the divinity of Christ, and therefore the Mother of God? or was she only the mother of the humanity of Christ? For a considerable time already the question had been agitated, and among a people whose ancestors for ages had been devout worshipers of the mother goddesses — Diana and Cybele — the title “Mother of God” was gladly welcomed and strenuously maintained. This party spoke of Mary as “God-bearer;” the opposite party called her only “man-bearer;” while a third party coming between tried to have all speak of her as “Christ-bearer.”

As before stated, this question had already been agitated considerably, but when two such characters as Cyril and Nestorius took it up, it speedily became the one all-important question, and the all-absorbing topic. Nestorius started it in his very first sermon after becoming bishop of Constantinople. He denied that Mary could properly be called the Mother of God. Some of his priests immediately withdrew from his communion, and began to preach against his heresy, and the monks rushed in also. Nestorius denounced them all as miserable men, called in the police, and had some of them flogged and imprisoned, especially several monks who had accused him to the emperor. From this the controversy spread rapidly, and Cyril, urged on by both natural and inherited jealousy, came to the rescue in defense of the title, “Mother of God.” “Cyril of Alexandria, to those who esteem the stern and uncompromising assertion of certain Christian tenets the one paramount Christian virtue, may be the hero, even the saint: but while ambition, intrigue, arrogance, rapacity, and violence are proscribed as unchristian means — barbarity, persecution, bloodshed as unholy and unevangelical wickedness — posterity will condemn the orthodox Cyril as one of the worst of heretics against the spirit of the gospel.” — Milman.^{f420}

It is not necessary to put into this book the blasphemous arguments of either side. It is enough to say that in this controversy, as in that regarding the Homooousion, the whole dispute was one about words and terms only. Each determined that the other should express the disputed doctrine in his own words and ideas, while he himself could not clearly express his ideas in words different from the others. “Never was there a case in which the

contending parties approximated so closely. Both subscribed, both appealed, to the Nicene Creed; both admitted the pre-existence, the impassibility, of the Eternal Word; but the fatal duty... of considering the detection of heresy the first of religious obligations, mingled, as it now was, with human passions and interests, made the breach irreparable.” —
Milman.^{f421}

Cyril demanded of Nestorius that he should confess Mary to be the Mother of God, without any distinction, explanation, or qualification. And because Nestorius would not comply, Cyril denounced him everywhere as a heretic, stirred up the people of Constantinople against him, and sent letters to the emperor, the empress, and to Pulcheria, to prove to them that the Virgin Mary “ought to be called” the Mother of God. He declared that to dispute such a title was rank heresy, and by adulation, and by declaring that whoever disputed this title was unworthy of the protection of the imperial family, he sought to have the court take his side at once against Nestorius. But Nestorius had the advantage with respect to the court, because he was present in Constantinople.

Fierce letters also passed between Cyril and Nestorius, and both sent off letters to Celestine, bishop of Rome. Nestorius sent his first, but he wrote in Greek, and Celestine had to send it to Gaul to be translated into Latin, so that he could read it. Before the letter of Nestorius was returned from Gaul, Cyril’s letter had arrived, which was written in Latin; with which also he had sent some of the sermons of Nestorius which he had translated into Latin for the benefit of Celestine. Yet further he gave citations to Athanasius and Peter of Alexandria, where they had given to Mary the title of Mother of God. Celestine called a council in Rome, A.D. 430. The letters and papers of both Cyril and Nestorius were read, after which Celestine made a long speech to prove that “the Virgin Mary was truly the Mother of God.” He supported his views by quotations from the Eastern bishops, whom Cyril had cited, and also from his predecessors Damasus and Hilary, and from Ambrose of Milan who had caused the people on Christmas day every year to sing a hymn in honor of Mary, in which she was called the Mother of God.

The council declared that Nestorius was “the author of a new and very dangerous heresy,” praised Cyril for opposing it, declared the doctrine of Cyril strictly orthodox, and condemned to deposition all ecclesiastics who should refuse to adopt it. Celestine conveyed to Nestorius the decision of

the council, and in the name of the council and in his own name, commanded him publicly and in a written apology, to renounce his heretical opinions within ten days after the receipt of this letter, or else incur the penalty of excommunication. On the same day Celestine also wrote a letter to Cyril, appointing him as his agent to execute the decision of the council, and empowering him in the name, and with the authority, of the apostolic see, to excommunicate and depose Nestorius, if by the expiration of ten days he had not recanted. Other letters were also sent at the same time to the clergy and laity of Constantinople and to the principal bishops of the East, exhorting them to steadfastness in the faith, and declaring that whomever Nestorius had excommunicated or deposed on account of this question, should be counted as in communion with the bishop of Rome.

All these letters were sent to Cyril, who upon receiving them, called a council of the Egyptian bishops, and drew up twelve propositions with their respective curses, which Nestorius was to sign if he would obey the sentence of the council at Rome, and recant his opinions. It was also required that Nestorius should not only acknowledge the creed of Nice, but that he must add a written and sworn declaration that he did so, and that he would condemn all his previous “pernicious and unholy assertions,” and agree in future to “believe and teach the same as Cyril, and as the synod, and the bishops of the East and West.” — Hefele.^{f422}

All this with the decree of the Council of Rome was sent by four bishops to Nestorius at Constantinople. These bishops to make as great a display of their authority as possible, went to the cathedral on Sunday, at the time of public service, and delivered the document to Nestorius, while he was performing the principal service of the day. In answer to these decrees Nestorius, in a sermon preached on the following Sabbath, declared that to maintain the peace and tranquillity of the church, “he was ready to grant the title of ‘Mother of God’ to the Virgin Mary, providing nothing else was thereby meant but that the man born of her was united to the Divinity.” But Cyril insisted that he should adopt the twelve propositions and their curses which the Alexandrian Synod had sent. As a final reply Nestorius then drew up twelve counter propositions with their respective curses, to which he demanded that Cyril should subscribe.

It was now the middle of December, 430. All the time that these contentions had been going on, both parties had been calling for a general

council; and as early as November 19, the emperors Theodosius II and Valentinian III had issued letters ordering a general council to meet at Ephesus in the spring of 431.

Of all places in the world, Ephesus was the very one where it would be the nearest to an impossibility to obtain anything like a fair examination of the question. Like Diana of old, the Virgin Mary was now the patroness of Ephesus; and the worse than heathen Catholics were more fanatically devoted to her than even the heathen Ephesians had been to Diana. But a fair examination of the question, or in fact any real examination, was not intended by Celestine and Cyril. Their only intention was either the unconditional surrender or the condemnation of Nestorius. Cyril was appointed by Celestine to preside at the council. He addressed Celestine, asking whether Nestorius should be allowed to sit as a member of the council. Celestine told him that he should do everything to restore peace to the church and to win Nestorius to the truth: but that if Nestorius was quite determined against this, “then he must reap what, with the help of the devil, he had sown.” — Hefele.^{f423}

Celestine also sent a letter to the emperor Theodosius II, saying that he could not personally attend the council, but that he would take part by commissioners. He desired that the emperor “should allow no innovations, and no disturbance of the peace of the church. He should even regard the interests of the faith as higher than those of the State; and the peace of the church as much more important than the peace of the nations.” Celestine’s instructions to his commissioners were to the same intent. He commanded them to “hold strictly by Cyril,” but at the same time to be sure “to preserve the dignity of the apostolic see.” They were directed to attend all the meetings of the council, yet to take no part in any of the discussions, but to “give judgments” on the views of others. And finally, the letter which Celestine sent by these legates to the bishops in the council exhorted them “to preserve the true faith,” and closed with these words: —

“The legates are to be present at the transactions of the synod, and will give effect to that which the pope has long ago decided with respect to Nestorius; for he does not doubt that the assembled bishops will agree with this.”^{f424}

Neither of the emperors was present at the council, but they jointly appointed Count Candidian, captain of the imperial bodyguard, as the

“Protector of the Council.” Nestorius came with sixteen bishops, accompanied by an armed guard composed of bathmen of Constantinople and a horde of peasants. In addition to this, by the special favor of the emperor, an officer, Irenaeus, with a body of soldiers, was appointed to protect him. Cyril came with fifty Egyptian bishops and a number of bathmen and “a multitude of women” from Alexandria, and such sailors in his fleet as he could depend upon. Arrived at Ephesus, he was joined by Memnon, bishop of that city, with fifty-two bishops, and a crowd of peasants whom he had drawn into the city. Juvenalis, bishop of Jerusalem, came with his subordinate bishops, we know not the number; these also were hostile to Nestorius, and joined Cyril and Memnon. Others came from Thessalonica, Apamea, and Hieropolis, and when the council opened, there were one hundred and ninety-eight bishops present, including the pope’s legates, and not including Nestorius. John of Antioch, with the bishops of his diocese, was on the way, but did not reach Ephesus until Cyril’s part of the council was over.

The council was to have met June 7, 431, but owing to delays on the part of the bishops of Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Antioch, it did not open until June 22, and even then the bishops of Antioch had not arrived. But all the time was spent in preliminary disputes, winning partisans, and working up the populace. As Cyril had the great majority of the bishops on his side, and as the city was already devoted to the “Mother of God.” Nestorius was at a great disadvantage, and his enemies did not hesitate to let him know it, and to make him feel it. Cyril preached a sermon in which he paid the following idolatrous tribute to Mary: —

“Blessed be thou, O Mother of God! Thou rich treasure of the world, inextinguishable lamp, crown of virginity, scepter of true doctrine, imperishable temple, habitation of Him whom no space can contain, mother and virgin, through whom He is, who comes in the name of the Lord. Blessed be thou, O Mary, who didst hold in thy womb the Infinite One; thou through whom the blessed Trinity is glorified and worshiped, through whom the precious cross is adored throughout the world, through whom heaven rejoices and angels and archangels are glad, through whom the devil is disarmed and banished, through whom the fallen creature is restored to heaven, through whom every believing soul is saved.” ^{f425}

Cyril and his party urged that the council should be opened without any more delay. As the emperor had particularly required the presence of John of Antioch, Nestorius insisted on waiting till he came; and Candidian sustained Nestorius. Cyril refused, and he and his partisans assembled in the Church of the Virgin Mary to proceed with the council. As soon as Count Candidian learned of this, he hastened to the church to forbid it, and there he fell into an ecclesiastical trap. He declared that they were acting in defiance of the imperial rescript which was to guide the council. They answered that as they had not seen the rescript, they did not know what it required of them. The Count read it to them. This was just what they wanted. They declared that the reading of the rescript legalized their meeting! They greeted it with “loud and loyal clamors,” pronounced the council begun, and commanded the Count to withdraw from an assembly in which he had no longer any legal place.

Candidian protested against the unfairness of the proceedings; and then, he himself says, they “injuriously and ignominiously ejected” him. They next expelled all the bishops, sixty-eight in number, who were known to favor Nestorius, “and then commenced their proceedings as the legitimate Senate of Christendom.” — Milman.^{f425}

One of Cyril’s presbyters was secretary, and he formally opened the business of the council by reading a statement of the dispute that had brought them together. Then the emperor’s letter calling the council was read. They sent four bishops to notify Nestorius to appear. He courteously refused to acknowledge the legality of their assembly. A second deputation of four bishops was sent, and they returned with the word that they were not allowed by the guard to go near him, but received from his attendants the same answer as before. A third deputation of four was sent, and they returned with the report that they were subjected to the indignity of being kept standing in the heat of the sun, and receiving no answer at all. Having made such an earnest effort to have Nestorius present, but in vain, they “sorrowfully” commenced the proceedings without him.

The Nicene Creed was first read, and then Cyril’s letter to Nestorius, with the twelve propositions and their accompanying curses, all of which were solemnly confirmed by all the bishops in succession.

Then was read the letter of Nestorius to Cyril, with the twelve counter-propositions and their curses. One after another the bishops arose and

declared the propositions blasphemous, and vehemently uttered the appended curses. Then when the list was completed, they all arose, and with one mighty roar that made the arches of the great church echo and re-echo, they bawled, “Anathema to him who does not anathematize Nestorius! Anathema! Anathema! The whole world unites in the excommunication! Anathema on him who holds communion with Nestorius!”^{f426}

Next were read the letters of Celestine, condemning him, which were made a part of the acts of the council. Then followed the reading of statements from the writings of Athanasius, Peter of Alexandria, Julius I, Felix I of Rome; Theophilus of Alexandria, Cyprian, Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Atticus of Constantinople, and Amphilochius of Iconium, all to the effect that Mary was the Mother of God. Then the tender-hearted, pious souls, according to their own words, proceeded “with many tears, to this sorrowful sentence:” —

“As, in addition to other things, the impious Nestorius has not obeyed our citation, and did not receive the holy bishops who were sent by us to him, we were compelled to examine his ungodly doctrines. We discovered that he had held and published impious doctrines in his letters and treatises, as well as in discourses which he delivered in this city, and which have been testified to. Urged by the canons, and in accordance with the letter of our most holy father and fellow-servant Celestine, the Roman bishop, we have come, with many tears to this sorrowful sentence against him, namely, that our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he has blasphemed, decrees by the holy synod that Nestorius be excluded from the episcopal dignity, and from all priestly communion.”^{f427}

This sentence the bishops all signed, and then it was sent to Nestorius, addressed, “To Nestorius, a second Judas.” All these proceedings, from the visit and protest of Candidian to the notice to Nestorius, were carried through in a single day and one prolonged sitting.

It was now night. Criers were sent all through the city to post up the decrees of the council, and to announce the joyful news that Mary was indeed the Mother of God. Everywhere they were met with loudest shouts of joy. The multitude rushed into the streets and poured toward the church. With lighted torches they escorted the bishops to their abodes, the women

marching before and burning incense. The whole city was illuminated, and the songs and exultations continued far into the night. The demonstration far outdid that of their lineal ancestors, who, when they tried to kill the apostle Paul, “all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.”

Five days afterward John of Antioch with his bishops, arrived, and was greatly surprised to learn that the council was over. He got together about fifty bishops, who unanimously condemned the doctrines of Cyril and the proceedings of the council, and declared accursed all the bishops who had taken part in it. Cyril and Memnon answered with counter-curses. Letters came from Celestine, and Cyril’s council re-assembled formally to receive them. When they were read, the whole company arose and again cried with one voice: “The council renders thanks to the second Paul, Celestine; to the second Paul, Cyril: to Celestine, protector of the faith; to Celestine, unanimous with the council. One Celestine, one Cyril, one faith in the whole council, one faith throughout the world!” ^{f428}

Cyril’s council next sent messengers with overtures to John, who refused to see them. Then the council declared annulled all the acts of John’s council, and deposed and excommunicated him and all the bishops of his party. John threatened to elect a new bishop of Ephesus in the place of Memnon, whom his council had deposed. A party tried to force their way into the cathedral; but finding it defended by Memnon with a strong garrison, they retreated. Memnon’s forces made a strong sally, and drove them through the streets with clubs and stones, dangerously wounding many.

On learning that the council had been held, and Nestorius deposed before the arrival of John of Antioch, a letter had been sent down from the court, but was not received till this point in the contest. This letter annulled all the proceedings of the council, and commanded a re-consideration of the question by the whole assembly of the bishops now present. The letter also announced the appointment of another imperial officer, one of the highest officials of the State, to assist Count Candidian.

The court had not made known in Constantinople the proceedings of the council, and the deposition of Nestorius. Cyril sent away a secret message to the monks of Constantinople, announcing that Nestorius had been deposed and excommunicated. The object of this was by stirring up those

fanatics to influence the court. The weak-minded Theodosius II stood in great awe of the holiness of the monks. "His palace was so regulated that it differed little from a monastery." In 422 there died one of these who was noted for that kind of holiness that attaches to a monk, and Theodosius secured "his cassock of sack-cloth of hair, which, although it was excessively filthy, he wore as a cloak, hoping that thus he should become a partaker, in some degree, of the sanctity of the deceased." — Socrates.^{f429} And now, on receipt of Cyril's message, a certain Dalmatius, who was famous for his filthy sanctity, left his cell and put himself at the head of the whole herd of monks and archimandrites in and about Constantinople. They marched solemnly through the streets, and everywhere as they passed, the populace burst into curses against Nestorius. They marched to the palace and lounged about the gates; but the chief influence at court was yet favorable to Nestorius, and their demonstrations had no immediate effect.

By this time the reports of both parties had reached the court. Theodosius, after examining both accounts, approved both, and pronounced Nestorius, Cyril, and Memnon, all three deposed. As for their faith, he pronounced them "all three alike orthodox," but deposed them as a punishment which he said they all three alike deserved as being the chief authors of continual disturbances.

The new imperial commissioner was sent down to Ephesus with the letter announcing the emperor's decision. As soon as he arrived, he summoned the bishops before him. Memnon refused to appear. Those who did come, however, had no sooner arrived than each party began to denounce the other. Cyril and his party pronounced the presence of Nestorius unendurable, and demanded that he be driven out. The party of Nestorius and John of Antioch, just as sternly demanded that Cyril should be expelled. As neither party could have its way, they began to fight. The imperial commissioner had to command his soldiers to separate the pugilistic bishops and stop the fight. When order had thus been enforced, the imperial letters were read. As soon as the sentence of deposition against Cyril and Memnon was read, the uproar began again, and another fight was prevented only by the arrest of the three chiefs. Nestorius and John of Antioch submitted without remonstrance; but Cyril made a speech "in which he represented himself as the victim of persecution, incurred by apostolic innocence, and borne with apostolic resignation," and then yielded to the "inevitable necessity." Memnon was hunted up and also

taken into custody. Cyril escaped, and with his body-guard of bathmen, women, and sailors, sailed away to Alexandria.

The emperor next commanded that eight bishops of each party should appear in his presence at Constantinople. They were sent, but, on account of the desperate temper of the monks of Constantinople, it was counted unsafe for them to enter the city, and therefore they were stopped at Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus. There the emperor met them. The whole summer had been spent in these contentions of the council, and it was now September 4, when the emperor granted them the first audience. Four times the emperor had them appear before him, and heard them fully.

He appeared so decidedly to favor the party of Nestorius, that they thought the victory was already won. So certain were they of this that they even sent off letters to their party at Ephesus, instructing them to send up a message of thanks to him for his kindness. But at the fifth meeting all their brilliant prospects were blasted. Cyril, from his post in Alexandria, had sent up thousands of pounds of gold, with instructions to Maximian, bishop of Constantinople, to add to it, not only the wealth of that church, but his utmost personal effort to arouse “the languid zeal of the princess Pulcheria in the cause of Cyril, to propitiate all the courtiers, and, if possible, to satisfy their rapacity.” — Milman. ^{f430}

As avarice was one of the ruling passions of the eunuchs and women who ruled Theodosius II, “Every avenue of the throne was assaulted with gold. Under the decent names of eulogies and benedictions, the courtiers of both sexes were bribed according to the measure of their rapaciousness. But their incessant demands despoiled the sanctuaries of Constantinople and Alexandria; and the authority of the patriarch was unable to silence the just murmur of his clergy, that a debt of sixty thousand pounds had already been contracted to support the expense of this scandalous corruption.” — Gibbon. ^{f431a}

The efforts of Cyril were at last effective. The eunuch Scholasticus, one of the chief ministers of the emperor and the supporter of the cause of Nestorius at court, was bought; and it was this that caused the sudden revolution in the emperor’s conduct toward the party of Nestorius. In the fifth and last audience that he gave the deputies, the emperor told them at once that they had better abandon Nestorius, and admit both Cyril and

Memnon to their communion. They remonstrated, but he would listen to nothing. He put an end to the hearings, and returned the next day to Constantinople, taking with him the bishops of Cyril's party, regularly to ordain the successor of Nestorius in the bishopric of Constantinople.

Shortly afterward an imperial edict was issued declaring Nestorius justly deposed, re-instating Cyril and Memnon in their respective sees, pronouncing all the other bishops alike orthodox, and giving them all leave to return to their homes. This dissolved the council.

Even before the dissolution of the council the emperor had sent an order to Nestorius, commanding him to leave Ephesus and return to the monastery whence he had been called to the archbishopric of Constantinople. By the persistent efforts of Celestine, bishop of Rome, and others, the emperor was induced — A.D. 436 — to banish him and two of his friends — a count of the empire and a presbyter of Constantinople — to Petra in Arabia. July 30, in the same year, an imperial edict was issued, commanding all who believed with Nestorius, to be called Simonians; that all the books by Nestorius should be sought for and publicly burnt; forbidding the Nestorius to hold any meetings anywhere, in city, in village, or in field; and if any such meeting was held, then the place where it was held should be confiscated, as also the estates of all who should attend the meeting. Nestorius was not allowed to remain long at Petra. He was taken from there to a place away in the desert between Egypt and Libya, and from there dragged about from place to place till he died of the hardships inflicted, at what date is not certainly known, but about A.D. 440.

Such was the cause and such the conduct of the first Council of Ephesus, the third general council of the Catholic Church. And thus was established the Catholic doctrine that the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God.

The controversy went on, however, nor did it ever logically stop until December 8, A.D. 1854, when Pope Pius IX established the actual divinity of the Virgin Mary, by announcing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which reads as follows: —

“By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as well as by our own, we declare, promulgate, and define that the doctrine which teaches that the most blessed Virgin Mary, at the very instant of her conception, was kept free from every stain of original sin solely by the grace

and prerogative of the omnipotent God, in consideration of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was revealed by God, and must on that account be believed firmly and continually by all the faithful ones.”^{f432a}

CHAPTER 18.

THE EUTYCHIAN CONTROVERSY.

IT having been decided that the Virgin Mary was the Mother of God, out of that decision there now arose another question involving the nature of Christ. That question was: How was the divine nature related to the human so that Mary could truly be called the Mother of God? That is, Did the divine nature become human? or was the divine nature only joined to the human? In other words: Were there two natures in Christ? or was there but one?

It was now A.D. 448, and the Eutychian controversy began. For a clear understanding of the case, it will be best formally to introduce the leading characters.

Theodosius II was still emperor of the East; Valentinian III was emperor of the West.

Eutyches was the abbot, or superior, of a monastery close to Constantinople. He had been the chief leader of the monks in the contest against Nestorius. "At his bidding the swarms of monks had thronged into the streets, defied the civil power, terrified the emperor, and contributed more than any other cause, to the final overthrow of Nestorius. He had grown old in the war against heresy." — Milman.^{f431}

Flavianus was now the occupant of the episcopal seat of Constantinople.

Chrysaphius was another eunuch, who had risen to the place of chief minister of Theodosius II, and was also the godson of Eutyches. He was carrying on a court intrigue to break the power of Pulcheria, by exalting the influence of Eudocia. He hoped also to place Eutyches on the episcopal throne of Constantinople. The accession of Flavianus to that dignity had prevented this design for the time being, but he still held it in mind. When Flavianus was installed in the bishopric, Chrysaphius demanded that he should make to the emperor the offering of gold that was customary on such occasions. Instead of bringing gold, Flavianus brought only three loaves of consecrated bread. This, Chrysaphius so employed as to prejudice the emperor against the archbishop.

Dioscorus was now archbishop of Alexandria. In this place it will be sufficient description of him simply to remark that he was a second Cyril, and leave it to the progress of the narrative to reveal him exactly as he was.

Leo I, “the Great,” was bishop of Rome, and regarded Dioscorus as “a prelate adorned with many virtues, and enriched with the gifts of the Holy Ghost.” ^{f432}

Eusebius was bishop of Doryleum, to which office he had been appointed from a civil office in the household of Pulcheria. He also had been an early, ardent, and persistent adversary of Nestorius. This Eusebius now stood forth as the accuser of Eutyches.

At a small which had been called for another purpose at Constantinople, November 8, A.D. 448, Eusebius presented a written complaint against Eutyches and asked that it be read. The complaint was to the effect that Eutyches had accused of Nestorianism orthodox teachers — even Eusebius himself. To the complaint was appended a demand that Eutyches should be summoned before the present synod to answer.

As for Eusebius himself, he announced that he was ready to prove that Eutyches had “no right to the name of Catholic,” and that he was “far from the true faith.” Flavianus expressed surprise, and told Eusebius that he ought to go to Eutyches, and, by a private interview, try to convince him of the true faith; and if then he really showed himself to be a heretic, he would cite him before the synod. Eusebius said he had been to him several times. Flavianus asked him to go again; but he refused, and then the synod sent a priest and a deacon, as deputies to convey to Eutyches the accusations, and summon him to the synod which would meet again in four days.

The synod met again, November 12, and Eusebius renewed his complaint, with the addition that by conversations and discussions, Eutyches had misled many others. He then suggested that the synod should give expression to the true faith on the question that had been raised. Flavianus produced a letter which Cyril had written to Nestorius at the beginning of the controversy between them; the act of the Council of Ephesus which approved this letter; and another letter, which Cyril had written, about the close of that controversy. He required the bishops present to assent to the statements therein contained, as the expression of the true faith according to the Nicene Creed, which they had always believed and still believed, namely: —

“Jesus Christ, only-begotten Son of God, is true God and true man, of a reasonable soul and a body subsisting, begotten of the Father before all time, without beginning, according to the Godhead, but in the last times, for us men and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, according to the manhood; of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with his mother, according to the manhood. We confess that Christ after the Incarnation consists of two natures in one hypostasis [personality] and in one person; one Christ, one Son, one Lord. Whoever asserts otherwise, we exclude from the clergy and the church.”^{f433}

This they all signed, and then at the suggestion of Eusebius it was sent to those who were absent for them to sign.

The next session of the synod was held November 15, and the deputies who had been sent to Eutyches reported that he had refused to come, for the reason that when he became a monk, he resolved never to leave the monastery to go to any place whatever. Besides, he told them that the synod ought to know that Eusebius had long been his enemy, and that it was only out of malice that he now accused him. He said he was ready to affirm and subscribe the declarations of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus. The synod summoned him again, and again he refused to come. Then Eusebius declared, “The guilty have ever ways of escaping; Eutyches must now be brought here, even against his will.” The synod then summoned him the third time.

At the next meeting a messenger came from Eutyches, saying that he was sick. Flavianus told him the synod would wait until Eutyches got well, but that then he must come. At the next meeting, the deputies who had been sent with the third summons, reported that Eutyches had told them that he had sent his messenger to the archbishop and the synod that he might in his name give his assent to the declarations of the councils of Nice and Ephesus, “and to all that Cyril had uttered.” At this Eusebius broke in with the declaration, “Even if Eutyches will now assent, because some have told him that he must yield to necessity and subscribe, yet I am not therefore in the wrong, for it is with reference, not to the future, but to the past, that I have accused him.”^{f434} The deputies then closed with the information that he would come to the synod on the next Monday.

At the appointed time, Eutyches came; but he did not come alone. He came accompanied by a messenger of the emperor's privy council, and escorted by a great crowd composed of soldiers, and servants of the praetorian prefect, and "a rout of turbulent monks." The emperor's representative bore a letter to the synod, in which the emperor said: —

"I wish the peace of the church and the maintenance of the orthodox faith, which was asserted by the Fathers at Nicaea and Ephesus; and because I know that the patrician Florentius is orthodox, and proved in the faith, therefore it is my will that he be present at the sessions of the synod, as the faith is in question." ^{f435}

At this the bishops cried out, "Many years to the emperor, his faith is great! Many years to the pious, orthodox, high-priestly emperor." Then the emperor's commissioner took his place, and Eusebius and Eutyches, the accuser and the accused, placed themselves in the midst. The first thing was to read the proceedings from the beginning up to this point, the vital part of which was the declarations to which they had demanded that Eutyches should give his assent. The reader the Nicene Creed, and there was no dissent. He read the first of Cyril's letters, yet there was no dissent. He read the decision of the Council of Ephesus, and still there was no dissent. Then he began the second of Cyril's letters and read: —

"We confess our Lord Jesus Christ as perfect God and perfect man, and as of one substance with the Father according to the Godhead, and of one substance with us according to the manhood; for a union of the two natures has taken place, therefore we confess one Christ, one Lord, and, in accordance with this union without confusion, we call the holy Virgin God bearer, because God the Logos was made flesh and man, and in the conception united the temple which he assumed from her with himself" — ^{f436}

At this point Eusebius broke in. Seeing the reading was nearly finished with no sign of dissent, he was afraid that Eutyches would actually approve all the declarations, which doubtless he would have done. He therefore interrupted the reading, with the exclamation, "Certainly such is not confessed by this man here; he has never believed this, but the contrary, and so he has taught every one who has come to him." Florentius asked that Eutyches might be given a chance to say for himself whether he agreed with what had been read." To this Eusebius vehemently objected,

for the reason, said he, “If Eutyches agrees to it, then I must appear as having been lightly a slanderer, and shall LOSE MY OFFICE”!!

Florentius renewed his request that Eutyches might be allowed to answer; but Eusebius strenuously objected. And he only consented at the last, on the express condition that no prejudice should lodge against him, even though Eutyches should confess all that was required. Flavianus confirmed this condition, with the assurance that not the slightest disadvantage should come to Eusebius. But even then Eutyches was not allowed to answer in his own way, because the predicament in which Eusebius had found himself, involved in a measure the whole synod also, as they had given full credit to the charges of Eusebius, and had refused all the assurances of Eutyches that he agreed to all the documents which they had cited. Flavianus and Eusebius, therefore, in order to save themselves from defeat and perhaps deposition, if the matter should come to a general council, determined if possible to entrap Eutyches in some statement which they could condemn. The proceedings then were as follows: —

Flavianus. — “Say now, dost thou acknowledge the union of two natures?”

Eutyches. — “I believe that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, but here I stop, and advise you do so too.”

Eusebius. “Dost thou confess the existence of two natures, even after the incarnation, and that Christ is of one nature with us after flesh, or not?”

Eutyches. — “I have not come to dispute, but to testify to your Holiness what I think. My view, however, is set down in this writing; command, therefore, that it be read.”

Flavianus. — “If it is thine own confession of faith, why shouldst thou need the paper?”

Eutyches. — “That is my belief: I pray to the Father with the Son, and to the Son with the Father, and to the Holy Ghost with the Father and Son. I confess that his bodily presence is from the body of the holy Virgin, and that he became perfect for our salvation. This I confess before the Father, before the Son, and before the Holy Ghost, and before your holiness.”

Flavianus. — “Dost thou confess also that the one and the same Son, our Lord Christ, is of one substance with the Father as to his Godhead and of one substance with his mother as to his manhood?”

Eutyches. — “I have already declared my opinion; leave me now in peace.”

Flavianus. — “Dost thou confess that Christ consists of two natures?”

Eutyches. — “I have not hitherto presumed to dispute concerning the nature of my God; but that he is of one substance with us, have I hitherto, as I affirm never said. Up to this present day have I never said that the body of our Lord and God is of one substance with us. I do confess, however, that the holy Virgin is of one substance with us, and that our God is made of our flesh.”

Flavianus, Florentius, and Basil of Seleucia. — “If thou dost acknowledge that Mary is of one substance with us, and that Christ has taken his manhood from her, then it follows of itself that he, according to his manhood, is also of one substance with us.”

Eutyches. — “Consider well, I say not that the body of man has become the body of God, but I speak of a human body of God, and say that the Lord was made flesh of the Virgin. If you wish me to add further that his body is of one substance with ours, then I do this; but I do not understand this as though I denied that he is the Son of God. Formerly I did not generally speak of a unity of substance, but now I will do so, because your Holiness thus requires it.”

Flavianus. — “Thou does it then only of compulsion, and not because it is thy faith?”

Eutyches. — “I have not hitherto so spoken, but will do now in accordance with the will of the synod.”

Florentius. — “Dost thou believe that our Lord, who was born of the Virgin, is of one substance with us, and that after the incarnation he is of two natures, or not?”

Eutyches. — “I confess that before the union he was of two natures, but after the union I confess only one nature.”

At this “the whole council was in an uproar, and nothing was heard but anathemas and curses, each bishop there present striving to distinguish himself above the rest, by being the foremost in uttering the most bitter and severe his zeal could suggest.” — Bower.^{f437} When the noise had ceased, Flavianus, in the name of the synod, demanded of Eutyches a public declaration of his faith in, and a curse upon every view that did not accept, the doctrines which had been set forth by the synod.

Eutyches. — “I will now indeed, since the synod so requires, accept the manner of speech in question; but I find it neither in Holy Scripture nor in the Fathers collectively, and therefore cannot pronounce a curse upon the non-acceptance of the question, because that would be cursing the Fathers.”

All together (springing to their feet). — “Let him be accursed!”

Flavianus. — “What does this man deserve who does not confess the right faith, but persists in his perverseness?”

Eutyches. — “I will now indeed accept the required manner of speaking in accordance with the will of the synod, but cannot pronounce the curse.”

Florentius. — “Dost thou confess two natures in Christ, and his unity of substance with us?”

Eutyches. “I read the writings of St. Cyril and St. Athanasius: before the union they speak of two natures, but after the union only of one.”

Florentius. — “Dost thou confess two natures even after the union? If not, then wilt thou be condemned.”

Eutyches. — “Let the writings of Cyril and Athanasius be read.”

Basil of Seleucia. — “If thou dost not acknowledge two natures after the union also, then thou acceptest a mingling and confusion.”

Florentius. — He who does not say “of two natures,” and who does not acknowledge two natures, has not the right faith.”

All together. — “And he who accepts anything only by compulsion does not believe in it. Long live the emperors!”

Flavianus, announcing the sentence. — “ Eutyches, a priest and archimandrite, has, by previous statements, and even now by his own confessions, shown himself to be entangled in the perversity of Valentinus and Apollinaris, without allowing himself to be won back to the genuine dogmas by our exhortation and instruction; therefore we, bewailing his complete perversity, have decreed, for the sake of Christ whom he has reviled, that he be deposed from every priestly office, expelled from our communion, and deprived of his headship over the convent. And all who henceforth hold communion with him, and have recourse to him, must know that they too are liable to the penalty of excommunication.” ^{f438}

The sentence was subscribed by all the synod, about thirty in number, and the synod was dissolved, November 22, A.D. 448.

It is not necessary to follow the particulars any farther; as in every other controversy, the dispute speedily spread far and wide. The decree of the synod was sent by Flavianus to all the other bishops for their indorsement. As soon as the action of the synod had been announced, Dioscorus, with all his powers, espoused the cause of Eutyches. Through Chrysaphius the Eunuch, Eutyches was already powerful at court, and added to this the disfavor in which Flavianus was already held by the emperor, the war assumed powerful proportions at the start.

The next step was, of course, for both parties to appeal to the bishop of Rome. Eutyches felt perfectly safe in appealing to Leo, because he had the words of Julius, bishop of Rome, saying, “It must not be said that there are two natures in Christ after their union; for as the body and soul form but one nature in man, so the divinity and humanity from but one nature in Christ.” ^{f439} This being precisely the view of Eutyches, he felt perfectly confident in his appeal to Leo, for he could not suppose that Leo would contradict Julius. He shortly found that such a hope was altogether vain.

The emperor also wrote to the bishop of Rome. It seems that Leo did not make any answer to Eutyches direct. To Flavianus he sent a request for a fuller account of the whole matter, and that it should be sent by an envoy. To the emperor he wrote rejoicing that Theodosius “has not only the heart of an emperor, but also that of a priest, and is rightly anxious that no discord should arise; for then is the empire best established when the holy Trinity is served in unity.” ^{f440}

Dioscorus seeing now a chance of humbling the archbishop of Constantinople, joined Eutyches in a request to the emperor to call a general council. Chrysaphius, seeing again a prospect of accomplishing his favorite project to make Eutyches archbishop of Constantinople, strongly supported this request. But Theodosius, after his experience with the council at Ephesus, dreaded to have anything to do with another one, and sought to ward off another calamity of the kind. But there was no remedy; the thing had to come.

Accordingly, March 30, A.D. 449, a message in the name of the two emperors, Theodosius II and Valentinian III, was issued, announcing that “as doubts and controversies have arisen respecting the right faith, the holding of an oecumenical synod has become necessary.” Therefore the archbishops, metropolitans, and “other holy bishops distinguished for knowledge and character,” should assemble at Ephesus August 1. A special edict was sent to Dioscorus, saying: —

“The emperor has already forbidden Theodoret of Cyrus, on account of his writings Cyril, to take part in the synod, unless he is expressly summoned by the synod itself. Because, however, it is to be feared that some Nestorianizing bishops will use every means in order to bring him with them, the emperor following the rule of the holy Fathers, will nominate Dioscorus to be president of the synod. Archbishop Juvenal of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Caesarea, and all zealous friends of the orthodox faith will support Dioscorus. In conclusion, the emperor expresses the wish that all who shall desire to add anything to the Nicene confession of faith, or take anything from it, shall not be regarded in the synod; but on this point Dioscorus shall give judgment, since it is for this very purpose that the synod is convoked.”

Leo was specially invited; and a certain Barsumas, a priest and superior of a monastery in Syria, was called as the representative of the monks, and Dioscorus was directed to receive him as such, and give him a seat in the council.

Not willing to wait for the decision of the question by the coming general council, Leo took occasion to assert his authority over all; and June 13 sent a letter to Flavianus, in which he indorsed the action of the Synod of Constantinople as far as it went, but reprobated the synod for treating the

matter so mildly as it had done, and himself took the strongest ground against Eutyches. In answer to the request of the emperor that he should attend the general council, Leo declined to attend in person, but promised to be present by Legates a Latere.

The council, composed of one hundred and forty-nine members, met in the Church of the Virgin Mary at Ephesus, and was formally opened August 8 A.D. 449. Dioscorus, the president, was seated upon a high throne. Two imperial commissioners, Elpidius and Eulogius, were in attendance with a strong body of troops to keep order in the council, and preserve peace in the city. The council was opened with the announcement by the secretary, that “the Godfearing emperors have from zeal for religion, convoked this assembly. Then the imperial message calling the council was read, and next the two legates of the bishop of Rome announced that though invited by the emperor, Leo did not appear in person, but had sent a letter. Next Elpidius, the imperial commissioner, made a short speech, in which he said:

“The Logos has on this day permitted the assembled bishops to give judgment upon him. If you confess him rightly, then he also will confess you before his heavenly Father. But those who shall prevent the true doctrine will have to undergo a severe two-fold judgment, that of God and that of the emperor.” ^{f442}

Next was read the emperor’s instructions to the two imperial commissioners, which ran as follows: —

“But lately the holy Synod of Ephesus has been engaged with the affairs of the impious Nestorius, and pronounced a righteous sentence on him. Because, however, new controversies of faith have arisen, we have summoned a second synod to Ephesus in order to destroy the evil to the roots. We have therefore selected Elpidius and Eulogius for the service of the faith in order to fulfill our commands in reference to the Synod of Ephesus. In particular they must allow no disturbances and they must arrest every one who arouses such, and inform the emperor of him; they must take care that everything is done in order, must be present at the decisions, and take care that the synod examine the matter quickly and carefully, and give information of the same to the emperor. Those bishops who previously sat in judgment on Eutyches (at

Constantinople) are to be present at the proceedings at Ephesus, but are not to vote, since their own previous sentence must be examined anew. Further, no other question is to be brought forward at the synod, and especially no question of money, before the settlement of the question of faith. By a letter to the proconsul, we have required support for the commissioners from the civil and military authorities, so that they may be able to fulfill our commissions which are as far above other business as divine above human things.” ^{f443}

Following this was read a letter from the emperor to the council, in which he said: —

“The emperor has adjudged it necessary to call this assembly of bishops, that they might cut off this controversy and all its diabolical roots, exclude the adherents of Nestorius from the church, and preserve the orthodox faith firm and unshaken; since the whole hope of the emperor and the power of the empire, depend on the right faith in God and the holy prayers of the synod.” ^{f444}

The council was now formally opened, and according to the instructions of the emperor they proceeded first to consider the faith. But upon this a dispute at once arose as to what was meant by the faith. Some insisted that this meant that the council should first declare its faith; but Dioscorus interpreted it to mean not that the faith should first be declared, for this the former council had already done, but rather that they were to consider which of the parties agreed with what the true faith explains. And then he cried out: “Or will you alter the faith of the holy Fathers?” In answer to this there were cries, “Accursed be he who makes alterations in it; accursed be he who ventures to discuss the faith.”

Next Dioscorus took a turn by which he covertly announced what was expected of the council. He said: “At Nicaea and at Ephesus the true faith has already been proclaimed; but although there have been two synods, the faith is but one.” In response to this there were loud shouts for the assembly, “No one dare add anything or take anything away. A great guardian of the faith is Dioscorus. Accursed be he who still discuss the faith; the Holy Ghost speaks by Dioscorus.” ^{f445}

Eutyches was now introduced to the council, that he might explain his faith. He first commended himself to the holy Trinity, and censured the Synod of Constantinople. He then handed to the secretary a written confession, in which he repeated the Nicene Creed, indorsed the acts of the Council of Ephesus and the doctrine of the Holy Father Cyril, and cursed all heretics from Nestorius clear back to Simon Magus, who had been rebuked by the apostle Peter. He then gave an account of the proceedings against himself. When this had been read, Flavianus demanded that Eusebius should be heard; but the imperial commissioners stopped him with the statement that they were not called together to judge Eutyches anew, but to judge those who had judged him, and that therefore the only legitimate business of the council was to examine the acts of the Synod of Constantinople.

Accordingly the proceedings of that synod were taken up. All went smoothly enough until the reader came to the point where the synod had demanded of Eutyches that he should acknowledge two natures in Christ after the incarnation. When this was read, there was an uproar against it in the council, as there had been against the statement of Eutyches in the synod; only the uproar here was as much greater than there, as the council was greater than the synod. The council cried with one voice, “Away with Eusebius! banish Eusebius! let him be burned alive! As he cuts asunder the two natures in Christ, so be he cut asunder!”^{f446}

Dioscorus asked: “Is the doctrine that there are two natures after the incarnation to be tolerated?” Aloud the council replied: “Accursed be he who says so.” Again Dioscorus cried: “I have your voices, I must have your hands. He that cannot cry loud enough to be heard, let him lift up his hands.” Then with uplifted hands the council unanimously bellowed: “Whoever admits the two natures, let him be accursed; let him be driven out, torn in pieces, massacred.”^{f447}

Eutyches was then unanimously pronounced orthodox and declared restored to the communion of the church, to the government of his monastery, and to all his former privileges; and he was exalted as a hero for “his courage in daring to teach, and his firmness in daring to defend, the true and genuine doctrine of the Fathers. And on this occasion, those distinguished themselves the most by their panegyrics, who had most distinguished themselves by their invectives before.” — Bower.^{f448}

Dioscorus having everything in his own power, now determined to visit vengeance upon the archbishop of Constantinople. Under pretense that it was for the instruction of his colleagues, he directed that the acts of the previous Council of Ephesus concerning the Nicene Creed, etc., should be read. As soon as the reading was finished, he said: "You have now heard that the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who teaches otherwise than the Nicene Creed, or makes alterations in it, and raises new or further questions. Every one must now give his opinion in writing as to whether those who, in their theological inquiries go beyond the Nicene Creed, are to be punished or not." ^{f449}

This was aimed directly at Flavianus and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, as they expressed the wish that the expression "two natures" might be inserted in the Nicene Creed. To the statement of Dioscorus several bishops responded at once: "Whoever goes beyond the Nicene Creed is not to be received as Catholic." Then Dioscorus continued: "As then the first Synod of Ephesus threatens every one who alters anything in the Nicene faith, it follows that Flavianus of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylaeum must be deposed from their ecclesiastical dignity. I pronounce, therefore, their deposition, and every one of those present shall communicate his view of this matter. Moreover everything will be brought to the knowledge of the emperor."

Flavianus replied: "I except against you," and, to take time by the forelock, placed a written appeal in the hands of the legates of Leo. Several of the friends of Flavianus left their seats, and prostrating themselves before the throne of Dioscorus, begged him not to inflict such a sentence, and above all that he would not ask them to sign it. He replied, "Through my tongue were to be cut out, I would not alter a single syllable of it." Trembling for their own fate if they should refuse to subscribe, the pleading bishops now embraced his knees, and entreated him to spare them; but he angrily exclaimed: "What! do you think to raise a tumult? Where are the counts?"

At this the counts ordered doors to be thrown open, and the proconsul of Asia entered with a strong body of armed troops, followed by a confused multitude of furious monks, armed with chains, and clubs, and stones. Then there was a general scramble of the "holy bishops" to find a refuge. Some took shelter behind the throne of Dioscorus, others crawled under the benches — all concealed themselves as best they could. Dioscorus declared: "The sentence must be signed. If any one objects to it, let him

take care; for it is with me has to deal.” The bishops, when they found that they were not to be massacred at once, crept out from under the benches and from other places of concealment, and returned trembling to their seats.

Then Dioscorus took a blank paper, and accompanied by the bishop of Jerusalem and attended by an armed guard, passed through the assembly and had each bishop in succession to sign it. All signed but the legates of the bishops of Rome. Then the blank was filled up by Dioscorus with a charge of heresy against Flavianus, and with the sentence which he had just pronounced upon Flavianus and Eusebius. When the sentence was written, Flavianus again said: “I except against you;” upon which Dioscorus with some other bishops rushed upon him, and with Barsumas crying out, “Strike him! strike him dead!” they beat him and banged him about, and then threw him down and kicked him and tramped upon him until he was nearly dead; then sent him off immediately to prison, and the next morning ordered him into exile. At the end of the second day’s journey he died of the ill usage he had received in the council. ^{f450}

All these proceedings, up to the murder of Flavianus, were carried out on the first day. The council continued three days longer, during which Dioscorus secured the condemnation and deposition of Domnus of Antioch, and several other principal bishops, although they had signed his blank paper, for having formerly opposed Cyril and Eutyches. He then put an end to the council, and returned to Alexandria.

The emperor Theodosius, whom Leo had praised as having the heart of a priest, issued an edict in which he approved and confirmed the decrees of the council, and commanded that all the bishops of the empire should immediately subscribe to the Nicene Creed. He involved in the heresy of Nestorius, all who were opposed to Eutyches, and commanded that no adherent of Nestorius or Flavianus should ever be raised to a bishopric. “By the same edict, persons of all ranks and conditions were forbidden, on pain of perpetual banishment, to harbor or conceal any who taught, held, or favored, the tenets of Nestorius, Flavianus, and the deposed bishops; and the books, comments, homilies, and other works, written by them or passing under their names, were ordered to be publicly burnt.” ^{f451a} He then wrote to Valentinian III, that by the deposition of the turbulent prelate Flavianus, “peace had in the end been happily restored to all the churches in his dominions.”

As the doctrine which the council had established was contrary to that which Leo had published in his letter, he denounced the council as a “synod of robbers,” refused to recognize it at all, and called for another general council. But in every respect this council was just as legitimate and as orthodox as any other one that had been held from the Council of Nice to that day. It was regularly called; it was regularly opened; the proceedings were all perfectly regular; and when it was over, the proceedings were regularly approved and confirmed by the imperial authority. In short, there is no element lacking to make second Council of Ephesus as thoroughly regular and orthodox as the first Council of Ephesus, which is held by the Church of Rome to be entirely orthodox, or even as orthodox as the Council of Nice itself.

CHAPTER 19.

THE POPE MADE AUTHOR OF THE FAITH.

LEO persisted in his refusal to recognize the validity of the acts of the second Council of Ephesus, and insisted that another general council should be called. As it was the will of Leo alone that made, or could now make, the late council anything else than strictly regular and orthodox according to the Catholic system of discipline and doctrine, it is evident that if another general council was called, it would have to be subject to the will of Leo, and its decision upon questions of the faith would be but the expression of the will of Leo. This is precisely what Leo aimed at, and nothing less than this would satisfy him.

Leo had now been bishop of Rome eleven years. He was a full-blooded Roman in all that term implies. “All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone.” — Milman.^{f451}

Yet Leo was not the first one in whom this spirit was manifested. His aspirations were but the culmination of the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome which had been constantly growing. To trace the subtle, silent, often violent, yet always constant, growth of this spirit of supremacy and encroachment of absolute authority, is one of the most curious studies in all history; though it cannot be followed in detail in this book. Not only was there never an opportunity lost, but opportunities were created, for the bishop of Rome to assert authority and to magnify his power. Supremacy in discipline and in jurisdiction was asserted by Victor and Stephen; but it was not until the union of Church and State that the field was fully opened to the arrogance of the bishopric of Rome. A glance at the successive bishops from the union of Church and State to the accession of Leo, will give a better understanding of the position and pretensions of Leo than could be obtained in any other way.

MELCHIADES

was bishop of Rome from July 2, A.D. 311, to December, 314, and therefore, as already related, was in the papal chair when the union of Church and State was formed, and took a leading part in that evil intrigue. And soon the bishopric of Rome began to receive its reward in imperial favors. "The bishop of Rome sits by the imperial authority at the head of a synod of Italian bishops, to judge the disputes of the African Donatists." — Milman. ^{f452} Melchiades was succeeded by —

SYLVESTER, A.D. 314-336.

In the very year of his accession, the Council of Arles bestowed upon the bishopric of Rome the distinction and the office of notifying all the churches of the proper time to celebrate Easter. And in 325 the general Council of Nice recognized the bishop of Rome the first bishop of the empire. Under him the organization of the church was formed upon the model of the organization of the State. He was succeeded by —

MARK, A.D. 336,

whose term continued only from January till October, and was therefore so short that nothing occurred worthy of record in this connection. He was succeeded by —

JULIUS, OCTOBER 336-352,

under whom the Council of Sardica — 347 — made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, upon which "single precedent" the bishopric of Rome built "a universal right." — Schaff. ^{f453} Julius was succeeded by —

LIBERIUS, 352-366,

who excommunicated Athanasius and then approved his doctrine, and carried on the contest with Constantius, in which he incurred banishment for the Catholic faith; and then became Arian, then Semi-Arian, and then Catholic again. He was succeeded by —

DAMASUS, 366-384.

In his episcopate, Valentinian I enacted a law making the bishop of Rome the judge of other bishops. A council in Rome, A.D. 378, enlarged his powers of judging, and petitioned the emperor Gratian to exempt the bishop of Rome from all civil jurisdiction except that of the emperor alone; to order that he be judged by none except a council, or the emperor direct; and that the imperial power should be exerted to compel obedience to the judgment of the bishop of Rome concerning other bishops. Gratian granted part of their request, and it was made to count for all. Damascus was succeeded by —

SIRICIUS, 384-389,

who issued the first decretal. A decretal is “an answer sent by the pope to applications to him as head of the church, for guidance in cases involving points of doctrine or discipline.” The directions of Siricius in this decretal were to be strictly observed under penalty of excommunication. It was dated February 11, A.D. 385. He convened a council in Rome, which decreed that “no one should presume to ordain a bishop without the knowledge of the apostolic see.” — Bower. ^{f454} He was succeeded by —

ANASTASIUS I, 389-402,

who, though very zealous to maintain all that his predecessors had asserted or claimed, added nothing in particular himself. He condemned as a heretic, Origen, who had been dead one hundred and fifty years, and who is now a Catholic saint. He was succeeded by —

INNOCENT I, 402-417.

Innocent was an indefatigable disciplinarian, and kept up a constant correspondence with all the West, as well as with the principal bishoprics of the East, establishing rules, dictating to councils, and issuing decretals upon all the affairs of the church. Hitherto the dignity of the bishopric of Rome had been derived from the dignity of the city of Rome. Innocent now asserted that the superior dignity of the bishopric of Rome was derived from Peter, whom he designated the Prince of the Apostles; and that in this respect it took precedence of that of Antioch because that in Rome Peter had accomplished what he had only begun in Antioch. He demanded the absolute obedience of all churches in the West, because, as he declared,

Peter was the only apostle that ever preached in the West; and that all the churches in the West had been founded by Peter, or by some successor of his. This was all a lie, and he knew it, but that made no difference to him; he unblushingly asserted it, and then, upon that, asserted that “all ecclesiastical matters throughout the world are, by divine right, to be referred to the apostolic see, before they are finally decided in the provinces.” — Bower. ^{f455} At the invasion of Alaric and his siege of Rome, Innocent headed an embassy to the emperor Honorius to mediate for a treaty of peace between Alaric and the emperor. “Upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome’s universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet, and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline.” — Milman. ^{f456} He was succeeded by

ZOSIMUS, MARCH 18, A.D. 417-DEC. 26, 418,

who asserted with all the arrogance of Innocent, all that Innocent had claimed. He not only boasted with Innocent that to him belonged the power to judge all causes, but that the judgment “is irrevocable;” and accordingly established the use of the dictatorial expression, “For so it has pleased the apostolic see,” as sufficient authority for all things that he might choose to command. And upon this assumption, those canons of the Council of Sardica which made the bishop of Rome the source of appeal, he passed off upon the bishops of Africa as the canons of the Council of Nice, in which he was actually followed by Leo, and put tradition upon a level with the Scriptures. He was succeeded by —

BONIFACE I, 419-422,

who added nothing to the power or authority of the bishopric of Rome, but diligently and “conscientiously” maintained all that his predecessors had asserted, in behalf of what he called “the just rights of the see,” in which he had been placed. He was succeeded by —

CELESTINE I, 422-432,

who in a letter written A.D. 438, plainly declared: “As I am appointed by God to watch over his church, it is incumbent upon me everywhere to root out evil practices, and introduce good ones in their room, for my pastoral vigilance is restrained by no bounds, but extends to all places where Christ

is known and adored.” — Bower.^{f457} It was he who appointed the terrible Cyril his vicegerent to condemn Nestorius, and to establish the doctrine that Mary was the Mother of God. He was succeeded by —

SIXTUS III, 432-440,

who as others before, added nothing specially to the papal claims, yet yielded not an iota of the claims already made. He was succeeded by —

LEO I, “THE GREAT,” A.D. 440-461.

Such was the heritage bequeathed to Leo by his predecessors, and the arrogance of his own native disposition, with the grand opportunities which offered during his long rule, added to it a thousandfold. At the very moment of his election he was absent in Gaul on a mission as mediator to reconcile a dispute between two of the principal men of the empire. He succeeded in his mission, and was hailed as “the Angel of Peace,” and the “Deliverer of the Empire.” In a sermon, he showed what his ambition embraced. He portrayed the powers and glories of the former Rome as they were reproduced in Catholic Rome. The conquests and universal sway of Heathen Rome were but the promise of the conquests and universal sway of Catholic Rome. Romulus and Remus were but the precursors of Peter and Paul. Rome of former days had by her armies conquered the earth and sea: now again, by the see of the holy blessed Peter as head of the world, Rome through her divine religion would dominate the earth.^{f458}

In A.D. 445, “at the avowed instance of Leo” and at the dictation, if not in the actual writing, of Leo, Valentinian III issued a “perpetual edict” “commanding all bishops to pay an entire obedience and submission to the orders of the apostolic see;” “to observe, as law, whatever it should please the bishop of Rome to command;” “that the bishop of Rome had a right to command what he pleased;” and “whoever refused to obey the citation of the Roman pontiff should be compelled to do so by the moderator of the province” in which the recalcitrant bishop might dwell.^{f459}

This made his authority absolute over all the West, and now he determined to extend it over the East, and so make it universal. As soon as he learned the decision of the Council of Ephesus, he called a council in Rome, and by it rejected all that had been done by the council at Ephesus, and wrote to the emperor, Theodosius II, “entreating him in the name of the holy Trinity, to declare null what had been done there,” and set everything back

as it was before that council was called, and so let the matter remain until a general council could be held in Italy.

Leo addressed not the emperor Theodosius alone, to have another council called. He wrote to Pulcheria, appointing her a legate of St. Peter, and entreated her “to employ all her interest with the emperor to obtain the assembling of an oecumenical council, and all her authority to prevent the evils that would be otherwise occasioned by the war which had been lately declared against the faith of the church.” — Bower.^{f460}

In February 450, the emperor Valentinian III, with his mother Placidia and his wife Eudocia, who was the daughter of Theodosius II, made a visit to Rome. The next day after their arrival, they went to the Church of St. Peter, where they were received by Leo, who, as soon as he met them, put on all the agony he could, and with sobs, and tears, and sighs, he addressed them; but on account of his great excess of grief, his words were so mumbled that nothing could be made of them.

Presently the two women began to cry. This somewhat relieved the stress upon Leo, so that with much eloquence, he represented the great danger that threatened the church. Then he mustered up his tears again, and mixed them with more sighs and sobs, and begged the emperor and empress, by the apostle Peter to whom they were about to pay their respects, by their own salvation and by the salvation of Theodosius, to write to the emperor, and spare no pains to persuade him to nullify the proceedings of the second Council of Ephesus, and call another general council, this time in Italy.

As soon as it was learned in the East what strenuous efforts Leo was making to have another general council called, many of the bishops who had condemned Flavianus began to make overtures to the party of Leo, so that if another council should be called, they might escape condemnation. Dioscorus learning this, called a synod of ten bishops in Alexandria, and solemnly excommunicated Leo, bishop of Rome, for presuming to judge anew, and annul what had already been judged and finally determined by a general council.

Leo finally sent four legates to the court of Theodosius, to urge upon him the necessity of another general council, but before they reached Constantinople, Theodosius was dead; and having left no heir to his throne, Pulcheria, Leo’s legate, became empress. As there was no precedent in Roman history to sanction the rule of a woman alone, she married a

senator by the name of Marcian, and invested him with the imperial robes, while she retained and exercised the imperial authority. The first thing they did was to burn Chrysaphius. The new authority received Leo's legates with great respect, and returned answer that they had nothing so much at heart as the unity of the church and the extirpation of heresies, and that therefore they would call a general council. Not long afterward they wrote to Leo, inviting him to assist in person at the proposed council.

No sooner was it known that Theodosius was dead, and Pulcheria and Marcian in power, than the bishops who had indorsed and praised Eutyches, changed their opinions and condemned him and all who held with him. Anatolius, an defender of Eutyches, who had succeeded Flavianus as archbishop of Constantinople, and had been ordained by Dioscorus himself, "assembled in great haste all the bishops, abbots, presbyters, and deacons, who were then in Constantinople, and in their presence not only received and signed the famous letter of Leo to Flavianus, concerning the incarnation, but at the same time anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, their doctrine, and all their followers, declaring that he professed no other faith but what was held and professed by the Roman Church and by Leo." — Bower.^{f461} The example of Anatolius was followed by other bishops who had favored Eutyches, and by most of those who had acted in the late council, "and nothing was heard but anathemas against Eutyches, whom most of those who uttered them, had but a few months before, honored as a new apostle, and as the true interpreter of the doctrine of the church and the Fathers." — Bower.^{f462}

By an imperial message dated May 17, A.D. 451, a general council was summoned to meet at Nice in Bithynia, the first of September. The council met there accordingly, but an invasion of the Huns from Illyricum made it necessary for Marcian to remain in the capital; and therefore the council was removed from Nice to Chalcedon. Accordingly at Chalcedon there assembled the largest council ever yet held, the number of bishops being six hundred and thirty.

Marcian, not being able to be present at the opening, appointed six of the chief officers of the empire, and fourteen men of the Senate as commissioners to represent him at the council. Leo's legates presided; their names were Paschasinus, Lucentius, and Boniface.

FIRST SESSION, OCTOBER 8.

When all the bishops were seated, Leo's legates arose, and advanced to the middle of the assembly, and Paschasinus, holding a paper in his hand, said:

“We have here an order from the most blessed and apostolic pope, of the city of Rome, which is the head of all churches, by which his apostleship has been pleased to command that Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, should not be allowed to sit in the council. Let him therefore be ordered to withdraw, else we must withdraw.”

The commissioners. — “What have you to object against Dioscorus in particular?”

No answer. The question was repeated.

Lucentius. — “He must be called to account for the judgment he gave at Ephesus, where he presumed to assemble a council without the consent of the apostolic see, which has never been thought lawful, which has never been done; as he is therefore to be judged, he ought not to sit as a judge.”

The commissioners. — “Neither ought you to sit as a judge, since you take it upon you to act as a party. However, let us know what crime you lay to the charge of Dioscorus, for it is not agreeable to justice or reason, that he alone should be charged with a crime of which many others are no less guilty than he.”

The legates. — “Leo will by no means suffer Dioscorus to sit or act in this assembly as a judge, and if he does, then we must withdraw, agreeably to our instructions.” ^{f463}

The commissioners finding the legates immovable, yielded at last, and ordered Dioscorus to leave his seat, and put himself in the midst of the assembly, in the place of one accused.

Then Eusebius of Dorylaeum, the original accuser of Eutyches, stepped forward as the accuser of Dioscorus, and declared: “I have been wronged by Dioscorus; the faith has been wronged; the bishop Flavian was murdered, and, together with myself, unjustly deposed by him. Give directions that my petition be read.” This petition was a memorial to the emperors, and was to the effect that at the late council at Ephesus,

Dioscorus “having gathered a disorderly rabble, and procured an overbearing influence by bribes, made havoc, as far as lay in his power, of the pious religion of the orthodox, and established the erroneous doctrine of Eutyches the monk, which had from the first been repudiated by the holy Fathers; “that the emperors should therefore command Dioscorus to answer the accusation which he now made; and that the acts of the late council of Ephesus should be read in the present council, because from these he could show that Dioscorus was “estranged from the orthodox faith, that he strengthened a heresy utterly impious,” and that he had “wrongfully deposed” and “cruelly outraged” him.^{f464}

When the reading of the memorial was ended, it was decided that not only the acts of the late council at Ephesus, but those of the original synod at Constantinople and all the steps between, should be read.

The late council at Ephesus had excommunicated Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus. Theodoret had appealed to Leo. Leo had re-instated him, and the emperor Marcian had specially summoned him to this council. Theodoret had arrived, and at this point in the proceedings, the imperial commissioners directed that he should be admitted to the council. “The actual introduction of Theodoret caused a frightful storm.” — Hefele.^{f465} A faint estimate of this frightful storm may be formed from the following account of it, which is copied bodily from the report of the council: —

“And when the most reverend bishop Theodoret entered, the most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine [the party of Dioscorus] shouted out, ‘Mercy upon us! the faith is destroyed. The canons of the church excommunicate him. Turn him out! turn out the teacher of Nestorius.’

“On the other hand, the most reverend the bishops of the East, of Thrace, of Pontus, and of Asia, shouted out, ‘We were compelled [at the former council] to subscribe our names to blank papers; we were scourged into submission. Turn out the Manicheans! Turn out the enemies of Flavian; turn out the adversaries of the faith!’

“Dioscorus, the most reverend bishop of Alexandria, said, “Why is Cyril to be turned out? It is he whom Theodoret has condemned.’

“The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, ‘Turn out the murderer Dioscorus. Who knows not the deeds of Dioscorus?’

“The most reverend the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine shouted out, ‘Long life to the empress!’

“The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, ‘Turn out the murderers!’

“The most reverend the bishops of Egypt shouted out, ‘The empress turned out Nestorius; long life to the Catholic empress! The orthodox synod refuses to admit Theodoret.’”

Here there was a “momentary” lull in the storm, of which Theodoret instantly took advantage, and stepped forward to the commissioners with “a petition to the emperors,” which was really a complaint against Dioscorus, and asked that it be read. The commissioners said that the regular business should be proceeded with, but that Theodoret should be admitted to a seat in the council, because the bishop of Antioch had vouched for his orthodoxy. Then the storm again raged.

“The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, ‘He is worthy-worthy!’

“The most reverend the bishops of Egypt shouted out, ‘Don’t call him bishop, he is no bishop. Turn out the fighter against God; turn out the Jew!’

“The most reverend the bishops of the East shouted out, ‘The orthodox for the synod! Turn out the rebels; turn out the murderers!’

“The most reverend the bishops of Egypt, ‘Turn out the enemy of God. Turn out the defamer of Christ. Long life to the empress! Long life to the emperor! Long life to the Catholic emperor! Theodoret condemned Cyril. If we receive Theodoret, we excommunicate Cyril.’” ^{f466}

At this stage the commissioners were enabled by a special exertion of their authority, to allay the storm. They plainly told the loud-mouthed bishops, “Such vulgar shouts are not becoming in bishops, and can do no good to either party.” ^{f467}

When the tumult had been subdued, the council proceeded to business. First there were read all the proceedings from the beginning of the Synod of Constantinople against Eutyches clear down to the end of the late

Council of Ephesus; during which there was much shouting and counter-shouting after the manner of that over the introduction of Theodoret, but which need not be repeated.

The first act of the council after the reading of the foregoing minutes, was to annul the sentence which Dioscorus had pronounced against Flavianus and Eusebius. "Many of the bishops expressed their penitence at their concurrence in these acts; some saying that they were compelled by force to subscribe — others to subscribe a blank paper." — Milman.^{f468} Then a resolution was framed charging Dioscorus with having approved the doctrine of two natures, and having opposed Flavianus in maintaining it; and with having forced all the bishops at Ephesus to sign the sentence which he had pronounced.

Dioscorus was not afraid of anything, not even the terrors of an orthodox church council, and without the least sign of intimidation or fear, he boldly confronted the whole host of his adversaries. In answer to their charges —

Dioscorus said. — "I have condemned, still do, and always will, condemn, the doctrine of two natures in Christ, and all who maintain it. I hold no other doctrine but what I have learned of the Fathers, especially Athanasius, Nazianzen, and Cyril. I have chosen rather to condemn Flavianus than them. Those who do not like my doctrine may use me as they please, now they are uppermost and have the power in their hands; but in what manner soever they think fit to use me, I am unalterably determined, my soul being at stake, to live and die in the faith which I have hitherto professed. As to my having forced the bishops to sign the condemnation of Flavianus, I answer that the constancy of every Christian, and much more of a bishop, ought to be proof against all kinds of violence and death itself. The charge brought by Eusebius lays heavier against them than it does against me, and therefore it is incumbent upon them to answer that, as they are the more guilty."^{f469}

Night had now come. Dioscorus demanded an adjournment. It was refused. Torches were brought in. The night was made hideous by the wild cries of acclamation to the emperor and the Senate, of appeals to God and curses upon Dioscorus. When the resolution was finally put upon its passage, it was announced as follows by —

The imperial commissioners. — “As it has now been shown by the reading of the acts and by the avowal of many bishops who confess that they fell into error at Ephesus, that Flavianus and others were unjustly deposed, it seems right that, if it so pleases the emperor, the same punishment should be inflicted upon the heads of the previous synod, Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia, and that their deposition from the episcopal dignity should be pronounced by the council.”

The orientals. — “That is quite right.”

Many of the party of Dioscorus now abandoned him and his cause, and went over to the other side, exclaiming: “We have all erred, we all ask for pardon.” Upon this there was an almost unanimous demand that only Dioscorus should be deposed.

Dioscorus. — “They are condemning not me alone, but Athanasius and Cyril. They forbid us to assert the two natures after the incarnation.”

The orientals, and other opponents of Dioscorus, all together. — “Many years to the Senate! holy God, holy, Almighty, holy Immortal, have mercy upon us! Many years to the emperors! The impious must ever be subdued! Dioscorus the murderer, Christ has deposed! This is a righteous judgment, a righteous senate, a righteous council.”

Amid such cries as these, and, “Christ has deposed Dioscorus, Christ has deposed the murderer, God has avenged his martyrs,” the resolution was adopted. Then the council adjourned. ^{f470}

THE SECOND SESSION, OCTOBER 10.

As soon as the council had been opened, the direction was given by —

The imperial commissioners. — “Let the synod now declare what the true faith is, so that the erring may be brought back to the right way.”

The bishops, protesting. — “No one can venture to draw up a new formula of the faith, but that which has already been laid down by the Fathers [at Nice, Constantinople, and the first of Ephesus] is to be held fast. This must not be departed from.”

Cecropius, bishop of Sebastopol. — “On the Eutychian question a test has already been given by the Roman archbishop, which we [that is, he and and his nearest colleagues] have all signed.”

All the bishops, with acclamation. — “That we also say, the explanation already given by Leo suffices; another declaration of the faith must not be put forth.”

The imperial commissioners. — “Let all the patriarchs [the chief bishops] come together, along with one or two bishops of their province, and take common counsel respecting the faith, and communicate the result, so that, by its universal acceptance, every doubt in regard to the faith may be removed, or if any believe otherwise, which we do not expect, these may immediately be made manifest.”

The bishops. — “A written declaration of faith we do not bring forward. This is contrary to the rule” [referring to the command of the first Council of Ephesus].

Florentius, bishop of Sardes. — “As those who have been taught to follow the Nicene Synod, and also the regularly and piously assembled synod at Ephesus, in accordance with the faith of the holy Fathers Cyril and Celestine, and also with the letter of the most holy Leo, cannot possibly draw up at once a formula of the faith, we therefore ask for a longer delay; but I, for my part, believe that the letter of Leo is sufficient.”

Cecropius. — “Let the formulas be read in which the true faith has already been set forth.”

This suggestion was adopted. First the Nicene Creed, with its curse against the Arian heresy, was read, at the close of which, —

The bishops, unanimously. — “That is the orthodox faith, that we all believe, into that we were baptized, into that we also baptize; thus Cyril taught, thus believes Pope Leo.”

Next was read the Creed of Constantinople, and with similar acclamations it was unanimously indorsed. Then were read the two letters which Cyril had written, and which were a part of the record of the inquisition upon

Eutyches. Lastly there was read the letter of Leo. When Leo's letter was read, it was cheered to the echo, and again roared —

The bishops. — “It is the belief of the Fathers — of the apostles — so believe we all! Accursed be he that admits not that Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo! Leo has taught what is righteous and true, and so taught Cyril. Eternal be the memory of Cyril! Why was not this read at Ephesus? It was suppressed by Dioscorus!”

The bishops of Illyricum and Palestine, however, said that there were some passages — three, it proved — in the letter of Leo of which they had some doubts. The truth of those passages was confirmed by statements which Cyril had made to the same effect.

The imperial commissioners. — “Has any one still a doubt?”

The bishops, by acclamation. — “No one doubts.”

Still there was one bishop who hesitated, and requested that there might be a few days' delay, that the question might be quietly considered and settled; and as the letter of Leo had been read, that they might have a copy of the letter of Cyril to Nestorius, that they might examine them together.

The council. — “If we are to have delay, we must request that all the bishops in common shall take part in the desired consultation.”

The commissioners. — “The assembly is put off for five days, and the bishops shall, during that time, meet with Anatolius of Constantinople, and take counsel together concerning the faith, so that the doubting may be instructed.”

As the council was about to be dismissed, some bishops entered a request that the bishops who had taken a leading part in the late council of Ephesus, should be forgiven!”

The petitioning bishops. “We petition for the Fathers that they may be allowed again to enter the synod. The emperor and the empress should hear of this petition. We have all erred; let all be forgiven! “

Upon this “a great commotion again arose, similar to that at the beginning of the council over the introduction of Theodoret.”

The clergy of Constantinople shouted. — “Only a few cry for this, the synod itself says not a syllable.”

The orientals cried out. — “Exile to the Egyptian!”

The Illyrians. — “We beseech you, pardon all!”

The orientals. — “Exile to the Egyptian!”

The Illyrians. — “We have all erred; have mercy on us all! These words to the orthodox emperor! The churches are rent in pieces.”

The clergy of Constantinople. — “To exile with Dioscorus; God has rejected him. Whoever has communion with him is a Jew.”

In the midst of this uproar, the imperial commissioners put an end to the session. The recess continued only two days instead of five, for —

THE THIRD SESSION WAS HELD OCTOBER 13.

The first step taken at this session was by Eusebius of Dorylaem, who proudly stepped forward to secure by the council his vindication as the champion of orthodoxy. He presented a petition to the council in which, after repeating his accusation against Dioscorus, he said: —

“I therefore pray that you will have pity upon me, and decree that all which was done against me be declared null, and do me no harm, but that I be again restored to my spiritual dignity. At the same time anathematize his evil doctrine, and punish him for his insolence according to his deserts.”

Following this, Dioscorus was charged with enormous crimes, with lewdness and debauchery to the great scandal of his flock; with styling himself the king of Egypt, and attempting to usurp the sovereignty. Dioscorus was not present, and after being summoned three times without appearing, Leo’s legates gave a recapitulation of the crimes charged against him, and then pronounced the following sentence: —

“Leo archbishop of the great and ancient Rome, by us and the present synod, with the authority of St. Peter, on whom the Catholic Church and orthodox faith are founded, divests Dioscorus of the episcopal dignity, and declares him henceforth incapable of exercising any sacerdotal or episcopal functions.” ^{f471a}

THE FOURTH SESSION, OCTOBER 17.

At this session, the discussion of the faith was resumed. First, there was read the act of the second session, ordering a recess of five days for the consideration of the faith.

The commissioners. — “What has the reverend synod now decreed concerning the faith?”

The papal legate, Paschasinus. — “The holy synod holds fast the rule of faith which was ratified by the Fathers at Nicaea and by those at Constantinople. Moreover, in the second place, it acknowledges that exposition of this creed which was given by Cyril at Ephesus. In the third place, the letter of the most holy man Leo, archbishop of all churches, who condemned the heresy of Nestorius and Eutyches, shows quite clearly what is the true faith, and this faith the synod also holds, and allows nothing to be added to it or taken from it.”

The bishops all together. — “We also all believe thus, into that we were baptized, into that we baptize, thus we believe.”

In the midst of the assembly was the throne upon which lay the Gospels. The imperial commissioners now required that all the bishops should swear by the Gospels whether or not they agreed with the faith expressed in the creeds of Nice and Constantinople, and in Leo’s letter. The first to swear was Anatolius, archbishop of Constantinople, next, the three legates of Leo, and after them, one by one, others came, until one hundred and sixty-one votes had been thus taken; whereupon the imperial commissioners asked the remaining bishops to give their votes all at once.

The bishops, unanimously and vociferously. — “We are all agreed, we all believe thus; he who agrees, belongs to the synod! Many years to the emperors, many years to the empress! Even the five bishops [who had been deposed with Dioscorus] have subscribed, and believe as Leo does! They also belong to the synod!”

The imperial commissioners and other. — “We have written on their [the five bishops’] account to the emperor, and await his commands. You, however, are responsible to God for these five for whom you intercede, and for all the proceedings of this synod.”

The bishops. — “God has deposed Dioscorus; Dioscorus is rightly condemned; Christ has deposed him.”

After this the council waited to receive word from the emperor respecting the five bishops. After several hours the message came, saying that the council itself should decide as to their admission. As the council was already agreed upon it, and had called for it, the five bishops were called in at once. As they came in and took their places, again cried loudly —

The bishops. — “God has done this! Many years to the emperors, to the Senate, to the commissioners! The union is complete, and peace given to the churches!”

The commissioners next announced that the day before, a number of Egyptian bishops had handed in a confession of faith to the emperor, who wished that it should be read to the council. The bishops were called in and took their places, and their confession was read. The confession was signed by thirteen bishops, but it was presented in the name of “all the bishops of Egypt.” It declared that they agreed with the orthodox faith and cursed all heresy, particularly that of Arius, and a number of others, but did not name Eutyches amongst the heretics. As soon as this was noticed, the council accused the Egyptians of dishonesty. Leo’s legates demanded whether or not they would agree with the letter of Leo, and pronounce a curse on Eutyches.

The Egyptians. — “If any one teaches differently from what we have indicated, whether it be Eutyches, or whoever it be, let him be anathema. As to the letter of Leo, however, we cannot express ourselves, for you all know that in accordance with the prescription of the Nicene Council, we are united with the archbishop of Alexandria, and therefore must await his judgment in this matter.”

This caused such an outcry in the council against them, that the thirteen yielded so far as to pronounce openly and positively a curse upon Eutyches. Again the legates called upon them to subscribe to the letter of Leo.”

The Egyptians. — “Without the consent of our archbishop we cannot subscribe.”

Acacius, bishop of Ariarathia. — “It is inadmissible to allow more weight to one single person who is to hold the bishopric of Alexandria,

than to the whole synod. The Egyptians only wish to throw everything into confusion here as at Ephesus. They must subscribe Leo's letter or be excommunicated."

The Egyptians. — "In comparison with the great number of the bishops of Egypt, there are only a few of us present, and we have no right to act in their name, to do what is here required. We therefore pray for mercy, and that we may be allowed to follow our archbishop. Otherwise all the provinces of Egypt will rise up against us."

Cecropius of Sebastopol. — [Again reproaching them with heresy]"It is from yourselves alone that assent is demanded to the letter of Leo, and not in the name of the rest of the Egyptian bishops."

The Egyptians. — "We can no longer live at home if we do this."

Leo's legate, **Lucentius**. — "Ten individual men can occasion no prejudice to a synod of six hundred bishops and to the Catholic faith."

The Egyptians. — "We shall be killed, we shall be killed, if we do it. We will rather be made away with here by you than there. Let an archbishop for Egypt be here appointed, and then we will subscribe and assent. Have mercy on our gray hairs! Anatolius of Constantinople knows that in Egypt all the bishops must obey the archbishop of Alexandria. Have pity upon us; we would rather die by the hands of the emperor, and by yours than at home. Take our bishopries if you will, elect an archbishop of Alexandria; we do not object."

Many bishops. — "The Egyptians are heretics; they must subscribe the condemnation of Dioscorus."

The imperial commissioners. — "Let them remain at Constantinople until an archbishop is elected for Alexandria."

The legate, **Paschasinus**. — [Agreeing] "They must give security not to leave Constantinople in the meantime."

During the rest of the session matters were discussed which had no direct bearing upon the establishment of the faith.

THE FIFTH SESSION, OCTOBER 22.

The object of this session was the establishment of the faith; and the object was accomplished. The first thing was the reading of a form of doctrine which, according to arrangement made in the second session, had been framed, and also the day before had been “unanimously approved.” As soon as it was read, however, there was an objection made against it.

John, bishop of Germanicia. — “This formula is not good; it must be improved.”

Anatolius. — “Did it not yesterday give universal satisfaction?”

The bishops in acclamation. — “It is excellent, and contains the Catholic faith. Away with the Nestorians! The expression ‘Theotokos’ [Mother of God] must be received into the creed.”

Leo’s legates. — “If the letter of Leo is not agreed to, we demand our papers, so that we may return home, and that a synod may be held in the West.”

The imperial commissioners then suggested that a commission composed of six bishops from the East, three from Asia, three from Illyria, three from Pontus, and three from Thrace, with the archbishop of Constantinople and the Roman legates, should meet in the presence of the commissioners, and decide upon a formula of the faith, and bring it before the council. The majority of the bishops, however, loudly demanded that the one just presented should be accepted and subscribed by all, and charged John of Germanicia with being a Nestorian.

The commissioners. — “Dioscorus asserts that he condemned Flavianus for having maintained that there are two natures in Christ; in the new doctrinal formula, however, it stands, ‘Christ is of two natures.’”

Anatolius. — “Dioscorus has been deposed not on account of false doctrine, but because he excommunicated the pope, and did not obey the synod.”

The commissioners. — “The synod has already approved of Leo’s letter. As that has been done, then that which is contained in the letter must be confessed.”

The majority of the council, however, insisted upon adopting the formula already before them. The commissioners informed the emperor of the situation. Immediately the answer came.

The emperor's message. — “Either the proposed commission of bishops must be accepted, or the bishops must individually declare their faith through their metropolitans, so that all doubt may be dispelled, and all discord removed. If they will do neither of these things, a synod must be held in the West, since they refuse here to give a definite and stable declaration respecting the faith.”

The majority. — “We abide by the formula, or we go!”

Cecropius of Sebastopol. — “Whoever will not subscribe it can go [to a Western council].”

The Illyrians. — “Whoever opposes it is a Nestorian; these can go to Rome!”

The Commissioners. — “Dioscorus has rejected the expression, ‘There are two natures in Christ,’ and on the contrary has accepted ‘of two natures,’ Leo on the other hand says, In Christ there are two natures united;’ which will you follow, the most holy Leo, or Dioscorus?”

The whole council. — “We believe with Leo, not with Dioscorus; whoever opposes this is a Eutychian.”

The commissioners. — “Then you must also receive into the creed, the doctrine of Leo, which has been stated.”

The council now asked for the appointment of the commission which the commissioners had suggested. Among those who were made members of the commission were a number of bishops who had not only “vehemently supported” the doctrine of Eutyches, but had also actually taken a leading part with Dioscorus in the second Council of Ephesus. The commission met at once in the oratory of the church in which the council was held, and after consulting together not a great while, they returned to the council and presented the following preamble: —

“The holy and great and CEcumenical Synod, at Chalcedon in Bithynia,... has defined as follows: Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, when confirming the faith in his disciples, declared: ‘Peace I

leave with you; my peace I give unto you, ‘so that no one might be separated from his neighbor in the doctrines of religion, but that the preaching of the truth should be made known to all alike. As, however, the evil one does not cease by his tares to hinder the seed of religion, and is ever inventing something new in opposition to the truth, therefore has God, in his care for the human race, stirred up zeal in this pious and orthodox emperor, so that he has convoked the heads of the priesthood in order to remove all the plague of falsehood from the sheep of Christ, and to nourish them with the tender plants of truth. This we have also done in truth, since we have expelled, by our common judgment, the doctrines of error, and have renewed the right faith of the Fathers, have proclaimed the creed of the three hundred and eighteen to all, and have acknowledged the one hundred and fifty of Constantinople who accepted it, as our own. While we now receive the regulations of the earlier Ephesine Synod, under Celestine and Cyril, and its prescriptions concerning the faith, we decree that the confession of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers at Nicaea is a light to the right and unblemished faith, and that that is also valid which was decreed by the one hundred and fifty fathers at Constantinople for the confirmation of the Catholic and apostolic faith.”

Here they inserted bodily the creed of the council of Nice and that of Constantinople, found on pages 350 and 396 of this book; and then the preamble continued as follows: —

“This wise and wholesome symbol of divine grace would indeed suffice for a complete knowledge and confirmation of religion, for it teaches everything with reference to the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and declares the incarnation of the Lord to those who receive it in faith: as, however, those who would do away with the preaching of the truth devised vain expressions through their own heresies, and, on the one side, dared to destroy the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord and rejected the designation of God-bearer, and, on the other side, introduced a mixture and confusion [of the natures], and, contrary to reason, imagined only one nature of the flesh and of the Godhead, and rashly maintained that the divine nature of the Only-begotten was, by the mixture, become possible, therefore the holy, great, and Œcumenical Synod decrees that the faith of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers shall remain

inviolate, and that the doctrine afterwards promulgated by the one hundred and fifty Fathers at Constantinople, on account of the Pneumatomachi shall have equal validity, being put forth by them, not in order to add to the creed of Nicaea anything that was lacking, but in order to make known in writing their consciousness concerning the Holy Chest against the deniers of his glory.

“On account of those, however, who endeavored to destroy the mystery of the incarnation, and who boldly insulted him who was born of the holy Mary, affirmed that he was a mere man, the holy synod has accepted as valid the synodal letter of St. Cyril to Nestorius and to the orientals in opposition to Nestorianism, and has added to them the letter of the holy archbishop Leo of Rome, written to Flavian for the overthrow of the Eutychian errors, as agreeing with doctrine of St. Peter and as a pillar against all heretics, for the confirmation of the orthodox dogmax. The synod opposes those who seek to rend the mystery of the incarnation into a duality of sons, and excludes from holy communion those who venture to declare the Godhead of the Only-begotten as capable of suffering, and opposes those who imagine a mingling and a confusion of the two natures of Christ, and drives away those who foolishly maintain that the servant-form of the Son, assumed from us, is from a heavenly substance, or any other [than ours], and anathematizes those who fable that before the union there were two natures of our Lord, but after the union only one.”

Having thus paved the way, they presented for the present occasion, for all people, and for all time, the following creed: —

“Following, accordingly, the holy Fathers, we confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and we all with one voice declare him to be at the same time perfect in Godhead, and perfect in manhood, very God, and at the same time very man, consisting of a reasonable soul and a body, being consubstantial with the Father as respects his Godhead, and at the same time consubstantial with ourselves as respects his manhood; resembling us in all things, independently of sin; begotten before the ages, of the Father, according to his Godhead, but born, in the last of the days, of Mary, the virgin and Mother of God, for our sakes and for our salvation; being one and the same Jesus Christ, Son, Lord, Only-

begotten, made known in two natures without confusion, without conversion, without severance, without separation inasmuch as the difference of the natures is in no way annulled by their union, but the peculiar essence of each nature is rather preserved, and conspires in one person and in one subsistence, not as though he were parted or severed into two persons, but is one and the same Son, Only-begotten, Divine Word, Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets declared concerning him, and Christ himself has fully instructed us, and the symbol of the Fathers has conveyed to us. Since, then, these matters have been defined by us with all accuracy and diligence, the holy and universal synod has determined that no one shall be at liberty to put forth another faith, whether in writing, or by framing, or devising, or teaching it to others. And that those who shall presume to frame, or publish, or teach another faith, or to communicate another symbol to those who are disposed to turn to the knowledge of the truth from heathenism, or Judaism, or any other sect — that they, if they be bishops or clerks, shall suffer deprivation. the bishops of their episcopal, the clerks of their clerical, office; and if monks or laics, shall be anathematized.”^{f472a}

When the reading of this report of the commission was finished, the council adjourned.

THE SIXTH SESSION, OCTOBER 25.

At this session the emperor Marcian and the empress Pulcheria, came with their whole court to ratify the decision which the council in the previous session had reached concerning the faith. Marcian opened the session in a speech, spoken first in Latin and repeated in Greek, which was as follows:

“From the beginning of our reign we have had the purity of the faith peculiarly at heart. As now, through the avarice or perversity of some, many have been seduced to error, we summoned the present synod so that all error and all obscurity might be dispelled, that religion might shine forth from the power of its light, and that no one should in future venture further to maintain concerning the incarnation of our Lord and Saviour, anything else than that which the apostolic preaching and the decree, in accordance therewith, of the three hundred and eighteen holy Fathers have handed down to

posterity, and which is also testified by the letter of the holy Pope Leo of Rome to Flavian. In order to strengthen the faith, but not at all to exercise violence, we have wished, after the example of Constantine, to be personally present at the synod, so that the nations may not be still more widely separated by false opinions. Our efforts were directed to this, that all, becoming one in the true doctrine, may return to the same religion and honor the true Catholic faith. May God grant this.”

As soon as he had finished the speech in Latin, —

The bishops unanimously exclaimed. — “Many years to the emperor, many years to the empress; he is the only son of Constantine. Prosperity to Marcian, the new Constantine!”

After he had repeated the speech in Greek, the bishops repeated their shouts of adulation. Then the whole declaration, preamble and all, concerning the faith, was read, at the close of which —

The Emperor Marcian. — “Does this formula of the faith express the view of all?”

The six hundred bishops all shouting at once. — We all believe thus; there is one faith, one will; we are all unanimous, and have unanimously subscribed; we are all orthodox! This is the faith of the Fathers, the faith of the apostles, the faith of the orthodox; this faith has saved the world. Prosperity to Marcian, the new Constantine, the new Paul, the new David! long years to our sovereign lord David! You are the peace of the world, long life! Your faith will defend you. Thou honorest Christ. He will defend thee. Thou hast established orthodoxy.... To the august empress, many years! You are the lights of orthodoxy.... Orthodox from her birth, God will defend her. Defender of the faith, may God defend her. Pious, orthodox enemy of heretics, God will defend her. Thou hast persecuted all the heretics. May the evil eye be averted from your empire! Worthy of the faith, worthy of Christ! So are the faithful sovereigns honored.... Marcian is the new Constantine, Pulcheria is the new Helena! . . . Your life is the safety of all; your faith is the glory of the churches. By thee the world is at peace; by thee the orthodox faith is established; by thee heresy ceases to be: Long life to the emperor and empress!” ^{f473a}

The emperor then “gave thanks to Christ that unity in religion had again been restored, and threatened all, as well private men and soldiers as the clergy, with heavy punishment if they should again stir up controversies respecting the faith, “ and proposed certain ordinances which were made a part of the canons established in future sessions. As soon as he had ceased speaking, the bishops again shouted, “Thou art priest and emperor together, conqueror in war and teacher of the faith.”

The council was sitting in the Church of St. Euphemia, and Marcian now announced that in honor of St. Euphemia and the council, he bestowed upon the city of Chalcedon the title and dignity of “metropolis;” and in return the bishops all unanimously exclaimed, “This is just; an Easter be over the whole world; the holy Trinity will protect thee. We pray dismiss us.”

Instead of dismissing them, however, the emperor commanded them to remain “three or four days longer,” and to continue the proceedings. The council continued until November 1, during which time ten sessions were held, in which there was much splitting of theological hairs, pronouncing curses, and giving the lie; and an immense amount of hooting and yelling in approval or condemnation. None of it, however, is worthy of any further notice except to say that twenty-eight canons were established, the last of which confirmed to the archbishopric of Constantinople the dignity which had been bestowed by the Council of Constantinople seventy years before, and set at rest all dispute on the matter of jurisdiction by decreeing that in its privileges and ecclesiastical relations it should be exalted to, and hold, the first place after that of Old Rome. Against this, however, Leo’s legates protested at the time; and Leo himself, in three letters — one to Marcian, one to Pulcheria, and one to Anatolius — denounced it in his own imperious way.

Having closed its labors, the council drew up and sent to Leo a memorial beginning with the words of ~~xxxv~~ Psalm 126:2, which read in substance as follows: —

“Our mouth was filled with laughter, and our tongue with joy’

“The reason of this joy is the confirmation of the faith which has been preserved by your Holiness and the blissful contents of which have been translated by you as interpreter of the voice of Peter.

You the bishops of Chalcedon have taken as their guide, in order to

show to the sons of the church the inheritance of the truth. Your letter has been for us a spiritual, imperial banquet, and we believe we have had the heavenly Bridegroom present at it in our midst. As the head over the members, so have you by your representatives, had the predominance among us. In order that everything might proceed in the most orderly manner, however, the faithful emperors have had the presidency. The wild beast Dioscorus, having in his madness attacked even him who is by the Saviour a keeper of the divine vineyard, and having dared to excommunicate him whose vocation it is to unite the body of the church, the synod has inflicted meet punishment upon him because he has not repented and appeared in answer to our exhortation. All our other business has been prosperously conducted by God's grace and through St. Euphemia, who has crowned the assembly held in her bridal chamber, and has transmitted its doctrinal decree as her own to her bridegroom Christ by the hand of the emperor and the empress.... We have also confirmed the canon of the synod of the one hundred and fifty Fathers, by which the second rank is assigned to the see of Constantinople, immediately after thy holy and apostolic see. We have done it with confidence, because you have so often allowed the apostolic ray which shines by you to appear to the church at Constantinople, and because you are accustomed ungrudgingly to enrich those who belong to you by allowing them participation in your own possessions. Be pleased, therefore, to embrace this decree as though it were thine own, most holy and most blessed father. Thy legates have strongly opposed it, probably because they thought that this good regulation, like the declaration of the faith, should proceed from thyself. But we were of an opinion that it belonged to the CECumenical Synod to confirm its prerogatives to the imperial city in accordance with the wish of the emperor, assuming that when thou hadst heard it, thou wouldst regard it as thine own act. For all that the sons have done, which is good, conduces to the honor of the fathers. We pray thee, honor our decree also by thine assent; and as we have assented to thy good decree, so may thy loftiness accomplish that which is meet towards the sons. This will also please the emperors, who have sanctioned thy judgment in the faith as law; and the see of Constantinople may well receive a reward for the zeal with which it united itself with thee in the matter of religion. In order to show that we have done

nothing from favor or dislike towards any one, we have brought the whole contents of what we have done to thy knowledge, and have communicated it to thee for confirmation and assent.”

This was followed up December 18, by two letters to Leo from the emperor and the archbishop of Constantinople, Anatolius, saying that he had constantly done all for the honor of Leo and his legates, and from reverence for the pope, the council and himself had transmitted all to Leo for his approval and confirmation; Marcian expressing his gladness that the true faith had received its expression in accordance with the letter of Leo, and both praying him to approve and confirm the decrees of the council, and especially the canon in reference to the see of Constantinople. Leo steadily denounced that canon, however. But as Anatolius, in a letter, April, 454, acknowledged to Leo: “The whole force and confirmation of the decrees have been reserved for your Holiness;” this was to yield absolutely all to Leo, so far as it was possible for the council and its members to go.

February 7, A.D. 452, the emperor Marcian in the name of himself and Valentinian III, issued the following edict confirming the creed of the council: —

“That which has been so greatly and universally desired is at last accomplished. The controversy respecting orthodoxy is over, and unity of opinion is restored among the nations. The bishops assembled in Chalcedon at my command from various exarchies, have taught with exactness in a doctrinal decree what is to be maintained in respect to religion. All unholy controversy must now cease, as he is certainly impious and sacrilegious who, after the declaration made by so many bishops, thinks that there still remains something for his own judgment to examine. For it is evidently a sign of extreme folly when a man seeks for a deceptive light in broad day. He who, after discovery has been made of the truth, still inquires after something else seeks for falsehood. No cleric, no soldier, and generally no one, in whatever position he may be must venture publicity to dispute concerning the faith, seeking to produce confusion, and to find pretexts for false doctrines. For it is an insult to the holy synod to subject that which it has decreed and fundamentally established, to new examinations and public disputes, since that which was recently defined concerning the Christian faith

is in accordance with the doctrine of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers and the regulation of the one hundred and fifty Fathers. The punishment of the transgressors of this law shall not be delayed, since they are not only opponents of the lawfully established faith but also by their contentions betray the holy mysteries to the Jews and heathen. If a cleric ventures openly to dispute respecting religion, he shall be struck out of the catalogue of the clergy, the soldier shall be deprived of his belt, other persons shall be removed from the residence city, and shall have suitable punishments inflicted upon them, according to the pleasure of the courts of justice.”

The following July 28, he issued a decree in which he forbade the Eutychians to have any clergy; and if anybody should attempt to appoint any, both they who should appoint and he who was appointed, should be punished with confiscation of goods and banishment for life. They were forbidden to hold any assemblies of any kind, or to build, or to live in, monasteries. If they should presume to hold any kind of meeting, then the place where it was held would be confiscated, if it was with the knowledge of the owner. But if, without the knowledge of the owner it was rented by some one for them, he who rented it should be punished with a beating, with confiscation of goods, and with banishment. They were declared incapable of inheriting anything by will, or of appointing any Eutychian an heir. If any were found in the army, they were to be expelled from it. Those of them who had formerly been in the orthodox faith, and also the monks of the monastery — he called it the “stable” — of Eutyches, were to be driven entirely beyond the boundaries of the Roman empire. All their writings were to be burnt, whoever circulated them was to be banished and all instruction in the Eutychian doctrine was to be “rigorously punished.” And finally, all governors of provinces with their officials, and all judges in the cities who should be negligent in enforcing the law, were to be fined ten pounds of gold, as despisers of religion and the laws.

At the same time that this last decree was issued, Eutyches and Dioscorus were sentenced to banishment. Eutyches died before the sentence was enforced, and Dioscorus died in exile at Gangra in Paphlagonia two years afterward.

As Leo had published his letters rejecting the canon concerning the see of Constantinople, and had not yet formally published any approval of the

doctrinal decree of the council, the report went abroad throughout the East that he had repudiated all the decisions of the council. The report, therefore, was a new incentive to all who disagreed with the creed of the council, and “heresy” became again so prevalent that February 15, A.D. 453, Marcian addressed a letter to Leo earnestly beseeching him as soon as possible to issue a decree in confirmation of the decision of the Council of Chalcedon, “so that no one might have any further doubt as to the judgment of his Holiness.” March 21, Leo responded in the following words: —

“I doubt not, brethren, that you all know how willingly I have confirmed the doctrinal decree of the Synod of Chalcedon. You would have been able to learn this not only from the assent of my legates, but also from my letters to Anatolius of Constantinople, if he had brought the answer of the apostolic see to your knowledge. But that no one may doubt my approving of that which was decreed at the Synod of Chalcedon by universal consent in regard to the faith, I have directed this letter to all my brethren and fellow bishops who were present at the synod named, and the emperor will, at my request, send it to you, so that you may all know that not merely by my legates, but also by my own confirmation of it, I have agreed with you in what was done at the synod; but only, as must always be repeated, in regard to the subject of the faith, on account of which the general council was assembled at the command of the emperors, in agreement with the apostolic see. But in regard to the regulations of the Fathers of Nicaea, I admonish you that the rights of the individual churches must remain unaltered, as they were there established by the inspired Fathers. No unlawful ambition must covet that which is not its own, and no one must increase by the diminution of others. And that which pride has obtained by enforced assent, and thinks to have confirmed by the name of a council, is invalid, if it is in opposition to the canons of the aforesaid Fathers [of Nicaea]. How reverentially the apostolic see maintains the rules of these Fathers, and that I by God’s help shall be a guardian of the Catholic faith and of the ecclesiastical canons, you may see from the letter by which I have resisted the attempts of the bishop of Constantinople.”

As the necessity for the Council of Chalcedon was created by the will of Leo alone; as the council when assembled was ruled from beginning to end

by his legates in his name; as the documents presented in the council were addressed to “Leo, the most holy, blessed, and universal patriarch of the great city of Rome, and to the holy and CEcumenical Council of Chalcedon;” as the council distinctly acknowledged Leo as its head, and the members of the council as members of him; as the judgments were pronounced as his own; as his letter was made the test, and the expression of the faith, and with that all were required to agree; as the decisions of the council were submitted to him for approval and were practically of little or no force until he had formally published his approval, and then only such portion as he did approve; as, in short everything in connection with the council sprung from his will and returned in subjection to his will, — Leo, and in him the bishopric of Rome, thus became essentially the fountain of the Catholic faith.

It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Leo should officially declare that the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were inspired. This is precisely what he did. In a letter to Bishop Julian of Cos CEpistle 144, he said: “The decrees of Chalcedon are inspired by the Holy Spirit, and are to be received as the definition of the faith for the welfare of the whole world.” And in a letter CEpistle 145 to the emperor Leo, who succeeded Marcian in A.D. 457, he said: “The Synod of Chalcedon was held by divine inspiration.” As, therefore, the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were the expression of the will of Leo; and as these decrees were published and held as of divine inspiration; by this turn, it was a very short cut to the infallibility of the bishop of Rome.

Now let the reader turn to pages 426 and 470 and 472, and compare the Italicized words in the statement of Eutyches, in the statement of the commissioners in the council, and in the creed of Chalcedon. It will be seen that Leo and the council came so near to saying what Eutyches had said, that no difference can be perceived. Eutyches had been condemned as a heretic for saying that in Christ, after the incarnation, the two natures are one. Now Leo and the council express the orthodox faith by saying that in Christ there are two natures united in one. In other words, Eutyches was a condemned heretic for saying that Christ is “of two natures;” while Leo and the council were declared everlastingly orthodox for saying that Christ is “in two natures.” In Greek, the difference was expressed in the two small words *ek* and *en*; which like the two large words *Hamoousion* and *Hamoiouision*, in the beginning of the controversy between Alexander and Arius, differed only in a single letter. And like that also, the meaning of the

two words is so “essentially the same,” that he who believes either, believes the other. “Such was the device of the envious and God-hating demon in the change of a single letter, that, while in reality the one expression was completely inductive of the notion of the other, still with the generality the discrepancy between them was held to be considerable, and the ideas conveyed by them to be clearly in diametric opposition, and exclusive of each other; whereas he who confesses Christ in two natures, clearly affirms him to be from two,. . . and on the other hand, the position of one who affirms his origin from two natures, is completely inclusive of his existence in two.... So that in this case by the expression, ‘from two natures,’ is aptly suggested the thought of the expression, ‘in two,’ and conversely; nor can there be a severance of the terms.” — Evagrius. ^{f474a}

And that is all that there was in this dispute, or in any of those before it, in itself. Yet out of it there came constant and universal violence, hypocrisy, bloodshed, and murder, which speedily wrought the utter ruin of the empire, and established a despotism over thought which remained supreme for ages, and which is yet asserted and far too largely assented to.

The whole world having been thus once more brought to the “unity of the faith,” the controversy, the confusion, and the violence, went on worse than before. But as the faith of Leo which was established by the Council of Chalcedon, “substantially completes the orthodox Christology of the ancient church,” and has “passed into all the confessions of the Protestant churches” (Schaff); ^{f475a} and as the work of these four general councils — Nice, Constantinople, first of Ephesus, and Chalcedon — was to put dead human formulas in the place of the living oracles of God, a woman in the place of Christ, and a MAN IN THE PLACE OF GOD, it is not necessary to follow any farther the course of ambitious strife and contentious deviltry.

CHAPTER 20.

THE CHURCH USURPS THE CIVIL AUTHORITY.

THE events related in the five chapters immediately preceding this, abundantly demonstrate that the promise of the unity of the faith, which the bishops made to Constantine, was a fraud; and that the blessings which were promised and expected to accrue to the State by the union with the Church, proved a continual and horrible curse to the State and to society in general.

In tracing the faith of the Catholic Church, it has been necessary to deal most largely with society and the State in the East. But bad as it was in the East, it was worse in the West. The reason is that in the Eastern empire the imperial authority held its place above the church — the civil power remained superior to the ecclesiastical; whereas in the Western empire, the church exalted itself above the State — the ecclesiastical was made superior to the civil power. To trace the course, and to discover the result, of the workings of the Western system, that is, of the papacy in fact, is the purpose of the present chapter.

In the sketch of the bishops of Rome from Melchiades to Leo, given in the foregoing chapter, we have seen the working of the episcopal spirit in exalting the bishopric of Rome to the place of supremacy in religion. In the controversies which we have traced, it is clearly seen that in order to secure the weight of the influence of the bishop of Rome, each one to his particular side of the question, the parties to the innumerable controversies which kept everything in a ferment, were always ready to bestow every sort of flattering title and token of distinction upon him to whom they appealed. Then when the controversy had culminated in the inevitable council, the victorious party, if in harmony with the bishop of Rome, added to its flattering unction on him the weight of the council in whatever dignities and honors it might choose to bestow. In fact, there was never a controversy in which there was not an appeal to the bishop of Rome by one or both parties, and almost always by both. And there never was a general council that agreed with the bishop of Rome, by which there was not some special honor or dignity conferred upon him.

On the other hand, there was a curious train of political events which conspired to the same result, and which yet more fully opened the way for the church to usurp the civil power, and for the bishop of Rome to encroach upon the imperial authority.

Diocletian established his capital at Nicomedia, and Maximian his at Milan, A.D. 304; and with the exception of Maxentius and Constantine, during brief periods, never afterward was there an emperor who made Rome his capital: and even while Constantine did so, instead of detracting from the dignity of the bishop of Rome, it added to it; for as we have seen, the bishop of Rome bore a leading part in the formation of the union of Church and State, and the moment that that union was consummated, “the bishop of Rome rises at once to the rank of a great accredited functionary.... So long as Constantine was in Rome, the bishop of Rome, the head of the emperor’s religion, became in public estimation,... in authority and influence, immeasurably the superior, to all of sacerdotal rank... As long as Rome is the imperial residence, an appeal to the emperor is an appeal to the bishop of Rome.” — Milman.^{f471}

Thus the presence of Constantine in Rome redounded to the importance and dignity of the bishopric of Rome, but it was not until Constantine had moved his capital to Constantinople, that the way was opened for the full play of that arrogant spirit that has ever been the chief characteristic of that dignitary. “The absence of a secular competitor allowed the papal authority to grow up and to develop its secret strength” Milman);^{f472} and under the blandishments of necessitous imperial favor he did as he pleased, and more rapidly than ever his power grew.

In the sketch of the hierarchy, given on page 390, it will be noticed that in the gradation of the church dignitaries the ascent was only so far as corresponded to the four prefects in the State. There was not above the four patriarchs a bishop over all, as above the prefects the emperor was over all. The one great reason for this is that Constantine was not only emperor but bishop, and as “bishop of externals” in the church, he held the place of chief bishop, supreme pontiff — over the four patriarchs precisely as he held as emperor the chief authority over the four prefects.

Yet, in the nature of things, it was inevitable and only a question of time when the bishop of Rome would assert as a matter of right, his supremacy over all others, and when this should be accomplished, the matter of the

supremacy would then lie between him and the emperor alone, which would open the way for the bishop of Rome to encroach upon the civil and imperial authority. This spirit showed itself in the action of the bishop of Rome in studiously avoiding the title of “patriarch,” “as placing him on a level with other patriarchs.” He always preferred the title of “papa,” or “pope” (Schuffⁱ⁴⁷³): and this, because “patriarch” bespeaks an oligarchical church government, that is, government by a few; whereas “pope” bespeaks a monarchical church government, that is, government by one.

Again: in all the West there was no rival to the bishop of Rome. Whereas in the East there were three rivals to one another, whose jealousies not only curbed the encroachments of one another, but built up the influence and authority of the bishop of Rome.

In addition to all these things, both the weakness and the strength of the imperial influence and authority were made to serve the ambitious spirit of the bishopric of Rome. After Constantine’s death, with the exception of Valentinian I, there never was a single able emperor of the West; and even Valentinian I was the servant of the bishop of Rome to the extent that he “enacted a law empowering the bishop of Rome to examine and judge other bishops.” — Bower.ⁱ⁴⁷⁴ When Constantius exercised authority over the West, the bishop of Rome openly defied his authority; and although Liberius afterward changed his views and submitted, the example was never forgotten. And when Theodosius for a brief period exercised authority in the West, it was not only as the servant of the bishop of Rome, but as the subject of the bishop of Milan. It is true that the power of Ambrose in that particular case was exercised in a just cause. But a power that could be carried to such extremes in a cause that was just, could as easily be carried to the same extreme in a cause that was unjust. So it had been exercised before this on several occasions, and so it was exercised afterward on numberless occasions, and by others than Ambrose.

All these things conspired to open the way for the exaltation of the ecclesiastical above the civil power; and the ecclesiastics walked diligently in the way thus opened. The seed which directly bore this evil fruit, was also sown in that dark intrigue between Constantine and the bishops, which formed the union of Church and State, and created the papacy. That seed was sown when Constantine bestowed upon the bishops the right of judgment in civil matters.

It is a doctrine of Christianity, first, that there shall be no disputes among Christians, and, second, if any such do arise, then Christians must settle such differences among themselves, and not go to law before unbelievers.

✠ 1 Corinthians 8:1-7.

This order was faithfully followed in the church at the beginning; but as the power and influence of the bishopric grew, this office was usurped by the bishop, and all such cases were decided by him alone. Until the union of Church and State, however, every man had the right of appeal from the decision of the bishop to the civil magistrate.

Very shortly after the establishment of the Catholic Church, “Constantine likewise enacted a law in favor of the clergy, permitting judgment to be passed by the bishops when litigants preferred appealing to them rather than to the secular court; he enacted that their decree should be valid, and as far superior to that of other judges as if pronounced by the emperor himself; that the governors and subordinate military officers should see to the execution of these decrees; and that sentence, when passed by them, should be irreversible.” — Sozomen^{f475}.

This was only in cases, however, where the disputants voluntarily appeared and submitted their causes to the decision of the bishops. Yet as the bishops were ever ready to “extend their authority far beyond their jurisdiction, and their influence far beyond their authority” (Milman),^{f476} they to worked this power as to make their business as judges occupy the principle portion of their time. “To worldly-minded bishops it furnished a welcome occasion for devoting themselves to any foreign and secular affairs, rather than to the appropriate business of their spiritual calling; and the same class might also allow themselves to be governed by impure motives in the settlement of these disputes.” — Neander.^{f477}

Some bishops extended this right into what was known as the right of intervention, that is, the right of interceding with the secular power in certain cases. “The privilege of interceding with the secular power for criminals, prisoners, and unfortunates of every kind, had belonged to the heathen priests, and especially to the vestals, and now passed to the Christian ministry, above all to the bishops, and thenceforth became an essential function of their office.” — Schaff.^{f478}

This office was first assumed by the heathenized bishops for this purpose, but soon instead of interceding they began to dictate; instead of soliciting

they began to command; and instead of pleading for deserving unfortunates, they interfered with the genuine administration of the civil magistrates. As early as the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, the second council that was held by the direction of Constantine, the church power began to encroach in this matter upon the jurisdiction of the State. Canon 7 of this council, charged the bishops to take the oversight of such of the civil magistrates within their respective sees, as were church members; and if the magistrates acted inconsistently with their Christian duties, they should be turned out of the church. ^{f479}

This was at once to give to the bishops the direction of the course of civil matters. And the magistrates who were members of the church, — and it was not long before the great majority of them were such, — knowing that their acts were to be passed upon for approval or disapproval by the bishop, chose to take counsel of him beforehand so as to be sure to act according to “discipline,” and avoid being excommunicated. Thus by an easy gradation and extension of power, the bishopric assumed jurisdiction over the jurisprudence of the State.

Further, as the empire was now a religious State, a “kingdom of God,” the Bible was made the code of civil procedure as well as of religion. More than this, it was the Bible as interpreted by the bishops. Yet, more than this, it was the Bible as interpreted by the bishops according to the Fathers. “The Bible, and the Bible interpreted by the Fathers, became the code, not of religion only, but of every branch of knowledge.” — Milman. ^{f480} And as the Fathers themselves, necessarily, had to be interpreted, the bishops became the sole interpreters of the code, as well as the censors of the magistracy, in all the jurisprudence of the empire.

The advice which one of the model bishops in the church — in the estimation of some, a model even to this day ^{f481} — gave upon a certain occasion to a magistrate who had consulted him in regard to the performance of his duty, well illustrates the workings of this system as a system. A certain officer consulted Ambrose, bishop of Milan, as to what he would better do in a certain criminal case. Ambrose told him that according to ~~<BIB>~~ Romans 13, he was authorized to use the sword in punishment of the crime; yet, at the same time, advised him to imitate Christ in his treatment of the woman mentioned in ~~<BIB>~~ John 8, who had been taken in adultery, and forgive the criminal; because if the criminal had never been baptized, he might yet be converted and obtain forgiveness of

his sin: and if he had been baptized, it was proper to give him an opportunity to repent and reform.^{f482}

With the Bible as the code, this was the only thing that could be done, and this the only proper advice that could be given. For Christ distinctly commands: “Judge not;” “Condemn not.” And he does directly command that when a brother offends and is reproved, if he repents, he is to be forgiven; and if he does it seven times in a day and seven times in a day turns and says “I repent,” so often is he to be forgiven. Therefore, with the Bible as the code, the advice which Ambrose gave was the only advice which could properly be given. But it was destructive of civil government. And this is only to say that it was an utter perversion of the Bible to make it the code of civil procedure. Such procedure therefore in civil government where there was no possible means of knowing that repentance was genuine or reformation sure, was to destroy civil government, and substitute for it only a pretense at moral government which was absolutely impotent for any good purpose, either moral or civil. In other words, it was only to destroy the State, and to substitute for it, in everything, the church.

This is not saying anything against the Bible, nor against its principles. It is only exposing the awful perversion of its principles by the church in exalting its authority above the State. God’s government is moral, and he has made provision for maintaining his government with the forgiveness of transgression. But he has made no such provision for civil government. No such provision can be made, and civil government be maintained. The Bible reveals God’s method of saving those who sin against his moral government. civil government is man’s method of preserving order, and has nothing to do with sin, nor the salvation of sinners. Civil government prosecutes a man and finds him guilty. If before the penalty is executed he repents, God forgives him; but the government must execute the penalty.

And this authority was carried much further than merely to advise. The monks and clergy went so far at last as actually to tear away from the civil authorities, criminals and malefactors of the worst sort, who had been justly condemned. To such an extent was this carried that a law had to be enacted in 398 ordering that “the monks and the clergy should not be permitted to snatch condemned malefactors from their merited punishment.” — Neander.^{f483} Yet they were still allowed the right of intercession.

This evil led directly to another, or rather only deepened and perpetuated itself. Ecclesiastical offices, especially the bishoprics, were the only ones in the empire that were elective. As we have seen, all manner of vile and criminal characters had been brought into the church. Consequently these had a voice in the elections. It became therefore an object for the unruly, violent, and criminal classes to secure the election of such men as would use the episcopal influence in their interests, and shield them from justice.

“As soon as a bishop had closed his eyes, the metropolitan issued a commission to one of his suffragans to administer the vacant see, and prepare, within a limited time, the future election. The right of voting was vested in the inferior clergy, who were best qualified to judge of the merit of the candidates; in the senators or nobles of the city, all those who were distinguished by their rank or property; and finally in the whole body of the people who, on the appointed day, flocked in multitudes from the most remote parts of the diocese, and sometimes silenced by their tumultuous acclamations, the voice of reason and the laws of discipline. These acclamations might accidentally fix on the head of the most deserving competitor; of some ancient presbyter, some holy monk, or some layman, conspicuous for his zeal and piety.

“But the episcopal chair was solicited, especially in the great and opulent cities of the empire, as a temporal rather than as a spiritual dignity. The interested views, the selfish and angry passions, the arts of perfidy and dissimulation, the secret corruption, the open and even bloody violence which had formerly disgraced the freedom of election in the commonwealths of Greece and Rome, too often influenced the choice of the successors of the apostles. While one of the candidates boasted the honors of his family, a second allured his judges by the delicacies of a plentiful table, and a third, more guilty than his rivals, offered to share the plunder of the church among the accomplices of his sacrilegious hopes.” — Gibbon.^{f484}

The offices of the church, and especially the bishopric, thus became virtually political, and were made subject to all the strife of political methods. As the logical result, the political schemers, the dishonest men, the men of violent and selfish dispositions, pushed themselves to the front in every place; and those who might have given a safe direction to public

affairs, were crowded to the rear, and in fact completely shut out of office by the very violence of those who would have office at any cost.

Thus by the very workings of the wicked elements which had been brought into the church by the political methods of Constantine and the bishops, genuine Christianity was separated from this whole Church and State system, as it had been before from the pagan system. The genuine Christians, who loved the quiet and the peace which belong with the Christian profession, were reproached by the formal, hypocritical, political religionists who represented both the Church and the State, or rather the Church and the State in one, — the real Christians were reproached by these with being “righteous overmuch.”

“It was natural, however, that the bad element, which had outwardly assumed the Christian garb, should push itself more prominently to notice in public life. Hence it was more sure to attract the common gaze, while the genuinely Christian temper loved retirement, and created less sensation.”

“It was natural, however, that the bad element, which had outwardly assumed the Christian garb, should push itself more prominently to notice in public life. Hence it was more sure to attract the common gaze, while the genuinely Christian temper loved retirement, and created less sensation.”

“At the present time, the relation of vital Christianity to the Christianity of mere form, resembled that which, in the preceding period, existed between the Christianity of those to whom religion was a serious concern, and paganism, which constituted the prevailing rule of life. As in the earlier times, the life of genuine Christians had stood out in strong contrast with the life of the pagan world, so now the life of such as were Christians not merely by outward profession, but also in the temper of their hearts, presented a strong contrast with the careless and abandoned life of the ordinary nominal Christians. By these later, the others... were regarded in the same light as, in earlier times, the Christians had been regarded by the pagans. They were also reproached by these nominal Christians, just as the Christians generally had been taunted before by the pagans, with seeking to be righteous overmuch.” — Neander.^{f485}

In the episcopal elections, “Sometimes the people acted under outside considerations and the management of demagogues, and demanded unworthy or ignorant men for the highest offices. Thus there were frequent disturbances and collisions, and even bloody conflicts, as in the election of Damasus in Rome. In short all the selfish passions and corrupting influences which had spoiled the freedom of the popular political elections in the Grecian and Roman republics, and which appear also in the republics of modern times, intruded upon the elections of the church. And the clergy likewise often suffered themselves to be guided by impure motives.” — Schaff. ^{f486}

It was often the case that a man who had never been baptized, and was not even a member of the church, would be elected a bishop, and hurried through the minor offices to this position. Such was the case with Ambrose, bishop of Milan, in A.D. 374, and Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, in 381, and many others. In the contention for the bishopric, there was as much political intrigue, strife, contention, and even bloodshed, as there had formerly been for the office of consul in the republic in the days of Pompey and Caesar.

It often happened that men of fairly good character were compelled to step aside and allow low characters to be elected to office, for fear they would cause more mischief, tumult, and riot if they were not elected than if they were. Instances actually occurred, and are recorded by Gregory Nazianzen, in which certain men who were not members of the church at all, were elected to the bishopric in opposition to others who had every churchly qualification for the office, because “they had the worst men in the city on their side.” ^{f487} And Chrysostom says that “many are elected on account of their badness, to prevent the mischief they would otherwise do.” ^{f488} Such characters as these elected to office by such characters as those, and the office representing such authority as that did, — nothing but evil of the worst kind could accrue either to the civil government or to society at large.

More than this, as the men thus elected were the dispensers of doctrine and the interpreters of Scripture in all points both religious and civil; and as they owed their position to those who elected them, it was only the natural consequence that they adapted their interpretations to the character and wishes of those who had placed them in their positions. For “when once a political aspirant has bidden with the multitude for power, and still depends

on their pleasure for effective support, it is no easy thing to refuse their wishes, or hold back from their demands.” — Draper.^{f489}

Nectarius, who has been already mentioned after he had been taken from the praetorship and made bishop by such a method of election as the above — elected bishop of Constantinople before he had been baptized — wished to ordain his physician as one of his own deacons. The physician declined on the ground that he was not morally fit for the office. Nectarius endeavored to persuade him by saying, “Did not I, who am now a priest, formerly live much more immorally than thou, as thou thyself well knowest, since thou wast often an accomplice of my many iniquities?” — Schaff.^{f490} — The physician still refused, but for a reason which was scarcely more honorable than that by which he was urged. The reason was that although he had been baptized, he had continued to practice his iniquities, while Nectarius had quit his when he was baptized.

The bishops’ assumption of authority over the civil jurisprudence did not allow itself to be limited to the inferior magistrates. It asserted authority over the jurisdiction of the emperor himself. “In Ambrose the sacerdotal character assumed a dignity and an influence as yet unknown; it first began to confront the throne, not only on terms of equality, but of superior authority, and to exercise a spiritual dictatorship over the supreme magistrate. The resistance of Athanasius to the imperial authority had been firm but deferential, passive rather than aggressive. In his public addresses he had respected the majesty of the empire; at all events, the hierarchy of that period only questioned the authority of the sovereign in matters of faith. But in Ambrose the episcopal power acknowledged no limits to its moral dominion, and admitted no distinction of persons.” — Milman.^{f491}

As the Church and the State were identical, and as whoever refused to submit to the dictates of the bishopric was excommunicated from the church, this meant that the only effect of disobedience to the bishop was to become an outcast in society, if not an outlaw in the State. And more than this, in the state of abject superstition which now prevailed, excommunication from the church was supposed to mean consignment to perdition only. “The hierarchical power, from exemplary, persuasive, amiable, was now authoritative, commanding, awful. When Christianity became the most powerful religion, when it became the religion of the many, of the emperor, of the State, the convert or the hereditary Christian had no strong pagan party to receive him back into its bosom when outcast

from the church. If he ceased to believe, he no longer dared cease to obey. No course remained but prostrate submission, or the endurance of any penitential duty which might be enforced upon him.” — Milman.^{f492}

When the alliance was made between the bishops and Constantine, it was proposed that the jurisdiction of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities should remain separate, as being two arms of the same responsible body. This was shown in that saying of Constantine in which he represented himself as a “bishop of externals” of the church, that which pertained more definitely to its connection with civil society and conduct; while the regular bishops were bishops of the internal, or those things pertaining to the sacraments, ordination, etc. “Constantine... was the first representative of the imposing idea of a Christian theocracy, or of a system of policy which assumes all subjects to be Christians, connects civil and religious rights, and regards Church and State as the two arms of one and the same divine government on earth. This idea was more fully developed by his successors, it animated the whole Middle Age, and is yet working under various forms in these latest times.” — Schaff.^{f493}

To those who conceived it, this theory might have appeared well enough, and simply in theory it might have been imagined that it could be made to work; but when it came to be put into practice, the all-important question was, Where was the line which defined the exact limits between the jurisdiction of the magistrate and that of the bishop? between the authority of the Church and that of the State? The State was now a theocracy. The government was held to be moral, a government of God; the Bible the supreme code of morals, was the code of the government; there was no such thing as civil government — all was moral. But the subject of morals is involved in every action, yea, in every thought of man. The State then being allowed to be moral, it was inevitable that the church, being the arbiter of morals and the dispenser and interpreter of the code regulating moral action, would interpose in all questions of human conduct, and spread her dominion over the whole field of human action.

“In ecclesiastical affairs, strictly so called, the supremacy of the Christian magistracy, it has been said, was admitted. They were the legislators of discipline, order, and doctrine. The festivals, the fasts, the usages, and canons of the church, the government of the clergy, were in their exclusive power. The decrees of particular synods and councils possessed undisputed authority, as far as their sphere

extended. General councils were held binding on the whole church. But it was far more easy to define that which did belong to the province of the church than that which did not. Religion asserts its authority, and endeavors to extend its influence over the whole sphere of moral action, which is, in fact, over the whole of human life, its habits, manners, conduct.

“Christianity, as the most profound moral religion, exacted the most complete and universal obedience; and, as the acknowledged teachers and guardians of Christianity, the clergy continued to draw within their sphere every part of human life in which man is actuated by moral or religious motives. The moral authority, therefore, of the religion, and consequently of the clergy, might appear legitimately to extend over every transaction of life, from the legislature of the sovereign, which ought, in a Christian king, to be guided by Christian motive, to the domestic duties of the peasant, which ought to be fulfilled on the principle of Christian love....

“But there was another prolific source of difference. The clergy, in one sense, from being the representative body, had begun to consider themselves the church; but, in another and more legitimate sense, the State, when Christian, as comprehending all the Christians of the empire, became the Church. Which was the legislative body, — the whole community of Christians? or the Christian aristocracy, who were in one sense the admitted rulers? — Milman.^{f494}

To overstep every limit and break down every barrier that seemed in theory to be set between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, was the only consequence that could result from such a union. And when it was attempted to put the theory into practice, every step taken in any direction only served to demonstrate that which the history everywhere shows, that “the apparent identification of the State and Church by the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the empire, altogether confounded the limits of ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdiction.” — Milman.^{f495}

The State, as a body distinct from the Church, was gone. As a distinct system of law and government the State was destroyed, and its machinery

existed only as the tool of the Church to accomplish her arbitrary will and to enforce her despotic decrees.

CHAPTER 21.

THE RUIN OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

WE have seen the church secure the enactment of laws by which she could enforce church discipline upon all the people, whether in the church or not. We have seen her next extend her encroachments upon the civil power, until the whole system of civil jurisprudence, as such, was destroyed by being made religious. We shall now see how the evils thus engendered, and like dragon's teeth sown broadcast, with another element of the monstrous evil planted by Constantine and the bishops, caused the final and fearful ruin of the Roman empire.

Among the first of the acts of Constantine in his favors to the church was, as has been shown on page 290 of this book, the appropriation of money from the public treasury to the bishops.

Another enactment, A.D. 321, of the same character, but which was of vastly more importance, was his granting to the church the right to receive legacies. "This was a law which expressly secured to the churches a right which, perhaps, they had already now and then tacitly exercised; namely, the right of receiving legacies, which, in the Roman empire, no corporation whatever was entitled to exercise. unless it had been expressly authorized to do so by the State." — Neander.^{f501}

Some estimate of this enactment may be derived from the statement that "the law of Constantine which empowered the clergy of the church to receive testamentary bequests, and to hold land, was a gift which would scarcely have been exceeded if he had granted them two provinces of the empire." — Milman.^{f502} That which made this still more magnificent gift to the church was the view which prevailed, especially among the rich, that they could live as they pleased all their lives, and then at their death give their property to the church, and be assured a safe conduct to eternal bliss. "It became almost a sin to die without some bequest to pious uses." — Milman.^{f503}

We have seen in the previous chapter what kind of characters were chosen to the bishopric in those times; and when such a law was now made bestowing such privileges upon such characters, it is easy to understand

what use would be made of the privilege. Not content with simply receiving bequests that might voluntarily be made, they brought to bear every possible means to induce persons to bestow their goods upon the churches. They assumed the protectorship of widows and orphans, and had the property of such persons left to the care of the bishop.

Now into the coffers of the bishops, as into the coffers of the republic after the fall of Carthage, wealth came in a rolling stream of gold, and the result in this case was the same as in that. With wealth came luxury and magnificent display. The bishopric assumed a stateliness and grandeur that transcended that of the chief ministers of the empire; and that of the bishopric of Rome fairly outshone the glory of the emperor himself. He was the chief beneficiary in all these favors of Constantine.

As already related, when the emperors in the time of Diocletian began habitually to absent themselves from Rome, the bishop of Rome became the chief dignitary in the city. And by the time that Constantine moved the capital permanently from Rome, through these imperial favors the bishop of that city had acquired such a dignity that it was easy for him to step into the place of pomp and magnificent display that had before been shown by the emperor. "The bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer, Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishop drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot, and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the faith which he professed." — Eugene Lawrence.

f504

The offices of the church were the only ones in the empire that were elective. The bishopric of Rome was the chief of these offices. As that office was one which carried with it the command of such enormous wealth and such display of imperial magnificence, it became the object of the ambitious aspirations of every Catholic in the city; and even a heathen exclaimed, "Make me bishop of Rome, and I will be a Christian!"

Here were displayed all those elements of political strife and chicanery which were but referred to in the previous chapter. The scenes which occurred at the election of Damasus as bishop of Rome, A.D. 366, will illustrate the character of such proceedings throughout the empire, according as the particular bishopric in question compared with that of Rome. There were two candidates — Damasus and Ursicinus — and these two men represented respectively two factions that had been created in the contest between Liberius, bishop of Rome, and Constantius, emperor of Rome.

“The presbyters, deacons, and faithful people, who had adhered to Liberius in his exile, met in the Julian Basilica, and duly elected Ursicinus, who was consecrated by Paul, bishop of Tibur. Damasus was proclaimed by the followers of Felix, in S. M. Lucina. Damasus collected a mob of charioteers and a wild rabble, broke into the Julian Basilica, and committed great slaughter. Seven days after, having bribed a great body of ecclesiastics and the populace, and seized the Lateran Church, he was elected and consecrated bishop. Ursicinus was expelled from Rome.

“Damasus, however, continued his acts of violence. Seven presbyters of the other party were hurried prisoners to Lateran: their faction rose, rescued them, and carried them to the Basilica of Liberius. Damasus at the head of a gang of gladiators, charioteers, and laborers, with axes, swords, and clubs, stormed the church: a hundred and sixty of both sexes were barbarously killed; not one on the side of Damasus. The party of Ursicinus were obliged to withdraw, vainly petitioning for a synod of bishops to examine into the validity of the two elections.

“So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the prefect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighborhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the Basilica of Sisinnius. . . Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus: he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled. Another frightful massacre took place in the Church of St. Agnes. The emperor was forced to have

recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Praetextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possessions of his see.” “But Damasus had the ladies of Rome in his favor; and the council of Valentinian was not inaccessible to bribes. New scenes of blood took place. Ursicinus was compelled at last to give up the contest.” — Milman. ^{f505}

Of the bishop of Rome at this time we have the following sketch written by one who was there at the time, and had often seen him in his splendor: “I must own that when I reflect on the pomp attending that dignity, I do not at all wonder that those who are fond of show and parade, should scold, quarrel, fight, and strain every nerve to attain it; since they are sure, if they succeed, to be enriched with the offerings of the ladies; to appear no more abroad on foot, but in stately chariots, and gorgeously attired; to keep costly and sumptuous tables; nay, and to surpass the emperors themselves in the splendor and magnificence of their entertainments.” — Ammianus Marcellinus. ^{f506}

The example of the bishop of Rome was followed by the whole order of bishops, each according to his degree and opportunities. Chrysostom boasted that “the heads of the empire and the governors of provinces enjoy no such honor as the rulers of the church. They are first at court, in the society of ladies, in the houses of the great. No one has precedence of them.” By them were worn such titles as, “Most holy,” “Most reverend,” and “Most holy Lord.” They were addressed in such terms as, “Thy Holiness,” and “Thy Blessedness.” “Kneeling, kissing of the hand, and like tokens of reverence, came to be shown them by all classes, up to the emperor himself.” — Schaff. ^{f507}

The manners of the minor clergy of Rome are described by one who was well acquainted with them. “His whole care is in his dress, that it be well perfumed, that his feet may not slip about in a loose sandal; his hair is crisped with a curling-pin; his fingers glitter with rings; he walks on tiptoe lest he should splash himself with the wet soil; when you see him, you would think him a bridegroom rather than an ecclesiastic.” — Jerome. ^{f508}

Such an example being set by the dignitaries in the church, these too professing to be the patterns of godliness, their example was readily

followed by all in the empire who were able. Consequently, “The aristocratical life of this period seems to have been characterized by gorgeous magnificence without grandeur, inordinate luxury without refinement, the pomp and prodigality of a high state of civilization with none of its ennobling or humanizing effects. The walls of the palaces were lined with marbles of all colors, crowded with statues of inferior workmanship, mosaics of which the merit consisted in the arrangement of the stones; the cost, rather than the beauty and elegance, was the test of excellency, and the object of admiration. The nobles were surrounded with hosts of parasites, or servants. ‘You reckon up,’ Chrysostom thus addresses a patrician, ‘so many acres of land, ten or twenty palaces, as many baths, a thousand or two thousand slaves, chariots plated with silver or overlaid with gold.’

“Their banquets were merely sumptuous, without social grace or elegance. The dress of the females, the fondness for false hair sometimes wrought up to an enormous height, and especially affecting the golden dye, and for paint, from which irresistible propensities they were not to be estranged even by religion, excite the stern animadversion of the ascetic Christian teacher. ‘What business have rouge and paint on a Christian cheek? Who can weep for her sins when her tears wash her face bare and mark furrows on her skin? With what trust can faces be lifted up towards heaven, which the Maker cannot recognize as his own workmanship? Their necks, heads, arms, and fingers were loaded with golden chains and rings; their persons breathed precious odors; their dresses were of gold stuff and silk: and in this attire they ventured to enter the church.

“Some of the wealthier Christian matrons gave a religious air to their vanity; while the more profane wore their thin silken dresses embroidered with hunting pieces, wild beasts, or any other fanciful device, the more pious had the miracles of Christ, the marriage in Cana of Galilee, or the paralytic carrying his bed. In vain the preacher urged that it would be better to emulate these acts of charity and love, than to wear them on their garments... The provincial cities, according to their natural character, imitated the old and new Rome; and in all, no doubt, the nobility, or the higher order, were of the same character and habits.” — Milman.^{f509}

As in the republic of old, in the train of wealth came luxury, and in the train of luxury came vice; and as the violence now manifested in the election of the bishops was but a reproduction of the violence by which the tribunes and the consuls of the later republic were chosen, so the vices of these times were but a reproduction of the later republic and early empire — not indeed manifested so coarsely and brutally; more refined and polished, yet essentially the same iniquitous practice of shameful vice.

Another phase of the evil: Under the law empowering the church to receive legacies, the efforts of some of the clergy to persuade people, and especially women, to bestow their wealth upon the church, took precedence of everything else.

“Some of the clergy made it the whole business and employment of their lives to learn the names of the ladies, to find out their habitations, to study their humor. One of these, an adept in the art, rises with the sun, settles the order of his visits, acquaints himself with the shortest ways, and almost breaks into the rooms of the women before they are awake. If he sees any curious piece of household furniture, he extols, admires, and handles it; and, sighing that he too should stand in need of such trifles, in the end rather extorts it by force than obtains it by good-will, the ladies being afraid to disoblige the prating old fellow that is always running about from house to house.” — Jerome. ^{f510}

Because of the insatiable avarice of the Roman clergy, and because of the shameful corruption that was practiced with the means thus acquired, a law was enacted, A.D. 370. by Valentinian I, forbidding any ecclesiastics to receive any inheritance, donation, or legacy from anybody; and to let the world know that he did not complain of this hardship. the great bishop of Milan exclaimed: “We are excluded by laws lately enacted from all inheritances, donations, and legacies; yet we do not complain. And why should we? By such laws we only lose wealth; and the loss of wealth is no loss to us. Estates are lawfully bequeathed to the ministers of the heathen temples; no layman is exclude, let his condition be ever so low, let his life be ever so scandalous: clerks alone are debarred from a right common to the rest of mankind. Let a Christian widow bequeath her whole estate to a pagan priest, her will is good in law; let her bequeath the least share of it to a minister of God, her will is null. I do not mention these things by way of

complaint, but only to let the world know that I do not complain.” — Ambrose.^{f511}

The fact that such a law as this had to be enacted — a law applying only to the clergy — furnishes decisive proof that the ecclesiastics were more vicious and more corrupt in their use of wealth than was any other class in the empire. This in fact is plainly stated by another who was present at the time: “I am ashamed to say it, the priests of the idols. the stage-players, charioteers, whores, are capable of inheriting estates, and receiving legacies; from this common privilege, clerks alone, and monks, are debarred by law: debarred not under persecuting tyrants, but Christian princes.” — Jerome.^{f512}

Nor was this all. The same pagan rites and heathen superstitions and practices, which were brought into the church when the Catholic religion became that of the empire, not only still prevailed, but were enlarged. The celebration of the rights of the mysteries still continued, only with a more decided pagan character, as time, went on, and as the number of pagans multiplied in the church. To add to their impressiveness, the mysteries in the church, as in the original Eleusinia, were celebrated in the night. As the catechumen came to the baptismal font, he “turned to the West, the realm of Satan, and thrice renounced his power; he turned to the East to adore the Sun of Righteousness, and to proclaim his compact with the Lord of Life.” — Milman.^{f513}

About the middle of the fourth century there was added another form and element of sun worship. Amongst the pagans for ages, December 25 had been celebrated as the birthday of the sun. In the reigns of Domitian and Trajan, Rome formally adopted from Persia the feast of the Persian sun-god, Mithras, as the birth festival of the unconquered sun — Natales invicti Solis. The Church of Rome adopted this festival, and made it the birthday of Christ. And within a few years the celebration of this festival of the sun had spread throughout the whole empire east and west; the perverse-minded bishops readily sanctioning it with the argument that the pagan festival of the birth of the real sun, was a type of the festival of the birth of Christ, the Sun of Righteousness. Thus was established the church festival of Christmas.^{f514}

This custom, like the forms of sun worship — the day of the sun, worshiping toward the East, and the mysteries — which had already been

adopted, was so closely followed that it was actually brought “as a charge against the Christians of the Catholic Church that they celebrated the Solstitia with the pagans.” — Neander.^{f515} The worship of the sun itself was also still practiced. Pope Leo I testifies that in his time many Catholics had retained the pagan custom of paying “obeisance from some lofty eminence to the sun.” And that they also “first worshipped the rising sun, paying homage to the pagan Apollo, before repairing to the Basilica of St. Peter.” — Schaff.^{f516}

The images and pictures which had formerly represented the sun were adopted and transformed into representations of Christ. How easily this was accomplished can be discerned by an examination of the accompanying illustration. And such was the origin of the “pictures of Christ;” and especially of the nimbus or halo round the heads of them.

The martyrs, whether real or imaginary, were now honored in the place of the heathen heroes. The day of their martyrdom was celebrated as their birthday, and these celebrations were conducted in the same way that the heathen celebrated the festival days of their heroes. “The festivals in honor of the martyrs were avowedly instituted, or at least conducted, on a sumptuous scale in rivalry of the banquets which formed so important and attractive a part of the pagan ceremonial. besides the earliest Agapae, which gave place to the more solemn Eucharist, there were other kinds of banquets, at marriages and funerals, called likewise Agapae.” — Milman.

^{f517}

These festivals were celebrated either at the sepulchers of the martyrs or at the churches, and the day began with hymns; the history or fables of their lives and martyrdom was given; and eulogies were pronounced. “The day closed with an open banquet in which all the worshipers were invited to partake. The wealthy heathen had been accustomed to propitiate the manes of their departed friends by these costly festivals; the banquet was almost an integral part of the heathen religious ceremony. The custom passed into the church; and with the pagan feeling, the festival assumed a pagan character of gayety and joyous excitement, and even of luxury. In some places the confluence of worshipers was so great that, as in the earlier and indeed the more modern religions of Asia, the neighborhood of the more celebrated churches of the martyrs became marts for commerce, and fairs were established on those holidays.

“As the evening drew in, the solemn and religious thoughts gave way to other emotions; the wine flowed freely, and the healths of the martyrs were pledged, not unfrequently, to complete inebriety. All the luxuries of the Roman banquet were imperceptibly introduced. Dances were admitted, pantomimic spectacles were exhibited, the festivals were prolonged till late in the evening, or to midnight, so that other criminal irregularities profaned, if not the sacred edifice, its immediate neighborhood. The bishops had for some time sanctioned these pious hilarities with their presence; they had freely partaken of the banquets.” — Milman.^{f518}

So perfectly were the pagan practices duplicated in these festivals of the martyrs, that the Catholics were charged with practicing pagan rites, with the only difference that they did it apart from the pagans. This charge was made to Augustine: “You have substituted your Agapae for the sacrifices of the pagans: for their idols your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honors. You appease the shades of the dead with wines and feasts: you celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calends and their solstices; and as to their manners, those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the pagans except that you hold your assemblies apart from them.” — Draper.^{F519} And the only defense that Augustine could make was in a blundering casuistical effort to show a distinction in the nature of the two forms of worship.

In the burial of their dead, they still continued the pagan practice of putting a piece of mouth in the mount of the corpse with which the departed was to pay the charges of Charon for ferrying him over the River Styx.^{F520}

Another most prolific source of general corruption was the church’s assumption of authority to regulate, and that by law, the whole question of the marriage relation, both in the Church and in the State. “The first aggression... which the Church made on the State, was assuming the cognizance over all questions and causes relating to marriage.” — Milman.^{f521}

Among the clergy she attempted to enforce celibacy, that is, to prohibit marriage altogether. Monks had arisen to a perfect delirium of popularity, and “a characteristic trait of monasticism in all its forms is a morbid aversion to female society, and a rude contempt of married life.... Among the rules of Basil is a prohibition of speaking with a woman, touching one, or even looking on one, except in unavoidable cases.” —

Schaff. ^{F522} As monkery was so universally and so extremely popular among all classes from the height of imperial dignity to the depths of the monkish degradation itself, it became necessary for the clergy to imitate the monks in order to maintain popularity with the people. And as monkery is only an ostentatious display of self-righteousness, the contempt of married life was the easiest way for the clergy to advertise most loudly their imitation of monkish virtue.

In their self-righteousness some of the monks attained to such a “pre-eminence” of “virtue” that they could live promiscuously with women, or like Jerome, write “letters to a virgin.” that were unfit to be written to a harlot. The former class, in the estimation of an admirer, “bore away the pre-eminence from all others.” His account of them is as follows: —

“There are persons who, when by virtue they have attained to a condition exempt from passion, return to the world. In the midst of the stir, by plainly intimating that they are indifferent to those who view them with amazement, they thus trample underfoot vain-glory, the last garment, according to the wise Plato, which it is the nature of the soul to cast off. By similar means they study the art of apathy in eating, practising it even, if need be, with the petty retailers of victuals. They also constantly frequent the public baths, mostly mingling and bathing with women, since they have attained to such an ascendancy over their passions, as to possess dominion over nature, and neither by sight, touch, or even embracing of the female, to relapse into their natural condition; it being their desire to be men among men, and women among women, and to participate in both sexes. In short, by a life thus all excellent and divine, virtue exercises a sovereignty in opposition to nature, establishing her own laws, so as not to allow them to partake to satiety in any necessary.” — Evagrius. ^{F523}

The first decretal ever issued, namely, that by Pope Siricius, A.D. 335, commanded the married clergy to separate from their wives under sentence of expulsion from the clerical order upon all who dared to offer resistance; yet promising pardon for such as had offended through ignorance, and suffering them to retain their positions, provided they would observe complete separation from their wives — though even then they were to be held forever incapable of promotion. The clergy finding themselves forbidden by the pope to marry, and finding it necessary, in order to

maintain a standing of popularity, to imitate the monks, practiced the same sort of monkish “virtue” as described above. “The clerks who ought to instruct and awe the women with a grave and composed behavior, first kiss their heads, and then stretching out their hands as it were to bestow a blessing, slyly receive a fee for their salutation. The women in the meantime, elated with pride in feeling themselves thus courted by the clergy, prefer the freedom of widowhood to the subjection attending the state of matrimony.” — Jerome.^{F524}

As these associations differed from those in real matrimony “only in the absence of the marriage ceremony,” it was not an uncommon thing for men to gain admission to “holy orders” “on account of the superior opportunities which clericulture gave of improper intercourse with women.” This practice became so scandalous that in A.D. 370 Valentinian I enacted a law “which denounced severe punishment on ecclesiastics who visited the houses of widows and virgins.” — Lea.^{F525} The law, however, had really no effect in stopping the wickedness, and “with the disappearance of legitimate marriage in the priesthood, the already prevalent vice of the cohabitation of unmarried ecclesiastics with pious widows and virgins ‘secretly brought in,’ became more and more common. This spiritual marriage which had become as a bold ascetic venture, ended only too often in the flesh, and prostituted the honor of the church.” — Schaff.^{F526}

Again: in accordance with the rest of the theocratical legislation of Constantine and the bishops, the precepts of the Scripture in relation to marriage and divorce were adopted with heavy penalties, as the laws of the empire. As the church had assumed “cognizance over all questions relating to marriage,” it followed that marriage not celebrated by the church was held to be but little better than an illicit connection. Yet the weddings of the church were celebrated in the pagan way. Loose hymns were sung to Venus, and “the bride was borne by drunken men to her husband’s house among choirs of dancing harlots with pipes, and flutes, and songs of offensive license.” And when the marriage had been thus celebrated, and even consummated, the marriage bond was held so loosely that it amounted to very little, for “men changed their wives as quickly as their clothes, and marriage chambers were set up as easily as booths in a market.” — Milman.^{f527}

Of course there were against all these evils, laws abundant with penalties terrible, as in the days of the Caesars. And also as in those days the laws

were utterly impotent: not only for the same great reason that then existed, that the iniquity was so prevalent that there were none to enforce the laws; but for an additional reason that now existed, that is, the bishops were the interpreters of the code, and by this time through the interminable and hair-splitting distinctions drawn against heresies, the bishops had so sharpened their powers of interpretation that they could easily evade the force of any law, scriptural, canonical, or statutory that might be produced.

There is yet one other element of general corruption to be noticed. As we have seen, the means employed by Constantine in establishing the Catholic religion and church, and in making that the prevalent religion, were such as to win only hypocrities. This was bad enough in itself, yet the hypocrisy was voluntary; but when through the agency of her Sunday laws and by the ministration of Theodosius the church received control of the civil power to compel all without distinction who were not Catholics to act as though they were, hypocrisy was made compulsory; and every person who was not voluntarily a church-member was compelled either to be a hypocrite or a rebel. In addition to this, those who were of the church indeed, through the endless succession of controversies and church councils, were forever establishing, changing, and re-establishing the faith, and as all were required to change or revise their faith according as the councils decreed, all moral and spiritual integrity was destroyed. Hypocrisy became a habit, dissimulation and fraud a necessity of life, and the very moral fiber of men and of society was vitiated.

In the then existing order of things it was impossible that it could be otherwise. Right faith is essential to right morals. Purity of faith is essential to purity of heart and life. But there the faith was wrong and utterly corrupt, and nothing but corruption could follow. More than this, the faith was essentially pagan, and much more guilty than had been the original pagan, as it was professed under the name of Christianity and the gospel, and as it was in itself a shameful corruption of the true faith of the gospel. As the faith of the people was essentially pagan, or rather worse, the morality of the people could be nothing else. And such in fact it was.

“There is ample evidence to show how great had been the reaction from the simple genuineness of early Christian belief, and how nearly the Christian world had generally associated itself, in thought and temper, not to say in superstitious practice, with the pagan. We must not shut our eyes to the fact that much of the apparent

success of the new religion had been gained by its actual accommodation of itself to the ways and feelings of the old. It was natural it should be so. Once set aside, from doubt, distaste, or any other feeling, the special dogmas of the gospel,... and men will naturally turn to compromise, to eclecticism, to universalism, to indifference, to unbelief....

“If the great Christian doctors had themselves come forth from the schools of the pagans, the loss had not been wholly unrequited; so complacently had even Christian doctors again surrendered themselves to the fascinations of pagan speculations; so fatally, in their behalf, had they extenuated Christian dogma, and acknowledged the fundamental truth and sufficiency of science falsely so called.

“The gospel we find was almost eaten out from the heart of the Christian society. I speak not now of the pride of spiritual pretensions, of the corruption of its secular politics, of its ascetic extravagances, its mystical fallacies, of its hollowness in preaching, or its laxity in practice; of its saint worship, which was a revival of hero-worship; its addiction to the sensuous in outward service, which was a revival of idolatry. But I point to the fact less observed by our church historians, of the absolute defect of all distinctive Christianity in the utterances of men of the highest esteem as Christians, men of reputed wisdom, sentiment, and devotion. Look, for instance, at the remains we possess of the Christian Boethius, a man whom we know to have been a professed Christian and churchman, excellent in action, steadfast in suffering, but in whose writings, in which he aspires to set before us the true grounds of spiritual consolation on which he rested himself in the hour of his trial, and on which he would have his fellows rest, there is no trace of Christianity whatever, nothing but pure, unmingled naturalism.

“This marked decline of distinctive Christian belief was accompanied with a marked decline of Christian morality. Heathenism re-asserted its empire over the carnal affections of the natural man. The pictures of abounding wickedness in the high places and the low places of the earth, which are presented to us by the witnesses of the worst pagan degradation, are repeated, in colors not less strong, in lines not less hideous, by the observers of

the gross and reckless iniquity of the so-called Christian period now before us. It becomes evident that as the great mass of the careless and indifferent have assumed with the establishment of the Christian church in authority and honor, the outward garb and profession of Christian believers, so with the decline of belief, the corruption of the visible church, the same masses, indifferent and irreligious as of old, have rejected the moral restraints which their profession should have imposed upon them. — Merivale. ^{F528}

In short, the same corruptions that had characterized the former Rome were reproduced in the Rome of the fifth century. “The primitive rigor of discipline and manners was utterly neglected and forgotten by the ecclesiastics of Rome. The most exorbitant luxury, with all the vices attending it, was introduced among them, and the most scandalous and unchristian arts of acquiring wealth universally practiced. They seem to have rivaled in riotous living the greatest epicures of Pagan Rome when luxury was there at the highest pitch. For Jerome, who was an eye witness of what he writ, reproaches the Roman clergy with the same excesses which the poet Juvenal so severely censured in the Roman nobility under the reign of Domitian.” — Bower. ^{F529}

The following quotation, though touching upon some points already made, gives others of sufficient value to justify its insertion: “The mass of professing believers were found to relapse into the grossest superstitions and practices of the heathen.... The old heathen cultus, particularly that of the sun (Sol invictus), had formerly entwined itself with the Christian worship of God. Many Christians, before entering the Basilica of Peter, were wont to mount the platform, in order to make their obeisance to the rising luminary. Here was an instance of the way in which the ‘spirit of paganism,’ had found means of insinuating itself into the very heart of Christianity. Leo could say, with no great exaggeration, in looking at the moral position of the Roman Christians, ‘Quod temporibus nostris auctore diabolo sic vitata sunt omnia, ut fere nihil sit quod absque idololatria transigatur’ [In our time, by the instigation of the devil, all things have become so corrupt that there is hardly anything that is done without idolatry]. The weddings of the Christians could not be distinguished from, those of the pagans. Everything was determined by auguries and auspices; the wild orgies of the Bacchanalians, with all their obscene songs and revelry, were not wanting.” — Merivale. ^{F530}

And now all the evils engendered in that evil intrigue which united the State with a professed Christianity, hurried on the doomed empire to its final and utter ruin. "The criminal and frivolous pleasures of a decrepit civilization left no thought for the absorbing duties of the day or the fearful trials of the morrow. Unbridled lust and unblushing indecency admitted no sanctity in the marriage tie. The rich and powerful established harems, in the recesses of which their wives lingered, forgotten, neglected, and despised. The banquet, theater, and the circus exhausted what little strength and energy were left by domestic excesses. The poor aped the vices of the rich, and hideous depravity reigned supreme, and invited the vengeance of heaven. — Lea.^{F531}

The pagan superstitions, the pagan delusions, and the pagan vices, which had been brought into the church by the apostasy, and clothed with a form of godliness, had wrought such corruption that the society of which it was a part could no longer exist. From it no more good could possibly come, and it must be swept away. "The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theater going, intemperance, lewdness; in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous, barbarians." — Schaff.^{F532}

And onward those barbarians came, swiftly and in multitudes. For a hundred years the dark cloud had been hanging threateningly over the borders of the empire, encroaching slightly upon the West and breaking occasionally upon the East. But at the close of the fourth century the tempest burst in all its fury, and the flood was flowing ruinously. As early as A.D. 377 a million Goths had crossed the Danube, and between that time and A.D. 400 they had ravaged the country from Thessalonica to the Adriatic Sea. In A.D. 400 a host of them entered the borders of Italy, but were restrained for a season.

In 406 a band of Burgundians, Vandals, Suevi, and Alani from the north of Germany, four hundred thousand strong, overran the country as far as Florence. In the siege of that city their course was checked with the loss of more than one hundred thousand. They then returned to Germany, and with large accessions to their numbers, overran all the southern part of Gaul. The Burgundians remained in Gaul; the Vandals, the Alani, and the

Suevi overran all the southern part of Spain, and carried their ravages over the greater part of that province, and clear to the Strait of Gibraltar.

In 410 again returned the mighty hosts of the Goths, and spread over all Italy from the Alps to the Strait of Sicily, and for five days inflicted upon Rome such pillage as had never befallen it since the day, nearly a thousand years before, when the Cimbri left it in ruins. They marched out of Italy and took possession of Southeastern Gaul from the Mediterranean Sea to the Bay of Biscay.

In May 429, the Vandals, in whose numbers of the Alani had been absorbed, crossed the Strait of Gibraltar into Africa, and for ten years ravaged the country from there to Carthage, of which city they took possession with great slaughter, October 9, A.D. 439; and in 440 the terrible Genseric, king of the Vandals, ruled the Mediterranean and sacked the city of Rome.

In 449 the Saxons and their German neighbors invaded Britain, of which they soon became sole possessors, utterly exterminating the native inhabitants.

In 451-3 another mighty host, numbering seven hundred thousand, of all the barbarous nations, led by Attila, desolated Eastern Gaul as far as Chalons, and the north of Italy as far as the Rhone, but returned again beyond the Danube.

And finally, in 476, when Odoacer, king of the Heruli, became king of Italy, the last vestige of the Western empire of Rome was gone, and was divided among the ten nations of barbarians of the North.

Wherever these savages went, they carried fire and slaughter, and whenever they departed, they left desolation and ruin in their track, and carried away multitudes of captives. Thus was the proud empire of Western Rome swept from the earth; and that which Constantine and his ecclesiastical flatterers had promised one another should be the everlasting salvation of the State, proved its speedy and everlasting ruin.

It was impossible that it should be otherwise. We have seen to what a fearful depth of degradation Pagan Rome had gone in the days of the Caesars, yet the empire did not perish then. There was hope for the people. The gospel of Jesus Christ carried in earnestness, in simplicity, and in its heavenly power, brought multitudes to its saving light, and to a knowledge

of the purity of Jesus Christ. This was their salvation; and the gospel of Christ, by restoring the virtue and integrity of the individual, was the preservation of the Roman State.

But when by apostasy that gospel had lost its purity and its power in the multitudes who professed it; and when it was used only as a cloak to cover the same old pagan wickedness; when this form of godliness, practiced not only without the power but in defiance of it, permeated the great masses of the people, and the empire had thereby become a festering mass of corruption; when the only means which it was possible for the Lord himself to employ to purify the people, had been taken and made only the cloak under which to increase unto more ungodliness, — there was no other remedy: destruction must come.

And it did come, as we have seen, by a host wild and savage, it is true; but whose social habits were so far above those of the people which they destroyed, that savage as they were, they were caused fairly to blush at the shameful corruptions which they found in this so-called Christian society of Rome. This is proved by the best authority. A writer who lived at the time of the barbarian invasions and who wrote as a Christian, gives the following evidence as to the condition of things: —

“The church which ought everywhere to propitiate God, what does she, but provoke him to anger? How many may one meet, even in the church, who are not still drunkards, or debauchees, or adulterers, or fornicators, or robbers, or murderers, or the like, or all these at once. without end? It is even a sort of holiness among Christian people, to be less vicious.’ From the public worship of God, and almost during it, they pass to deeds of shame. Scarce a rich man but would commit murder and fornication. We have lost the whole power of Christianity, and offend God the more, that we sin as Christians. We are worse than the barbarians and heathen. If the Saxon is wild, the Frank faithless, the Goth inhuman, the Alanian drunken, the Hun licentious, they are, by reason of their ignorance, far less punishable than we, who, knowing the commandments of God, commit all these crimes.” — Salvian. ^{F533}

“He compares the Christians, especially of Rome, with the Arian Goths and Vandals, to the disparagement of the Romans, who add to the gross sins of nature the refined vices of civilization, passion

for the theaters, debauchery, and unnatural lewdness. Therefore has the just God given them into the hands of the barbarians, and exposed them to the ravages of the migrating hordes.” — Schaff. ^{F534}

And this description, says the same author, “is in general not untrue.” And he confirms it in his own words by the excellent observation that “nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian, but essentially heathen, world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society. There must be new, fresh nations, if the Christian civilization, prepared in the old Roman empire, was to take firm root and bear ripe fruit.” — Schaff. ^{F535}

These new, fresh nations came, and planted themselves upon the ruins of the old. Out of these came the faithful Christians of the Dark Ages, and upon them broke the light of the Reformation. And out of these and by this means God produced the civilization of the nineteenth century and the new republic of the United States of America, from which there should go once more in its purity, as in the beginning, the everlasting gospel to every nation and kindred and tongue and people.

CHAPTER 22.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE PAPACY.

AS out of the political difficulties of the days of Constantine, the Catholic Church rose to power in the State; so out of the ruin of the Roman empire she rose to supremacy over kings and nations. She had speedily wrought the ruin of one empire, and now for more than a thousand years she would prove a living curse to all the States and empires that should succeed it.

We have seen how that, by the arrogant ministry of Leo, the bishop of Rome was made the fountain of faith, and was elevated to a position of dignity and authority that the aspiring prelacy had never before attained. For Leo, as the typical pope, was one whose “ambition knew no bounds; and to gratify it, he stuck at nothing; made no distinction between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood; as if he had adopted the famous maxim of Julius Caesar, —

*Be just, unless a kingdom tempts to break the laws,
For sovereign power alone can justify the cause,’*

or thought the most criminal actions ceased to be criminal, and became meritorious, when any ways subservient to the increase of his power or the exaltation of his see.” — Bower.^{F501a}

Nor was the force of any single point of his example ever lost upon his successors. His immediate successor, —

HILARY, 461-467,

was so glad to occupy the place which had been made so large by Leo, that shortly after his election he wrote a letter to the other bishops asking them to exult with him, taking particular care in the letter to tell them that he did not doubt that they all knew what respect and deference was paid “in the Spirit of God to St. Peter and his see.” The bishops of Spain addressed him as “the successor of St. Peter, whose primacy ought to be loved and feared by all.” He was succeeded by —

SIMPLICIUS, 467-483,

in whose pontificate the empire perished when the Heruli, under Odoacer, overran all Italy, deposed the last emperor of the West, appropriated to themselves one third of all the lands, and established the Herulian kingdom, with Odoacer as king of Italy. In fact, the more the imperial power faded, and the nearer the empire approached its fall, the more rapidly and the stronger grew the papal assumptions. Thus the very calamities which rapidly wrought the ruin of the empire, and which were hastened by the union of Church and State, were turned to the advantage of the bishopric of Rome. During the whole period of barbarian invasions from 400 to 476, the Catholic hierarchy everywhere adapted itself to the situation, and reaped power and influence from the calamities that were visited everywhere.

We have seen that Innocent I, upon whose mind there appears first to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, during the invasion of Italy and the siege of Rome by Alaric, headed an embassy to the emperor to mediate for a treaty of peace between the empire and the invading Goths. We have seen that at the moment of Leo's election to the papal see, he was absent on a like mission to reconcile the enmity of the two principal Roman officers, which was threatening the safety of the empire. Yet other and far more important occasions of the same kind fell to the lot of Leo during the term of his bishopric. In 453 Leo was made the head of an embassy to meet Attila as he was on his way to Rome, if possible to turn him back. The embassy was successful; a treaty was formed; Attila retired beyond the Danube, where he immediately died; and Italy was delivered. This redounded no less to the glory of Leo than any of the other remarkable things which he had accomplished. He was not so successful with Genseric two years afterward, yet even then he succeeded in mitigating the ravages of the Vandals, which were usually so dreadful that the idea still lives in the word "vandalism."

Moreover, it was not against religion as such that the barbarians made war, as they themselves were religious. It was against that mighty empire of which they had seen much, and suffered much, and heard more, that they warred. It was as nations taking vengeance upon a nation which had been so great, and which had so proudly asserted lordship over all other nations, that they invaded the Roman empire. And when they could plant themselves and remain, as absolute lords, in the dominions of those who

had boasted of absolute and eternal dominion, and thus humble the pride of the mighty Rome, this was their supreme gratification. As these invasions were not inflicted everywhere at once, but at intervals through a period of seventy-five years, the church had ample time to adapt herself to the ways of such of the barbarians as were heathen, which as ever she readily did. The heathen barbarians were accustomed to pay the greatest respect to their own priesthood, and were willing to admit the Catholic priesthood to an equal or even a larger place in their estimation. Such of them as were already professedly Christian, were Arians, and not so savage as the Catholics; therefore, they, with the exception of the Vandals, were not so ready to persecute, and were willing to settle and make themselves homes in the territories of the vanished empire.

An account of the conversion of the Burgundians, and through them of the Franks, will illustrate the dealings of the papacy with the barbarians, and will also give the key to the most important events in the history of the supremacy of the bishopric of Rome.

Ever since the time of Constantine, the god and saviour of the Catholics had been a god of battle, and no surer way to the eternal rewards of martyrdom could be taken than by being killed in a riot in behalf of the orthodox faith, or to die by punishment inflicted for such proceeding, as in the case of that insolent ruffian who attempted to murder Orestes. It was easy, therefore, for the heathen barbarians, victory and surest passport to the halls of the warrior god, was to die in the midst of the carnage of bloody battle, — it was easy for such people as this to become converted to the god of battle of the Catholics. A single bloody victory would turn the scale, and issue in the conversion of whole nation.

The Burgundians were settled in that part of Gaul which now forms Western Switzerland and that part of France which is now the county and district of Burgundy. As early as A.D. 430, the Huns making inroads into Gaul, severely afflicted the Burgundians, who finding impotent the power of their own god, determined to try the Catholic god. They therefore sent representatives to a neighboring city in Gaul, requesting the Catholic bishop to receive them. The bishop had them fast for a week, during which time he catechized them, and then baptized them. Soon afterward the Burgundians found the Huns without a leader, and, suddenly falling upon them at the disadvantage, confirmed their conversion by the slaughter of ten thousand of the enemy. Thereupon the whole nation embraced the

Catholic religion “with fiery zeal.” — Milman.^{f502a} Afterward, however, when about the fall of the empire, the Visigoths under Euric asserted their dominion over all Spain, and the greater part of Gaul, and over the Burgundians too, they deserted the Catholic god, and adopted the Arian faith.

Yet Clotilda, a niece of the Burgundian king, “was educated” in the profession of the Catholic faith. She married Clovis, the pagan king of the pagan Franks, and strongly persuaded him to become a Catholic. All her pleadings were in vain, however, till A.D. 496, when in a great battle with the Alemanni, the Franks were getting the worst of the conflict, in the midst of the battle Clovis vowed that if the victory could be theirs, he would become a Catholic. The tide of battle turned; the victory was won, and Clovis was a Catholic. Clotilda hurried away a messenger with the glad news to the bishop of Rhiems, who came to baptize the new convert.

But after the battle was over, and the dangerous crisis was past, Clovis was not certain whether he wanted to be a Catholic. He said he must consult his warriors; he did so, and they signified their readiness to adopt the same religion as their king. He then declared that he was convinced of the truth of the Catholic faith, and preparations were at once made for the baptism of the new Constantine, Christmas day, A.D. 496. “To impress the minds of the barbarians, the baptismal ceremony was performed with the utmost pomp. The church was hung with embroidered tapestry and white curtains; odors of incense like airs of paradise, were diffused around; the building blazed with countless lights. When the new Constantine knelt in the font to be cleansed from the leprosy of his heathenism, ‘Fierce Sicambrian,’ said the bishop, ‘bow thy neck; burn what thou hast adored, adore what thou hast burned.’” Three thousand Franks followed the example of Clovis.” — Milman.^{f503a}

The pope sent Clovis a letter congratulating him on his conversion. As an example of the real value of his religious instruction, it may be well to state that some time after his baptism, the bishop delivered a sermon on the crucifixion of the Saviour; and while he dwelt upon the cruelty of the Jews in that transaction, Clovis blurted out, “If I had been there with my faithful Franks, they would not have dared to do it.” “If unscrupulous ambition, undaunted valor and enterprise, and desolating warfare, had been legitimate means for the propagation of pure Christianity, it could not have found a better champion than Clovis. For the first time the diffusion of

belief in the nature of the Godhead became the avowed pretext for the invasion of a neighboring territory.” — Milman^{f504a} “His ambitious reign was a perpetual violation of moral and Christian duties; his hands were stained with blood in peace as well as in war; and as soon as Clovis had dismissed a synod of the Gallican church, he calmly assassinated all the princes of the Merovingian race.” — Gibbon.^{f505a}

The bishop of Vienne also sent a letter to the new convert, in which he prophesied that the faith of Clovis would be a surety of the victory of the Catholic faith; and he, with every other Catholic in Christendom, was ready to do his utmost to see that the prophecy was fulfilled. The Catholics in all the neighboring countries longed and prayed and conspired that Clovis might deliver them from the rule of Arian monarchs; and in the nature of the case, war soon followed. Burgundy was the first country invaded. Before the war actually began, however, by the advice of the bishop of Rhiems, a synod of the orthodox bishops met at Lyons; then with the bishop of Vienne at their head, they visited the king of the Burgundians, and proposed that he call the Arian bishops together, and allow a conference to be held, as they were prepared to prove that the Arians were in error. To their proposal the king replied, “If yours be the true doctrine, why do you not prevent the king of the Franks from waging an unjust war against me, and from caballing with my enemies against me? There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works.” — Milman.^{f506a}

The bishop of Vienne dodged this pointed question, and replied, “We are ignorant of the motives and intentions of the king of the Franks; but we are taught by the Scripture that the kingdoms which abandon the divine law, are frequently subverted; and that enemies will arise on every side against those who have made God their enemy. Return with thy people to the law of God, and he will give peace and security to thy dominions.” — Gibbon.^{f507a} War followed, and the Burgundian dominions were made subject to the rule of Clovis, A.D. 500.

The Visigoths possessed all the southwestern portion of Gaul. They too were Arians; and the mutual conspiracy of the Catholics in the Gothic dominions, and the crusade of the Franks from the side of Clovis, soon brought on another holy war. At the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A.D. 508. Clovis complained, “It grieves me to see that the Arians

still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God; and, having vanquished the heretics, we will possess and divide their fertile province.” Clotilda added her pious exhortation to the effect “that doubtless the Lord would more readily lend his aid if some gift were made;” and in response, Clovis seized his battle-ax and threw it as far as he could, and as it went whirling through the air, he exclaimed, “There, on that spot where my Francesca shall fall, will I erect a church in honor of the holy apostles.” Gibbon.^{f508a}

War was declared; and as Clovis marched on his way, he passed through Tours, and turned aside to consult the shrine of St. Martin of Tours, for an omen. “His messengers were instructed to remark the words of the Psalm which should happen to be chanted at the precise moment when they entered the church.” And the oracular clergy took care that the words which he should “happen” to hear at that moment — uttered not in Latin, but in language which Clovis understood — should be the following from Psalm xviii: “Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those who rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me.” The oracle was satisfactory, and in the event was completely successful. “The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks.” — Gibbon.^{f509a}

Nor was the religious zeal of Clovis confined to the overthrow of the Arians. There were two bodies of the Franks, the Salians and the Ripuarians. Clovis was king of the Salians, Sigebert of the Ripuarians. Clovis determined to be king of all; he therefore prompted the son of Sigebert to assassinate his father, with the promise that the son should peaceably succeed Sigebert on the throne; but as soon as the murder was committed, Clovis commanded the murderer to be murdered, and then in a full parliament of the whole people of the Franks, he solemnly vowed that he had had nothing to do with the murder of either the father or the son; and upon this, as there was no heir, Clovis was raised upon a shield, and proclaimed king of the Ripuarian Franks; — all of which Gregory, bishop of Tours, commended as the will of God, saying of Clovis that “God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did that which was well pleasing in his sight.” — Milman.^{f510a}

Thus was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. When such actions as these were so lauded by the clergy as the pious acts of orthodox Catholics, it is certain that the clergy themselves were no better than were the bloody objects of their praise. Under the influence of such ecclesiastics, the condition of the barbarians after their so-called conversion, could not possibly be better, even if it were not worse than before. To be converted to the principles and precepts of such clergy was only the more deeply to be damned. In proof of this it is necessary only to touch upon the condition of Catholic France under Clovis and his successors.

Into the “converted” barbarians, the Catholic system instilled all of its superstition, and its bigoted hatred of heretics and unbelievers. It thus destroyed what of generosity still remained in their minds, while it only intensified their native ferocity; and the shameful licentiousness of the papal system likewise corrupted the purity, and the native respect for women and marriage which had always been a noble characteristic of the German nations. “It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours... Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes.

“The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That king Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter, is fearful enough; but we are astounded, even in these times, that a bishop of Tours should burn a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he coveted. Fredegonde sends two murderers to assassinate Childebart, and these assassins are clerks. She causes the archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a bishop and an archdeacon are her accomplices. She is not content with open violence; she administers poison with the subtlety of a Locusta or a modern Italian, apparently with no sensual design, but from sheer barbarity.”

“As to the intercourse of the sexes, wars of conquest, where the females are at the mercy of the victors, especially if female virtue is

not in much respect, would severely try the more rigid morals of the conqueror. The strength of the Teutonic character, when it had once burst the bonds of habitual or traditionary restraint, might seem to disdain easy and effeminate vice, and to seek a kind of wild zest in the indulgence of lust, by mingling it up with all other violent passions, rapacity and inhumanity. Marriage was a bond contracted and broken on the slightest occasion. Some of the Merovingian kings took as many wives, either together or in succession, as suited either their passions or their politics.”

The papal religion “hardly interferes even to interdict incest. King Chlotaire demanded for the fisc the third part of the revenue of the churches; some bishops yielded; one, Injuriosus, disdainfully refused, and Chlotaire withdrew his demands. Yet Chlotaire, seemingly unbuked, married two sisters at once. Charlbert likewise married two sisters: he, however, found a churchman — but that was Saint Germanus — bold enough to rebuke him. This rebuke the king (the historian quietly writes), as he had already many wives, bore with patience. Dagobert, son of Chlotaire, king of Austria, repudiated his wife Gomatrude for barrenness, married a Saxon slave Mathildis, then another, Regnatrude; so that he had three wives at once, besides so many concubines that the chronicler is ashamed to recount them. Brunehaut and Fredegonde are not less famous for their licentiousness than for their cruelty. Fredegonde is either compelled, or scruples not of her own accord, to take a public oath, with three bishops and four hundred nobles as her vouchers, that her son was the son of her husband Chilperic. — Milman.^{f511a} Thus did the papacy for the barbarians whom she “converted;” and such as she could not thus corrupt, she destroyed.

At the fall of the empire, the bishopric of Rome was the head and center of a strong and compactly organized power. And by deftly insinuating itself into the place of mediator between the barbarian invaders and the perishing imperial authority, it had attained a position where it was recognized by the invaders as the power which, though it claimed to be not temporal but spiritual was none the less real, had succeeded to the place of the vanished imperial authority of Rome. And in view of the history of the time, it is impossible to escape the conviction that in the bishopric of Rome there was at this time formed the determination to plant itself in the temporal dominion of Rome and Italy. The emperors had been absent from Rome so long that the bishop of Rome had assumed their place there, and we have

seen how the church had usurped the place of the civil authority. The bishop of Rome was the head of the church; and now, as the empire was perishing, he would exalt his throne upon its ruins, and out of the anarchy of the times would secure a place and a name among the powers and dominions of the earth.

The barbarians who took possession of Italy were Arians, which in the sight of the bishop of Rome was worse than all other crimes put together. In addition to this, the Herulian monarch, Odoacer, an Arian, presumed to assert civil authority over the papacy, which, on account of the riotous proceedings in the election of the pope, was necessary, but would not meekly be borne by the proud pontiffs. At the election of the first pope after the fall of the empire, the representative of Odoacer appeared and notified the assembly that without his direction nothing ought to be done, that all they had done was null and void, that the election must begin anew, and “that it belonged to the civil magistrate to prevent the disturbances that might arise on such occasions, lest from the church they should pass to the State.” And as these elections were carried not only by violence, but by bribery, in which the property of the church played an important part, Odoacer, by his lieutenant at this same assembly, A.D. 483, “caused a law to be read, forbidding the bishop who should now be chosen, as well as his successors, to alienate any inheritance, possessions, or sacred utensils that now belonged, or should for the future belong, to the church; declaring all such bargains void, anathematizing both the seller and the buyer, and obliging the latter and his heirs to restore to the church all lands and tenements thus purchased, how long soever they might have possessed them.” — Bower.^{f512a}

By the law of Constantine which bestowed upon the church the privilege of receiving donations, legacies, etc., by will, lands were included; and through nearly two hundred years of the workings of this law, the church of Rome had become enormously enriched in landed estates. And more especially “since the extinction of the Western empire had emancipated the ecclesiastical potentate from secular control, the first and most abiding object of his schemes and prayers had been the acquisition of territorial wealth in the neighborhood of his capital.” — Bryce.^{f513a}

The church of Rome had also other lands, scattered in different parts of Italy, and even in Asia, for Celestine I addressed to Theodosius II a request that he extend his imperial protection over certain estates in Asia, which a

woman named Proba had bequeathed to the Church of Rome. As the imperial power faded away in the West, the bishop of Rome, in his growing power, came more and more to assert his own power of protection over his lands in Italy. And when the imperial power was entirely gone, it was naturally held that this power fell absolutely to him. When, therefore, Odoacer, both a barbarian invader and a heretic, issued a decree forbidding the alienation of church lands and possessions, this was represented as a presumptuous invasion of the rights of the bishop of Rome, not only to do what he would with his own, but above all as protector of the property and estates of the church.

For this offense of Odoacer, there was no forgiveness by the bishop of Rome. Nothing short of the utter uprooting of the Herulian power could atone for it. The Catholic ecclesiastics of Italy began to plot for his overthrow, and it was soon accomplished. There were at that time in the dominions of the Eastern empire, unsettled and wandering about with no certain dwelling-place, the people of the Ostrogoths under King Theodoric. Although in the service of the empire, they were dissatisfied with their lot; and they were so savage and so powerful that the emperor was in constant dread of them. Why might not this force be employed to destroy the dominion of the Heruli, and deliver Rome from the interferences and oppression of Odoacer? The suggestion was made to Theodoric by the court, but as he was in the service of the empire, it was necessary that he should have permission to undertake the expedition. He accordingly addressed the emperor as follows: —

“Although your servant is maintained in affluence by your liberality, graciously listen to the wishes of my heart. Italy, the inheritance of your predecessors, and Rome itself, the head and mistress of the world, now fluctuates under the violence and oppression of Odoacer the mercenary. Direct me with my national troops, to march against the tyrant. If I fall, you will be relieved from an expensive and troublesome friend: if, with the divine permission, I succeed, I shall govern in your name, and to your glory, the Roman Senate, and the part of the republic delivered from slavery by my victorious army.”^{f514a}

The proposition which had been suggested was gladly accepted by the emperor Zeno, and in the winter of 489, the whole nation took up its march of seven hundred miles to Italy. “The march of Theodoric must be

considered as the emigration of an entire people: the wives and children of the Goths, their aged parents, and most precious effects, were carefully transported;... and at length, surmounting every obstacle by skillful conduct and persevering courage, he descended from the Julian Alps, and displayed his invincible banners on the confines of Italy.” — Gibbon.^{f515a}

Theodoric defeated Odoacer in three engagements, A.D. 489-490, and “from the Alps to the extremity of Calabria, Theodoric reigned by right of conquest.” Odoacer shut himself up in Ravenna, where he sustained himself against a close siege for three years. By the offices of the bishop of Ravenna, and the clamors of the hungry people, Odoacer was brought to sign a treaty of peace. He was soon afterward slain at a solemn banquet, and “at the same moment, and without resistance,” his people “were universally massacred,” March 5, A.D. 493.

Thus was destroyed the kingdom of Odoacer and the Heruli. And that it was in no small degree the work of the Catholic Church is certain; for, “Throughout the conquest and establishment of the Gothic kingdom, the increasing power and importance of the Catholic ecclesiastics, forces itself upon the attention. They are ambassadors, mediators in treaties; [they] decide the wavering loyalty or instigate the revolt of cities.” — Milman.

^{f516a} The bishop of Pavia himself bore to Theodoric at Milan the surrender and offer of allegiance of that great city.

Another thing which makes this view most certainly true, is the fact that no sooner was order restored in Italy and in Rome, and the church once more felt itself secure, than a council of eighty bishops, thirty-seven presbyters, and four deacons, was called in Rome by the pope, A.D. 499, the very first act of which was to repeal the law enacted by Odoacer on the subject of the church possessions. Nor was the law repealed in order to get rid of it; for it was immediately re-enacted by the same council. This was plainly to declare that the estates of the church were no longer subject in any way to the authority of the civil power, but were to be held under the jurisdiction of the church alone. In fact, it was tantamount to a declaration of the independence of the papacy and her possessions.

This transaction also conclusively proves that the resentment of the bishopric of Rome, which had been aroused by the law of Odoacer, was never allayed until Odoacer and the law, so far as it represented the

authority of the civil power, were both out of the way. And this is the secret of the destruction of the Herulian kingdom of Italy.

It is no argument against this to say that the Ostrogoths were Arians too. Because

(1) as we shall presently see, Theodoric, though an Arian, did not interfere with church affairs; and

(2) the Church of Rome, in destroying one opponent never hesitates at the prospect that it is to be done by another; nor that another will arise in the place of the one destroyed.

Upon the principle that it is better to have one enemy than two, she will use one to destroy another, and will never miss an opportunity to destroy one for fear that another will arise in its place.

Theodoric ruled Italy thirty-three years, A.D. 493-526, during which time Italy enjoyed such peace and quietness and absolute security as had never been known there before, and has never been known there since until 1870. The people of his own nation numbered two hundred thousand men, which with the proportionate number of women and children, formed a population of nearly one million. His troops, formerly so wild and given to plunder, were restored to such discipline that in a battle in Dacia, in which they were completely victorious, "the rich spoils of the enemy lay untouched at their feet," because their leader had given no signal of pillage. When such discipline prevailed in the excitement of a victory and in an enemy's country, it is easy to understand the peaceful order that prevailed in their own new-gotten land which the Herulians had held before them.

During the ages of violence and revolution which had passed, large tracts of land in Italy had become utterly desolate and uncultivated; almost the whole of the rest was under imperfect culture; but now "agriculture revived under the shadow of peace, and the number of husbandmen multiplied by the redemption of captives;" and Italy, which had so long been fed from other countries, now actually began to export grain. Civil order was so thoroughly maintained that "the city gates were never shut either by day or by night, and the common saying that a purse of gold might be safely left in the fields, was expressive of the conscious security of the inhabitants." — Gibbon." Merchants and other lovers of the blessings of peace thronged from all parts.

But not alone did civil peace reign. Above all, there was perfect freedom in the exercise of religion. In fact, the measure of civil liberty and peace always depends upon that of religious liberty. Theodoric and his people were Arians, yet at the close of a fifty years' rule of Italy, the Ostrogoths could safely challenge their enemies to present a single authentic case in which they had ever persecuted the Catholics. Even the mother of Theodoric and some of his favorite Goths had embraced the Catholic faith with perfect freedom from any molestation whatever. The separation between Church and State, between civil and religious powers, was clear and distinct. Church property was protected in common with other property, while at the same time it was taxed in common with all other property. The clergy were protected in common with all other people, and they were likewise, in common with all other people, cited before the civil courts to answer for all civil offenses. In all ecclesiastical matters they were left entirely to themselves. Even the papal elections Theodoric left entirely to themselves, and though often solicited by both parties to interfere, he refused to have anything at all to do with them, except to keep the peace, which in fact was of itself no small task. He declined even to confirm the papal elections, an office which had been exercised by Odoacer.

Nor was this merely a matter of toleration; it was in genuine recognition of the rights of conscience. In a letter to the emperor Justin, A.D. 524, Theodoric announced the genuine principle of the rights of conscience, and the relationship that should exist between religion and the State, in the following words, worthy to be graven in letters of gold: —

“To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God. By the nature of things, the power of sovereigns is confined to political government. They have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace. The most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief.”^{f518a}

Similar pleas had before been made by the parties oppressed, but never before had the principle been announced by the party in power. The enunciation and defense of a principle by the party who holds the power to violate it, is the surest pledge that the principle is held in genuine sincerity.

The description of the state of peace and quietness in Italy above given, applies to Italy, but not to Rome; to the dominions of Theodoric and the Ostrogoths, but not to the city of the pope and the Catholics. In A.D. 499, there was a papal election. As there were as usual rival candidates — Symmachus and Laurentius — there was a civil war. “The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the Senate, and the populace were divided;” the streets of the city “ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife.” — Milman.^{f519a}

The contestants were so evenly matched, and the violent strife continued so long, that the leading men of both parties persuaded the candidates to go to Theodoric at Ravenna, and submit to his judgment their claims. Theodoric’s love of justice and of the rights of the people, readily and simply enough decided that the candidate who had the most votes should be counted elected; and if the votes were evenly divided, then the candidate who had been first ordained. Symmachus secured the office. A council was held by Symmachus, which met the first of March, 499, and passed a decree “almost in the terms of the old Roman law, severely condemning all ecclesiastical ambition, all canvassing either to obtain subscriptions, or administration of oaths, or promises, for the papacy” during the lifetime of a pope. But such election methods as these were now so prevalent that this law was of as little value in controlling the methods of the aspiring candidates for the bishopric, as in the days of the republic the same kind of laws were for the candidates to the consulship.

Laurentius, though defeated at this time, did not discontinue his efforts to obtain the office. For four years he watched for opportunities, and carried on an intrigue to displace Symmachus, and in 503 brought a series of heavy charges against him. “The accusation was brought before the judgment-seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna and confined at Rimini,” but escaped and returned to Rome. Meantime, Laurentius had entered the city, and when Symmachus returned, “the sanguinary tumults between the two parties broke out with greater fury;” priests were slain, monasteries set on fire, and nuns treated with the utmost indignity.

The Senate petitioned Theodoric to send a visitor to judge the cause of Symmachus in the crimes laid against him. The king finding that that matter was only a church quarrel, appointed one of their own number, the bishop

of Altimio, who so clearly favored Laurentius that his partisanship only made the contention worse. Again Theodoric was petitioned to interfere, but he declined to assume any jurisdiction, and told them to settle it among themselves; but as there was so much disturbance of the peace, and it was so long continued, Theodoric commanded them to reach some sort of settlement that would stop their fighting, and restore public order. A council was therefore called. As Symmachus was on his way to the council, “he was attacked by the adverse party; showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard” (Milman ^{f520a}), and took refuge in the church of St. Peter. The danger to which he was then exposed he made an excuse for not appearing at the council.

The most of the council were favorable to Symmachus and to the pretensions of the bishop of Rome at this time, and therefore were glad of any excuse that would relieve them from judging him. However, they went through the form of summoning him three times; all of which he declined. Then the council sent deputies to state to Theodoric the condition of affairs, “saying to him that the authority of the king might compel Symmachus to appear, but that the council had not such authority.” Theodoric replied that “with respect to the cause of Symmachus, he had assembled them to judge him, but yet left them at full liberty to judge him or not, providing they could by any other means put a stop to the present calamities, and restore the wished-for tranquillity to the city of Rome.”

The majority of the council declared Symmachus “absolved in the sight of men, whether guilty or innocent in the sight of God,” for the reason that “no assembly of bishops has power to judge the pope; he is accountable for his actions to God alone.” — Bower. ^{f521a} They then commanded all, under penalty of excommunication, to accept this judgment, and submit to the authority of Symmachus, and acknowledge him “for lawful bishop of the holy city of Rome.” Symmachus was not slow to assert all the merit that the council had thus recognized in the bishop of Rome. He wrote to the emperor of the East that “a bishop is as much above an emperor as heavenly things, which the bishop administers and dispenses, are above all the trash of the earth, which alone the greatest among the emperors have the power to dispose of.” — Bower. ^{f522a} He declared that the higher powers referred to in ^{<510>}Romans 13:1, mean the spiritual powers, and that to these it is that every soul must be subject.

At another council held in Rome in 504, at the direction of Symmachus, a decree was enacted “ anathematizing and excluding from the communion of the faithful, all who had seized or in the future should seize, hold, or appropriate to themselves, the goods or estates of the church; and this decree was declared to extend even to those who held such estates by grants from the crown.” — Bower.^{f523a} This was explicitly to put the authority of the church of Rome above that of any State.

Justin was emperor of the East A.D. 518-527. He was violently orthodox, and was supported by his nephew, the more violently orthodox Justinian. It was the ambition of both, together and in succession, to make the Catholic religion alone prevalent everywhere. They therefore entered with genuine Catholic zeal upon the pious work of clearing their dominions of heretics. The first edict, issued in 523, commanded all Manichaeans to leave the empire under penalty of death; and all other heretics were to be ranked with pagans and Jews, and excluded from all public offices. This edict was no sooner learned of in the West, than mutterings were heard in Rome, of hopes of liberty from the “Gothic yoke.” The next step was violence.

Under the just administration of Theodoric, and the safety assured by the Gothic power, many Jews had established themselves in Rome, Genoa, Milan, and other cities, for the purposes of trade. They were permitted by express laws to dwell there. As soon as the imperial edict was known, which commanded all remaining heretics to be ranked as pagans and Jews, as the Catholics did not dare to attack the Gothic heretics, they, at Rome and Ravenna especially, riotously attacked the Jews, abused them, robbed them, and burnt their synagogues. A legal investigation was attempted, but the leaders in the riots could not be discovered. Then Theodoric levied a tax upon the whole community of the guilty cities, with which to settle the damages. Some of the Catholics refused to pay the tax. They were punished. This at once brought a cry from the Catholics everywhere, that they were persecuted. Those who had been punished were glorified as confessors of the faith, and “three hundred pulpits deplored the persecution of the church.” — Gibbon.^{f524a}

The edict of 523 was followed in 524 by another, this time commanding the Arians of the East to deliver up to the Catholic bishops all their churches, which the Catholic bishops were commanded to consecrate anew.

Theodoric addressed an earnest letter to Justin, in which he pleaded for toleration for the Arians from the Eastern empire. This was the letter in which was stated the principle of the rights of conscience, which we have already quoted on page 537. To this noble plea, however, “Justin coolly answered: —

“I pretend to no authority over men’s consciences, but it is my prerogative to intrust the public offices to those in whom I have confidence; and public order demanding uniformity of worship, I have full right to command the churches to be open to those alone who shall conform to the religion of the State.” ^{f525a}

Accordingly, while pretending to no authority over men’s consciences, the Arians of his dominions were by Justin “stripped of all offices of honor or emolument, were not only expelled from the Catholic churches, but their own were closed against them; and they were exposed to all insults, vexations, and persecutions of their adversaries, who were not likely to enjoy their triumph with moderation, or to repress their conscientiously intolerant zeal.” — Milman. ^{f526a} Many of them conformed to the state religion; but those of firm faith sent to Theodoric earnest appeals for protection.

Theodoric did all that he could, but without avail. He was urged to retaliate by persecuting the Catholics in Italy, but he steadfastly refused. He determined to send an embassy to Justin, and most singularly sent the pope as his ambassador. “The pope, attended by five other bishops and four senators, set forth on a mission of which it was the ostensible object to obtain indulgence for heretics — heretics under the ban of his church — heretics looked upon with the most profound detestation.” — Milman. ^{f527a} This arrangement gave the bishop of Rome the most perfect opportunity he could have asked, to form a compact with the imperial authority of the East, for the further destruction of the Ostrogothic kingdom.

The pope, John I, “was received in Constantinople with the most flattering honors, as though he had been St. Peter himself. The whole city, with the emperor at its head, came forth to meet him with tapers and torches, as far as ten miles beyond the gates. The emperor knelt at his feet, and implored his benediction. On Easter day, March 30, 525, he performed the service in the great church, Epiphanius the bishop ceding the first place to the holy stranger.” — Milman. ^{f528a} Such an embassy could have no other result than

more than ever to endanger the kingdom of Theodoric. Before John's return, the conspiracy became more manifest; some senators and leading men were arrested. One of them, Boethius, though denying his guilt, boldly confessed, "Had there been any hopes of liberty, I should have freely indulged them; had I known of a conspiracy against the king, I should have answered in the words of a noble Roman to the frantic Caligula, You would not have known it from me."^{f529a} Such a confession as that was almost a confession of the guilt which he denied. He and his father-in-law were executed. When the pope returned, he was received as a traitor, and put in prison, where he died, May 18, 526.

He was no sooner dead than violent commotion and disturbances again arose amongst rival candidates for the vacant chair. "Many candidates appeared for the vacant see, and the whole city, the Senate as well as the people and clergy, were divided into parties and factions, the papal dignity being now as eagerly sought for, and often obtained by the same methods and arts as the consular was in the times of the heathen." — Bower.^{f530a}

Theodoric now, seventy-four years old, fearing that these contentions would end in murder and blood-shed again, as they had at the election of Symmachus, suffered his authority to transcend his principles, and presumed, himself, to name a bishop of Rome. The whole people of the city, Senate, clergy, and all, united in opposition. But a compromise was effected, by which it was agreed that in future the election of the pope should be by the clergy and people, but must be confirmed by the sovereign. Upon this understanding, the people accepted Theodoric's nominee; and July 12, 526, Felix III was installed in the papal office.

The noble Theodoric died August 30, 526, and was succeeded by his grandson Athalaric, about ten years old, under the regency of his mother Amalasontha. Justin died, and was succeeded by —

JUSTINAN, AUGUST 1, 527 — NOVEMBER 14, 565.

In the supremacy of the papacy, Justinian holds the same place as does Constantine and Theodosius in the establishment of the Catholic Church. "Among the titles of greatness, the name 'Pious' was most pleasing to his ears; to promote the temporal and spiritual interests of the church was the serious business of his life; and the duty of father of his country was often sacrificed to that of defender of the faith." — Gibbon.^{f531a} "The emperor Justinian unites in himself the most opposite vices, — insatiable rapacity

and lavish prodigality, intense pride and contemptible weakness, unmeasured ambition and dastardly cowardice.... In the Christian emperor, seem to meet the crimes of those who won or secured their empire by assassination of all whom they feared, the passion for public diversions without the accomplishments of Nero or the brute strength of Commodus, the dotage of Claudius.” — Milman.^{f532a}

Pope Felix was succeeded by Boniface II, A.D. 530-532, who was chosen amidst the now customary scenes of disturbance and strife, which in this case were brought to an end, and the election of Boniface secured, by the death of his rival, who after his death was excommunicated by Boniface. On account of the shameful briberies and other methods of competition employed in the election of the popes, the Roman Senate now enacted a law “declaring null and execrable all promises, bargains, and contracts, by whomsoever or for whomsoever made, with a view to engage suffrages in the election of the pope; and excluding forever from having any share in the election, such as should be found to have been directly or indirectly concerned either for themselves or others, in contracts or bargains of that nature.” — Bower.^{f533a} Laws of the same import had already been enacted more than once, but they amounted to nothing; because as in the days of Caesar, everybody was ready to bribe or be bribed. Accordingly, at the very next election, in 532, “Votes were publicly bought and sold; and notwithstanding the decree lately issued by the Senate, money was offered to the senators themselves, nay, the lands of the church were mortgaged by some, and the sacred utensils pawned by others or publicly sold for ready money.” — Bower.^{f534a} As the result of seventy-five days of this kind of work, a certain John Mercurius was made pope, and took the title of John 2, December 31, 532.

In the year 532, Justinian issued an edict declaring his intention “to unite all men in one faith.” Whether they were Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, all who did not within three months profess and embrace the Catholic faith, were by the edict “declared infamous, and as such excluded from all employments both civil and military; rendered incapable of leaving anything by will; and all their estates confiscated, whether real or personal.” As a result of this cruel edict, “Great numbers were driven from their habitations with their wives and children, stripped and naked. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were plundered of what little they had, and many of them inhumanly massacred.” — Bower.^{f535a}

There now occurred a transaction which meant much in the supremacy of the papacy. It was brought about in this way: Ever since the Council of Chalcedon had “settled” the question of the two natures in Christ, there had been more, and more violent, contentions over it than ever before; “for everywhere monks were at the head of the religious revolution which threw off the yoke of the Council of Chalcedon.” In Jerusalem a certain Theodosius was at the head of the army of monks, who made him bishop, and in acts of violence, pillage, and murder, he fairly outdid the perfectly lawless bandits of the country. “The very scenes of the Saviour’s mercies ran with blood shed in his name by his ferocious self-called disciples.” — Milman. ^{f536}

In Alexandria “the bishop was not only murdered in the baptistery, but his body was treated with shameless indignities, and other enormities were perpetrated which might have appalled a cannibal.” And the monkish horde then elected as bishop one of their own number, Timothy the Weasel, a disciple of Dioscorus. — Milman. ^{f537}

Soon there was added to all this, another point which increased the fearful warfare. In the Catholic churches it was customary to sing what was called the Trisagion, or Thrice-Holy. It was, originally, the “Holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts” of Isaiah vi, 3; but at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, it had been changed, and was used by the council thus: “Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us.” At Antioch, in 477, a third monk, Peter the Fuller, “led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the streets,” loudly singing the Thrice-Holy, with the addition, “Who wast crucified for us.” It was orthodox to sing it as the Council of Chalcedon had used it, with the understanding that the three “Holies” referred respectively to the three persons of the Trinity. It was heresy to sing it with the later addition.

In A.D. 511, two hordes of monks on the two sides of the question met in Constantinople. “The two blackcowed armies watched each other for several months, working in secret on their respective partisans. At length they came to a rupture.... The Monophysite monks in the Church of the Archangel within the palace, broke out after the ‘Thrice-Holy’ with the burden added at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, “who wast crucified for us.’ The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavored to expel them from the church; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their work. There was a wild,

fierce fray; the divine presence of the emperor lost its awe; he could not maintain the peace. The bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, and children poured out from all quarters; the monks with their archimandrites at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war-cry.” — Milman. ^{f538}

These are but samples of the repeated — it might almost be said the continuous — occurrences in the cities of the East. “Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with blood.... The hymn of the angels in heaven was the battle cry on earth, the signal of human bloodshed.” — Milman. ^{f539}

In A.D. 512 one of these Trisagion riots broke out in Constantinople, because the emperor proposed to use the added clause. “Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire, the officers of the crown insulted, pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city.” In the house of the favorite minister of the emperor there was found a monk from the country. He was accused of having suggested the use of the addition. His head was cut off, and raised high on a pole, and the whole orthodox populace marched through the streets singing the orthodox Trisagion, and shouting, “Behold the enemy of the Trinity.” ^{f540}

In A.D. 519, another dispute was raised, growing out of the addition to the Trisagion. That was, “Did one of the Trinity suffer in the flesh? or did one person of the Trinity suffer in the flesh?” The monks of Scythia affirmed that one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh, and declared that to say that one person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh, was absolute heresy. The question was brought before Pope Hormisdas, who decided that “one person of the Trinity suffered in the flesh” was the orthodox view; and denounced the monks as proud, arrogant, obstinate, enemies to the church, disturbers of the public peace, slanderers, liars, and instruments employed by the enemy of truth to banish all truth, to establish error in its room, and to sow among the wheat the poisonous seeds of diabolical tares.

Now, in 533, this question was raised again, and Justinian became involved in the dispute.

This time one set of monks argued that “if one of the Trinity did not suffer on the cross, then one of the Trinity was not born of the Virgin Mary, and

therefore she ought no longer to be called the Mother of God.” Others argued: “If one of the Trinity did not suffer on the cross, then Christ who suffered was not one of the Trinity.” Justinian entered the lists against both, and declared that Mary was “truly the Mother of God;” that Christ was “in the strictest sense one of the Trinity;” and that whosoever denied either the one or the other, was a heretic. This frightened the monks, because they knew Justinian’s opinions on the subject of heretics were exceedingly forcible. They therefore sent off two of their number to lay the question before the pope. As soon as Justinian learned this, he too decided to apply to the pope. He therefore drew up a confession of faith that “one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh,” and sent it by two bishops to the bishop of Rome. To make his side of the question appear as favorable as possible to the pope, he sent a rich present of chalices and other vessels of gold, enriched with precious stones; and the following flattering letter: —

“Justinian, pious, fortunate, renowned, triumphant; emperor, consul, etc., to John, the most holy Archbishop of our city of Rome, and patriarch: —

“Rendering honor to the apostolic chair, and to your Holiness, as has been always and is our wish, and honoring your Blessedness as a father, we have hastened to bring to the knowledge of your Holiness all matters relating to the state of the churches. It having been at all times our great desire to preserve the unity of your apostolic chair, and the constitution of the holy churches of God which has obtained hitherto, and still obtains.

“Therefore we have made no delay in subjecting and uniting to your Holiness all the priests of the whole East.

“For this reason we have thought fit to bring to your notice the present matters of disturbance; though they are manifest and unquestionable, and always firmly held and declared by the whole priesthood according to the doctrine of your apostolic chair. For we cannot suffer that anything which relates to the state of the church, however manifest and unquestionable, should be moved, without the knowledge of your Holiness, who are **THE HEAD OF ALL THE HOLY CHURCHES**; for in all things, we have already declared, we are anxious to increase the honor and authority of your apostolic chair.” ^{f541}

All things were now ready for the deliverance of the Catholic Church from Arian dominion. Since the death of Theodoric, divided councils had crept in amongst the Ostrogoths, and the Catholic Church had been more and more cementing to its interests the powers of the Eastern throne.

“Constant amicable intercourse was still taking place between the Catholic clergy of the East and the West; between Constantinople and Rome; between Justinian and the rapid succession of pontiffs who occupied the throne during the ten years between the death of Theodoric and the invasion of Italy.” — Milman. ^{f542}

The crusade began with the invasion of the Arian kingdom of the Vandals in Africa, of whom Gelimer was the king, and was openly and avowedly in the interests of the Catholic religion and church. For in a council of his ministers, nobles, and bishops, Justinian was dissuaded from undertaking the African war. He hesitated, and was about to relinquish his design, when he was rallied by a fanatical bishop, who exclaimed: “I have seen a vision! It is the will of heaven, O emperor, that you should not abandon your holy enterprise for the deliverance of the African church. The God of battle will march before your standard and disperse your enemies, who are the enemies of his Son.” ^{f543}

This persuasion was sufficient for the “pious” emperor, and in June 533, “the whole fleet of six hundred ships was ranged in martial pomp before the gardens of the palace,” laden and equipped with thirty-five thousand troops and sailors, and five thousand horses, all under the command of Belisarius. He landed on the coast of Africa in September; Carthage was captured on the 18th of the same month; Gelimer was disastrously defeated in November; and the conquest of Africa, and the destruction of the Vandal kingdom, was completed by the capture of Gelimer in the spring of 534. ^{f544} During the rest of the year, Belisarius “reduced the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, Majorica, Minorica, and whatever else belonged to the Vandals, either on the continent or in the islands.” — Bower. ^{f545}

Belisarius dispatched to Justinian the news of his victory. “He received the messengers of victory at the time when he was preparing to publish the Pandects of the Roman law; and the devout or jealous emperor celebrated the divine goodness and confessed, in silence, the merit of his successful general. Impatient to abolish the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the Vandals, he proceeded, without delay, to the full establishment of the Catholic Church. Her jurisdiction, wealth, and immunities, perhaps the

most essential part of episcopal religion, were restored and amplified with a liberal hand; the Arian worship was suppressed, the Donatist meetings were proscribed; and the Synod of Carthage, by the voice of two hundred the seventeen bishops, applauded the just measure of pious retaliation.” — Gibbon^{f546}

As soon as this pious work had been fully accomplished in Africa, the arms of Justinian were turned against Italy and the Arian Ostrogoths. In 534 Amalasontha had been supplanted in her rule over the Ostrogoths by her cousin Theodotus. And “during the short and troubled reign of Theodotus — 534 to 536 — Justinian received petitions from all parts of Italy, and from all persons, lay as well as clerical, with the air and tone of its sovereign.” — Milman.^{f547}

Belisarius subdued Sicily in 535, and invaded Italy and captured Naples in 536. As it was now about the first of December, the Gothic warriors decided to postpone, until the following spring, their resistance to the invaders. A garrison of four thousand soldiers was left in Rome, a feeble number to defend such a city at such a time in any case, but these troops proved to be even more feeble in faith than they were in numbers. They threw over all care of the city, and “furiously exclaimed that the apostolic throne should no longer be profaned by the triumph or toleration of Arianism; that the tombs of the Caesars should no longer be trampled by the savages of the North; and, without reflecting that Italy must sink into a province of Constantinople, they fondly hailed the restoration of a Roman emperor as a new era of freedom and prosperity. The deputies of the pope and clergy, of the Senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter into the city whose gates would be thrown open to his reception.” — Gibbon.^{f548}

Belisarius at once marched to Rome, which he entered December 10, 536. But this was not the conquest of Italy or even of Rome. “From their rustic habitations, from their different garrisons, the Goths assembled at Ravenna for the defense of their country: and such were their numbers that after an army had been detached for the relief of Dalmatia, one hundred and fifty thousand fighting men marched under the royal standard” in the spring, A.D. 537; and the Gothic nation returned to the siege of Rome and the defense of Italy against the invaders. “The whole nation of the Ostrogoths had been assembled for the attack, and was almost entirely consumed in the siege of Rome,” which continued above a year, 537-538. “One year and

nine days after the commencement of the siege, an army so lately strong and triumphant, burnt their tents, and tumultuously repassed the Milvian bridge,” and Rome was delivered,

March 538. The remains of the kingdom were soon afterward destroyed. “They had lost their king (an inconsiderable loss), their capital, their treasures, the provinces from Sicily to the Alps, and the military force of two hundred thousand barbarians, magnificently equipped with horses and arms.” — Gibbon.^{f549} And thus was the kingdom of the Ostrogoths destroyed before the vengeful arrogance of the papacy.

This completely opened the way for the bishop of Rome to assert his sole authority over the estates of the church. The district immediately surrounding Rome was called the Roman duchy, and it was so largely occupied by the estates of the church that the bishop of Rome claimed exclusive authority over it. “The emperor, indeed, continued to control the elections and to enforce the payment of tribute for the territory protected by the imperial arms; but, on the other hand, the pontiff exercised a definite authority within the Roman duchy, and claimed to have a voice in the appointment of the civil officers who administered the local government.” — Encyclopedia Britannica.^{f550} Under the protectorate of the armies of the East which soon merged in the exarch of Ravenna, the papacy enlarged its aspirations, confirmed its powers, and strengthened its situation both spiritually and temporally. Being by the decrees of the councils, and the homage of the emperor, made the head of all ecclesiastical and spiritual dominion on earth, and being now in possession of territory, and exerting a measure of civil authority therein, the opportunity that now fell to the ambition of the bishopric of Rome was to assert, to gain, and to exercise, supreme authority in all things temporal as well as spiritual. And the sanction of this aspiration was made to accrue from Justinian’s letter, in which he rendered such distinctive honor to the apostolic see. It is true that Justinian wrote these words with no such far-reaching meaning, but that made no difference; the words were written, and like all other words of similar import, they could be, and were, made to bear whatever meaning the bishop of Rome should choose to find in them.

Therefore, the year A.D. 538, which marks the conquest of Italy, the deliverance of Rome, and the destruction of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, is the true date which marks the establishment of the temporal authority of the papacy, and the exercise of that authority as a world-

power. All that was ever done later in this connection was but to enlarge by additional usurpations and donations, the territories which the bishop of Rome at this point possessed, and over which he asserted civil jurisdiction. This view is fully sustained by the following excellent statement of the case: —

“The conquest of Italy by the Greeks was, to a great extent at least, the work of the Catholic clergy.... The overthrow of the Gothic kingdom was to Italy an unmitigated evil. A monarch like Witiges or Totila would soon have repaired the mischiefs caused by the degenerate successors of Theodoric, Athalaric, and Theodotus. In their overthrow began the fatal policy of the Roman see,... which never would permit a powerful native kingdom to unite Italy, or a very large part of it, under one dominion. Whatever it may have been to Christendom, the papacy has been the eternal, implacable foe of Italian independence and Italian unity; and so (as far as independence and unity might have given dignity, political weight, and prosperity) to the welfare of Italy.... Rome, jealous of all temporal sovereignty but her own, for centuries yielded up, or rather made Italy a battle field to the Transalpine and the stranger, and at the same time so secularized her own spiritual supremacy as to confound altogether the priest and the politician, to degrade absolutely and almost irrevocably the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world.” — Milman.^{f551}

Then “began that fatal policy of the Roman see,” because she was then herself a world-power, possessing temporalities over which she both claimed and exercised dominion, and by virtue of which she could contend with other dominions, and upon the same level. And that which made the papacy so much the more domineering in this fatal policy, was the fact of Justinian’s having so fully committed himself. When the mightiest emperor who had ever sat on the Eastern throne had not only under his own hand rendered such decided homage to the papacy, but had rooted out the last power that stood in her way, this to her was strongly justifiable ground for her assertion of dominion over all other dominions, and her disputing dominion with the powers of the earth.

It is evident that as the papacy had hitherto claimed, and had actually acquired, absolute dominion over all things spiritual, henceforth she would claim, and, if crafty policy and unscrupulous procedure were of any avail,

would actually acquire, absolute dominion over all things temporal as well as spiritual. Indeed, as we have seen, this was already claimed, and the history of Europe for more than a thousand of the following years, abundantly proves that the claim was finally and fully established. Henceforth kings and emperors were but her tools, and often but her playthings; and kingdoms and empires her conquests, and often only her traffic.

The history of this phase of the papacy is fully as interesting, though the details are not so important, as that which shows how her ecclesiastical supremacy was established. Here, however, will be noticed but the one point, how the papacy assumed the supremacy over kings and emperors and acquired the prerogative of dispensing kingdoms and empires.

The contest began even with Justinian, who had done so much to exalt the dignity and clear the way of the papacy. Justinian soon became proud of his theological abilities, and presumed to dictate the faith of the papacy, rather than to submit, as formerly, to her guidance. And from A.D. 542 to the end of his long reign in 565, there was almost constant war, with alternate advantage, between Justinian and the popes. But as emperors live and die, while the papacy only lives, the real victory remained with her.

In A.D. 568 the Lombards invaded Italy, and for nearly twenty years wrought such devastation that even the pope thought the world was coming to an end. The imperial power of the East was so weak that the defense of Italy fell exclusively to the exarch of Ravenna and the pope. And as “the death of Narses had left his successor, the exarch of Ravenna, only the dignity of a sovereignty which he was too weak to exercise for any useful purpose of government “ (Milman^{f552}), the pope alone became the chief defender of Italy. In 580 Gregory I — the Great — became pope, and concluded a treaty of peace with the Lombards, and “the pope and the king of the Lombards became the real powers in the north and center of Italy.” — Encyclopedia Britan.^{f553}

The wife of the king of the Lombards was a Catholic, and by the influence of Gregory, she “solemnly placed the Lombard nation under the patronage of St. John the Baptist. At Monza she built in his honor the first Lombard church, and the royal palace near it.” — Id. From this the Lombards soon became Catholic; but though this was so, they would not suffer the priesthood to have any part in the affairs of the kingdom. They “never

admitted the bishops of Italy to a seat in their legislative councils.” — Gibbon.^{f554} And although under the Lombard dominion “the Italians enjoyed a milder and more equitable government than any of the other kingdoms which had been founded on the ruins of the empire,” this exclusion of the clergy from affairs of the State was as much against them now, though Catholic, as their Arianism had been against them before; and the popes ever anxiously hoped to have them driven entirely from Italy.

In 728 the edict of the Eastern emperor abolishing the images, was published in Italy. The pope defended the images, of course, and “the Italians swore to live and die in defense of the pope and the holy images.” — Gibbon.^{f555} An alliance was formed between the Lombards and the papacy for the defense of the images. The alliance, however, did not last long. Both powers being determined to possess as much of Italy as possible, there was constant irritation, which finally culminated in open hostilities, and the Lombards invaded the papal territory in A.D. 739.

Charles Martel, the mayor of the palace of the Frankish kingdom, had gained a world-wide glory by his late victory over the Mohammedans at Tours. Of all the barbarians, the Franks, were the first who had become Catholic, and ever since, they had been dutiful sons of the church. The pope, Gregory III, now determined to appeal to Charles for help against this assertion of Lombard dominion. He sent to Charles the keys of the “sepulcher of St. Peter;” some filings from the chains with which “Peter had been bound;” and, more important than all, as the legitimate inheritor of the authority of the ancient Roman republic, he presumed to bestow upon Charles Martel the title of Roman consul. “Throughout these transactions the pope appears actually, if not openly, an independent power, leaguings with the allies or the enemies of the empire, as might suit the exigencies of the time.” And now, “the pope, as an independent potentate, is forming an alliance with a Transalpine sovereign for the liberation of Italy.” — Milman.^{f556}

The Lombards, too, sent to Charles with counter negotiations. This the pope knew, and wrote to Charles that in Italy the Lombards were treating him with contempt, and were saying, “Let him come, this Charles, with his army of Franks; if he can, let him rescue you out of our hands;” and then Gregory laments and pleads with Charles thus: —

“O unspeakable grief, that such sons so insulted should make no effort to defend their holy mother the church! Not that St. Peter is unable to protect his successors and to exact vengeance upon their oppressors, but the apostle is putting the faith of his followers to trial. Believe not the Lombard kings, that their only object is to punish their refractory subjects, the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, whose only crime is that they will not join in the invasion and plunder of the Roman see. Send, O my Christian son, some faithful officer, who may report to you truly the condition of affairs here; who may behold with his own eyes the persecutions we are enduring, the humiliation of the church, the desolation of our property, the sorrow of the pilgrims who frequent our shrine. Close not your ears against our supplication, lest St. Peter close against you the gates of heaven. I conjure you by the living and the true God, and by the keys of St. Peter, not to prefer the alliance of the Lombards to the love of the great apostle, but hasten, hasten to our succor, that we may say with the prophet, ‘The Lord has heard us in the day of tribulation, the God of Jacob has protected us.’”^{F557}

The ambassadors and the letters of the pope “were received by Charles with decent reverence; but the greatness of his occupations and the shortness of his life, prevented his interference in the affairs of Italy, except by friendly and ineffectual mediation.” — Gibbon.^{f558} But affairs soon took such a turn in France that the long-cherished desire of the papacy was rewarded with abundant fruition. Charles Martel was simply duke or mayor of the palace, under the sluggard kings of France. He died October 21, 741. Gregory III died November 27, of the same year, and was succeeded by Zacharias. No immediate help coming for France, Zacharias made overtures to the Lombards, and a treaty of peace for twenty years was concluded between the kingdom of Lombardy and “the dukedom of Rome.”

Charles Martel left two sons, Carloman and Pepin; but Carloman being the elder, was his successor in office. He had been in place but a little while, before he resigned it to his brother, and became a monk, A.D. 747. The events in Italy, and the prestige which the pope had gained by them, exerted a powerful influence in France, and as the pope had already desired a league with Charles Martel, who although not possessing the title, held all the authority, of a king, Pepin, his successor, conceived the idea that perhaps he could secure the papal sanction to his assuming the title of king

with the authority which he already possessed. Pepin therefore sent two ecclesiastics to consult the pope as to whether he might not be king of France, and Zacharias returned answer “that the nation might lawfully unite, in the same person, the title and authority of king; and that the unfortunate Childeric, a victim of the public safety, should be degraded, shaved, and confined in a monastery for the remainder of his days. An answer so agreeable to their wishes was accepted by the Franks as the opinion of a casuist, the sentence of a judge, or the oracle of prophet;... and Pepin was exalted on a buckler by the suffrage of a free people, accustomed to obey his laws, and to march under his standard;” and March 7, 752, was proclaimed king of the Franks. — Gibbon. ^{f559}

Zacharias died March 14 the same year, and was succeeded by Stephen II, who died the fourth day afterward, and before his consecration, and Stephen III became pope, March 26. Astolph was now king of the Lombards. He had openly declared himself the enemy of the pope, and was determined to make not only the territories of the exarchate, but those of the pope, his own. “In terms of contumely and menace, he demanded the instant submission of Rome, and the payment of a heavy personal tribute, a poll-tax on each citizen.” The pope sent ambassadors, but they were treated with contempt, and Astolph approached Rome to enforce his demand. “The pope appealed to heaven, by tying a copy of the treaty, violated by Astolph, to the holy cross.” — Milman. ^{f560}

He wrote to Pepin, but got no answer; in his distress he wrote even to Constantinople, but much less from there was there any answer. Then he determined to go personally to Pepin, and ask his help. There was present at the court of the pope an ambassador from the court of France, under whose protection Stephen placed himself, and traveled openly through the dominions of Astolph. November 15, 752 he entered the French dominions. He was met on the frontier by one of the clergy and a nobleman, with orders to conduct him to the court of the king. A hundred miles from the palace he was met by Prince Charles, afterward the mighty Charlemagne, with other nobles who escorted him on his way. Three miles from the palace, the king himself, with his wife and family, and an array of nobles, met Stephen. “As the pope approached, the king dismounted from his horse, and prostrated himself on the ground before him. He then walked by the side of the pope’s palfry. The pope and the ecclesiastics broke out at once into hymns of thanksgiving, and so chanting as they went, reached the royal residence. Stephen lost no time in adverting to the object of his visit.

He implored the immediate interposition of Pepin to enforce the restoration of St. Peter... Pepin swore at once to fulfill all the requests of the pope; but, as the winter rendered all military operations impracticable, invited him to Paris, where he took up his residence in the Abbey of St. Denys.” — Milman.^{f561}

Pepin had already been anointed by a bishop in France, but this was not enough; the pope must anoint him too, and then upon this claim that the king of the Franks held his kingdom by the grace of the bishop of Rome. In the monastery of St. Denys, Stephen III placed the diadem on the head of Pepin, anointed him with the holy oil, confirmed the sovereignty in his house forever, and pronounced an eternal curse upon all who should attempt to name a king of France from any other than the race of Pepin. The pope was attacked with a dangerous sickness which kept him at the capital of France until the middle of 753.

At some point in this series of transactions, we know not exactly where, the pope as the head of the restored republic of Rome, renewed to Pepin the Roman title and dignity of patrician, which, as well as that of consul, had been conferred upon Charles Martel. The insignia of this new office were the keys of the shrine of St. Peter, “as a pledge and symbol of sovereignty;” and a “holy” banner which it was their “right and duty to unfurl” in the defense of the church and city of Rome.

Meantime Astolph had persuaded Carloman to leave his monastery, and go to the court of Pepin to counteract the influence of the pope, and if possible to win Pepin to the cause of the Lombards. But the unfortunate Carloman was at once imprisoned “for life,” and his life was ended in a few days. In September and October 753, Pepin and the pope marched to Italy against Astolph, who took refuge in Pavia. They advance to the walls of that city; and Astolph was glad to purchase an ignominious peace, by pledging himself, on oath, to restore the territory of Rome.

Pepin returned to his capital; and Stephen retired to Rome. But Pepin was no sooner well out of reach, than Astolph was under arms again, and on his way to Rome. He marched to the very gates of the city, and demanded the surrender of the pope. “He demanded that the Romans should give up the pope into his hands, and on these terms only would he spare the city. Astolph declared he would not leave the pope a foot of land.” — Milman.^{f562}

Stephen hurried away messengers with a letter to Pepin in which the pope reminded him that St. Peter had promised him eternal life in return for a vow which he had made to make a donation to St. Peter. He told Pepin that he risked eternal damnation in not hastening to fulfill his vow; and that as Peter had Pepin's handwriting to the vow, if he did not fulfill it, the apostle would present it against him in the day of judgment. Pepin did not respond, and a second letter was dispatched in which the pope "conjured him, by God and his holy mother, by the angels in heaven, by the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and by the last day," to hasten to the rescue of his holy mother the church, and promised him if he would do so, "victory over all the barbarian nations, and eternal life." But yet Pepin did not respond, and as Astolph was pressing closer and harder, the pope determined to have St. Peter himself address the dilatory king. Accordingly, he sent now the following letter: —

"I, Peter the apostle, protest, admonish, and conjure you, the most Christian kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman, with all the hierarchy, bishops, abbots, priests, and all monks; all judges, dukes, counts and the whole people of the Franks. The Mother of God likewise adjures you, and admonishes and commands you, she as well as the thrones and dominions, and all the hosts of heaven to save the beloved city of Rome from the detested Lombards. If ye hasten, I, Peter the apostle, promise you my protection in this life and in the next, will prepare for you the most glorious mansions in heaven, will bestow on you the everlasting joys of paradise. Make common cause with my people of Rome, and I will grant whatever ye may pray for. I conjure you not to yield up this city to be lacerated and tormented by the Lombards, lest your own souls be lacerated and tormented in hell, with the devil and his pestilential angels. Of all nations under heaven, the Franks are highest in the esteem of St. Peter; to me you owe all your victories. Obey, and obey speedily, and, by my suffrage, our Lord Jesus Christ will give you in this life length of days, security, victory; in the life to come, will multiply his blessings upon you, among his saints and angels."

f563

This aroused Pepin to the most diligent activity. Astolph heard he was coming, and hastened back to his capital; but scarcely had he reached it before Pepin was besieging him there. Astolph yielded at once, and gave up to Pepin the whole disputed territory. Representatives of the emperor of

the East were there to demand that it be restored to him; but “Pepin declared that his sole object in the war was to show his veneration for St. Peter;” and as the spoils of conquest, he bestowed the whole of it upon the pope — A.D. 755. “The representatives of the pope, who, however, always speak of the republic of Rome, passed through the land, receiving the homage of the authorities, and the keys of the cities. The district comprehended Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Iesi, Forlimpopoli, Forli with the Castle Sussibio, Montefeltro, Acerra, Monte di Lucano, Serra, San Marino, Bobbio, Urbino, Cagli, Luciola, Gubbio, Comachio, and Narni, which was severed from the dukedome of Spoleto.”

Astolph was soon afterward killed while hunting. The succession was disputed between Desiderius and Rachis. Desiderius secured the throne by courting the influence of the pope, and in return the pope compelled him to agree to surrender to the papacy five cities, and the whole duchy of Ferrara besides. The agreement was afterward fulfilled, and these territories were added to the kingdom of the pope.

Stephen III died April 26, 757, and was succeeded by his brother Paul. Paul glorified Pepin as a new Moses, who had freed Israel from the bondage of Egypt. As Moses had confounded idolatry, so had Pepin confounded heresy; and he rapturously exclaimed, “Thou, after God, art our defender and aider. If all the hairs of our heads were tongues, we could not give you thanks equal to your deserts.”

All the donations which Pepin had bestowed upon the papacy were received and held by the popes, under the pious fiction that they were for such holy uses as keeping up the lights in the churches, and maintaining the poor. But in fact they were held as the dominions of the new sovereign State descended from the Roman republic, the actual authority of which had now become merged in the pope, and by right of which the pope had already made Charles a Roman consul, and Pepin a patrician. All these territories the pope ruled as sovereign. He “took possession as lord and master; he received the homage of the authorities and the keys of the cities. The local or municipal institutions remained; but the revenue, which had before been received by the Byzantine crown, became the revenue of the church: of that revenue the pope was the guardian, distributor, possessor.”

— Milman. ^{f564}

In A.D. 768, Pepin died, was succeeded by his two sons, Charles and Carloman. In 771 Carloman died, leaving Charles sole king, who by his remarkable ability became Charles the Great, — Charlemagne, — and reigned forty-six years, — forty-three from the death of Carloman, — thirty-three of which were spent in almost ceaseless wars.

Charlemagne was a no less devout Catholic than was Clovis before him. His wars against the pagan Saxons were almost wholly wars of religion; and his stern declaration that “these Saxons must be Christianized or wiped out,” expresses the temper both of his religion and of his warfare. He completed the conquest of Lombardy, and placed upon his own head the iron crown of the kingdom, and confirmed to the papacy the donation of territory which Pepin had made. He extinguished the exarchate of Ravenna, and its territory “by his grant was vested, either as a kind of feud or in absolute perpetuity, in the pope.” — Milman.^{f565}

It seems almost certain that Charlemagne really aspired to consolidate the territories of the West into a grand new Roman empire. Saxony, Bohemia, Bavaria, Pannonia, the Lombard kingdom of Italy as far as the duchy of Beneventum, that part of Spain between the Pyrenees and the river Ebro, Burgundy, Allemannia, and all Gaul, were subject to his sway. In addition to the kingship of all the Frankish dominions, he wore the iron crown of Lombardy. The next step was to be emperor indeed; and that was soon brought about. Leo III was pope. In 799 he made a journey to France, and was royally received and entertained by Charlemagne. At an imperial banquet, the king and the pope quaffed together their rich wines with convivial glee.” — Milman.^{f566} In 800 Charlemagne made a journey to Rome. He arrived in the city November 23, and remained there through the month of December.

On Christmas day magnificent services were held. Charlemagne appeared not in the dress of his native country, but in that of a patrician of Rome, which honor he had inherited from his father, who had received it from the pope. Thus arrayed, the king with all his court, his nobles, and the people and the whole clergy of Rome, attended the services. “The pope himself chanted the mass; the full assembly were wrapped in profound devotion. At the close the pope rose, advanced toward Charles with a splendid crown in his hands, placed it upon his brow, and proclaimed him Caesar Augustus.” The dome of the great church “resounded with the acclamations of the people, ‘Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus,

crowned by God the great and pacific emperor of the Romans.” Then the head and body of Charlemagne were anointed with the “holy oil” by the hands of the pope himself, and the services were brought to a close.^{f567} In return for all this, Charlemagne swore to maintain the faith, the power, and the privileges of the church; and to recognize the spiritual dominion of the pope, throughout the limits of his empire.

Thus had the papacy arrogated to itself all the authority of the ancient Roman empire, and with this the prerogative of bestowing upon whom she would, the dignities, titles, and powers of that empire. And now, as the representative of God, the pope had re-established that empire by bestowing upon Charlemagne the dignity and titles of Caesar, Augustus, and emperor.

Such was the origin, and thus was established, the doctrine of “divine right” in rulers. Thus was established the doctrine of the supremacy of the bishop of Rome over all things earthly, to whom it “belongs” to set up and to pull down kings and emperors. Thus did the papacy become the dispenser of kingdoms and empires, the disposer of peoples, and the distributor of nations. As she had already, and for a long while, asserted supreme authority over all things spiritual, in heaven and hell, as well as upon earth, and now by this transaction was enabled to assert supremacy over kingdoms, and empires, and their rulers, henceforth the papacy recognized no limits to her dominion over heaven, earth, and hell.

Ever since that Christmas day, A.D. 800, Leo and all his successors have spent their lives, and exercised their boundless ambition, in making felt to the uttermost this blasphemous claim; and for ages, nations groaned and people perished, under the frightful exercise of this infernal power. Under it the famous and the infamous Hildebrand punished Henry IV, emperor of Germany, in the no less famous and infamous transaction of Canossa. Under it, through the gift of the pope to Henry II, of England, Ireland is oppressed to-day, equally as the servitor of England, and the slave of the pope. By it Urban and his successors unto Innocent III, like terrible Muezzin, called millions from Europe to dreadful slaughter in the Crusades; and through it, by the instrumentality of the “Holy” Inquisition, Innocent III and his successors unto Gregory XVI, poured out their demoniacal wrath upon the innocent Albigenses, the devoted Waldenses, and the millions of other Christians who by sword, by captivity, by dungeon, by rack, by torture, and by flame, yielded their lives rather than

submit to this horrible despotism over the bodies and souls, the actions and the thoughts, of men, choosing rather to die the free men of Christ, than to live the slaves of that filthy strumpet who has “deluged Europe and Asia with blood” (Gibbon ^{f568}) and whom the holy seer of Patmos saw “drunken with the blood of the saints, and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.”

<6171>Revelation 17:1-6.

And even the Inquisition in its practical workings, is but the logic of the theocratical theory upon which the papacy is founded. God is the moral governor. His government is moral only, whose code is the moral law. His government and his law have to do with the thoughts, the intents, and the secrets of men’s hearts. This must be ever the government of God, and nothing short of it can be the government of God. The papacy then being the head of what pretends to be a government of God, and ruling there in the place of God, her government must rule in the realm of morals, and must take cognizance of the counsels of the heart. But being composed of men, how can she discover what are the thoughts of men’s hearts whether they be good or evil, that she may pronounce judgment upon them? By long and careful experiment, and by intense ingenuity, means were discovered by which the most secret thoughts of men’s hearts might be wrung from them, and that was by the confessional first, and especially for those who submit to her authority; and by the thumbscrew, the rack, and her other horrible tortures second, and for those who would not submit — in one word it was by the Inquisition that it was accomplished.

There remained but one thing more to make the enormity complete, and that was not only to sanction but to deify the whole deceitful, licentious, and bloody record, with the assertion of infallibility. As all the world knows, this too has been done. And even this is but the logic of the theocratical theory upon which the foundation of the papacy was laid in the days of Constantine. For, the papacy being professedly the government of God, he who sits at the head of it, sits there as the representative of God. He represents the divine authority; and when he speaks or acts officially, his speech or act is that of God. But to make a man thus the representative of God, is only to clothe human passions with divine power and authority. And being human, he is bound always to act unlike God; and being clothed with irresponsible power, he will often act like the devil. Consequently, in order to make all his actions consistent with his profession, he is compelled to cover them all with the divine attributes, and make everything that he does in his official capacity the act of God. This is precisely the logic and

the profession of papal infallibility. It is not claimed that all the pope speaks is infallible; it is only what he speaks officially — what he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, from the throne. The decree of infallibility is as follows:

“We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed, that the Roman pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his church should be endowed for defining doctrines regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the church.

“But if any one — which may God avert — presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

“Given at Rome in public session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our pontificate.” ^{f569}

Under this theory, he sits upon that throne as the head of the government of God, and he sits there as God indeed. For the same pope that published this dogma of infallibility, published a book of his speeches, in the preface to which, in the official and approved edition, he is declared to be “The living Christ,” “The voice of God; “ “He is nature that protests; he is God that condemns.” ^{f570} Thus, in the papacy there is fulfilled to the letter, in completest meaning, the prophecy — ~~ROM~~ 2 Thessalonians 2:1-9- — of “the falling away” and the revealing of “that man of sin,” “the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.”

Therefore, sitting in the place of God, ruling from that place as God, that which he speaks from the throne is the word of God, and must be infallible. This is the inevitable logic of the false theocratical theory. And if it be denied that the theory is false, there is logically no escape from accepting the whole papal system.

Thus so certainly and so infallibly is it true that the false and grossly conceived view of the Old-Testament theocracy. contains within it the germ of THE ENTIRE PAPACY.^{f571}

CHAPTER 23.

PROTESTANTISM — TRUE AND FALSE.

THEN came the Reformation, protesting against the papal system, and asserting again the rights of the individual conscience, declaring for a separation between Church and State, and that to Caesar is to be rendered only that which is Caesar's, while men are left free to render to God, according to the dictates of their own conscience, that which is God's.

To Luther more than to any other one, there fell the blessed task of opening up the contest with the papacy, and of announcing the principles of Protestantism. It is not without cause that Luther stands at the head of all men in the great Reformation and in the history of Protestantism: for he alone of all the leaders in the Reformation times held himself and his cause aloof from the powers of this world, and declined all connection of the State with the work of the gospel, even to support it. After he had burnt the pope's bull, *Aleander*, the pope's nuncio, at the coronation of Charles V at Cologne, addressed the elector, Frederick of Saxony, whose subject Luther was, in these words: —

“See the immense perils to which this man exposes the Christian commonwealth. If a remedy is not speedily applied, the empire is destroyed. What ruined the Greeks, if it was not their abandonment of the pope? You cannot remain united to Luther without separating from Jesus Christ. In the name of his Holiness, I ask of you two things: first, to burn the writings of Luther; secondly, to punish him according to his demerits, or at least to give him up a prisoner to the pope. The emperor, and all the princes of the empire, have declared their readiness to accede to our demands; you alone still hesitate.” ^{f601}

The elector answered just then, that this was a matter of too much importance to be decided upon the spur of the moment, and at a later time he would give a definite answer. At this time Luther wrote to Spalatin, the elector's chaplain, these words: —

“If the gospel was of a nature to be propagated or maintained by the power of the world, God would not have intrusted it to

fishermen. To defend the gospel appertains not to the princes and pontiffs of this world. They have enough to do to shelter themselves from the judgments of the Lord and his Anointed. If I speak, I do it in order that they may obtain the knowledge of the divine word, and be saved by it.”^{f602}

As Luther was on his way home from the Diet of Worms, where he made his memorable defense, Frederick had him captured and carried away to the Wartburg, where he was kept in confinement to protect him from the wrath of the papacy, which, through the imperial power, was expressed in the following words: —

“We, Charles the Fifth, to all the electors, princes, prelates, and others, whom it may concern: —

“The Almighty having intrusted to us, for the defense of his holy faith, more kingdoms and power than he gave to any of our predecessors, we mean to exert ourselves to the utmost to prevent any heresy from arising to pollute our holy empire.

“The Augustine monk, Martin Luther, though exhorted by us, has rushed, like a madman, against the holy church, and sought to destroy it by means of books filled with blasphemy. He has, in a shameful manner, insulted the imperishable law of holy wedlock. He has striven to excite the laity to wash their hands in the blood of priests; and, overturning all obedience, has never ceased to stir up revolt, division, war, murder, theft, and fire, and to labor completely to ruin the faith of Christians. . . In a word, to pass over all his other iniquities in silence, this creature, who is not a man, but Satan himself under the form of a man, covered with the cowl of a monk, has collected into one stinking pool all the worst heresies of past times, and has added several new ones of his own....

“We have therefore sent this Luther from before our face, that all pious and sensible men may regard him as a fool, or a man possessed of the devil; and we expect that, after the expiry of his safe-conduct, effectual means will be taken to arrest his furious rage.

“Wherefore, under pain of incurring the punishment due to the crime of treason, we forbid you to lodge the said Luther so soon as

the fatal term shall be expired, to conceal him, give him meat or drink, and lend him by word or deed, publicly or secretly, any kind of assistance. We enjoin you, moreover, to seize him, or cause him to be seized, wherever you find him, and bring him to us without any delay, or to keep him in all safety until you hear from us how you are to act with regard to him, and till you receive the recompense due to your exertions in so holy a work.

“As to his adherents, you will seize them, suppress them, and confiscate their goods.

“As to his writings, if the best food becomes the terror of all mankind as soon as a drop of poison is mixed with it, how much more ought these books, which contain a deadly poison to the soul, to be not only rejected, but also annihilated! You will therefore burn them, or in some other way destroy them entirely.

“As to authors, poets, printers, painters, sellers or buyers of placards, writings, or paintings against the pope or the church, you will lay hold of their persons and their goods, and treat them according to your good pleasure.

“And if any one, whatever be his dignity, shall dare to act in contradiction to the decree of our imperial majesty, we ordain that he shall be placed under the ban of the empire.

“Let every one conform hereto.” ^{f603}

Luther remained in the Wartburg until March 3, 1522, when without permission from anybody, he left and returned to Wittenberg. Knowing that his leaving the Wartburg without saying anything to the elector, would be ungrateful, and knowing also that his returning at all was virtually disclaiming the elector's protection, he addressed to him, the third day of his journey, the following letter: —

“Grace and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

“Most serene elector, gracious lord: What has happened at Wittenberg, to the great shame of the gospel, has filled me with such grief, that if I were not certain of the truth of our cause, I would have despaired of it.

“Your Highness knows — or if not, please to be informed — I received the gospel not from men, but from heaven, by our Lord Jesus Christ. If I have asked for conferences, it was not because I had doubts of the truth, but from humility, and for the purpose of winning others. But since my humility is turned against the gospel, my conscience now impels me to act in a different manner. I have yielded enough to your Highness in exiling myself during this year. The devil knows it was not from fear I did it. I would have entered Worms, though there had been as many devils in the town as there were tiles on the roofs. Now Duke George, with whom your Highness tries so much to frighten me, is far less to be feared than a single devil. Had that which has taken place at Wittemberg taken place at Leipsic (the duke’s residence), I would instantly have mounted my horse and gone thither, even though (let your Highness pardon the expression) for nine days it should have done nothing but rain Duke Georges, and every one of them been nine times more furious than he is. What is he thinking of in attacking me? Does he take Christ, my Lord, for a man of straw? The Lord be pleased to avert the dreadful judgment which is impending over him.

“It is necessary for your Highness to know that I am on my way to Wittemberg, under a more powerful protection than that of an elector. I have no thought of soliciting the assistance of your Highness; so far from desiring your protection, I would rather give you mine. If I knew that your Highness could or would protect me, I would not come to Wittemberg. No sword can give any aid to this cause. God alone must do all without human aid or co-operation. He who has most faith is the best protector. Now, I observe that your Highness is still very weak in the faith.

“But since your Highness desires to know what to do, I will answer with all humility. Your electoral Highness has already done too much, and ought to do nothing at all. God does not wish, and cannot tolerate, either your cares and labors, or mine. Let your Highness, therefore, act accordingly.

“In regard to what concerns myself, your Highness must act as elector. You must allow the orders of his Imperial Majesty to be executed in your towns and rural districts. You must not throw any

difficulty in the way, should it be wished to apprehend or slay me; for none must oppose the powers that be, save He who established them. “Let your Highness, then, leave the gates open, and respect safe-conducts, should my enemies themselves, or their envoys, enter the States of your Highness in search of me. In this way you will avoid all embarrassment and danger.

“I have written this letter in haste, that you may not be disconcerted on learning my arrival. He with whom I have to deal is a different person from Duke George. He knows me well, and I know something of Him.

“Your electoral Highness’s most humble servant,
“*MARTIN LUTHER.* ^{f604}

“Borna, the Conductor Hotel, Ash-Wednesday, 1552.”

During his absence, fanatical spirits had arisen, and extreme and somewhat violent steps had been taken, and amongst the first words which he spoke upon his arrival in Wittenberg were these: —

“It is by the word that we must fight; by the word overturn and destroy what has been established by violence. I am unwilling to employ force against the superstitious or the unbelieving. Let him who believes approach; let him who believes not stand aloof. None ought to be constrained. Liberty is of the essence of faith.” ^{f605}

In 1524 the Swabian peasants revolted, and in January, 1525, Luther addressed to them the following words: —

“The pope and the emperor have united against me; but the more the pope and the emperor have stormed, the greater the progress which the gospel has made. . . Why so? Because I have never drawn the sword, nor called for vengeance; because I have not had recourse either to tumult or revolt. I have committed all to God, and awaited his strong hand. It is neither with the sword nor the musket that Christians fight, but with suffering and the cross. Christ, their captain, did not handle the sword; he hung upon the tree.” ^{f606}

And when, June 25, A.D. 1530, the memorable confession of Protestantism was made at Augsburg, that confession, framed under the direction of

Luther, though absent, accordingly announced for all future time the principles of Protestantism upon the subject of Church and State. Upon this question that document declared as follows: —

“ARTICLE 28.

“OF ECCLESIASTICAL POWER.

“There have been great controversies touching the power of the bishops, in which some have in an unseemly manner mingled together the ecclesiastical power, and the power of the sword. And out of this confusion there have sprung very great wars and tumults, while the pontiffs, trusting in the power of the keys, have not only instituted new kinds of service, and burdened men’s consciences by reserving of cases, and by violent excommunications; but have also endeavored to transfer worldly kingdoms from one to another, and to despoil emperors of their power and authority. These faults godly and learned men in the church have long since reprehended; and for that cause ours were compelled, for the comforting of men’s consciences, to show the difference between the ecclesiastical power and the power of the sword. And they have taught that both of them, because of God’s command, are dutifully to be revered and honored, as the chief blessings of God upon earth.

“Now, their judgment is this: that the power of the keys, or the power of the bishops, according to the gospel, is a power or command from God, of preaching the gospel, of remitting or retaining sins, and of administering the sacraments. For Christ sends his apostles forth with this charge: ‘As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.’ ^{<1612>}John 20:21-23. ‘Go, and preach the gospel to every creature,’ etc. ^{<1615>}Mark 16:15.

“This power is exercised only by teaching or preaching the gospel, and administering the sacraments, either to many, or to single individuals, in accordance with their call. For thereby not corporeal, but eternal things are granted; as, an eternal righteousness, the Holy Ghost, life everlasting. These things cannot be obtained but by the ministry of the word and of the sacraments; as Paul says, ‘The

gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.’ ^{<B16>}Romans 1:16. Seeing, the, than the ecclesiastical power bestows things eternal, and is exercised only by the ministry of the word, it does not hinder the civil government any more than the art of singing hinders civil government. For the civil administration is occupied about other matters, than is the gospel. The magistracy does not defend the souls, but the bodies, and bodily things, against manifest injuries; and coerces men by the sword and corporal punishments, that it may uphold civil justice and peace.

“Wherefore the ecclesiastical and the civil power are not to be confounded. The ecclesiastical power has its own command, to preach the gospel and to administer the sacraments. Let it not by force enter into the office of another; let it not transfer worldly kingdoms; let it not abrogate the magistrates’ laws; let it not withdraw from them lawful obedience; let it not hinder judgments touching any civil ordinances or contracts; let it not prescribe laws to the magistrate touching the form of the State; as Christ says, ‘My kingdom is not of this world.’ ^{<B18>}John 18:36. Again: ‘Who made me a judge or a divider over you?’ ^{<D14>}Luke 12:14. And Paul says, ‘Our conversation is in heaven.’ ^{<D10>}Philippians 3:20. ‘The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations,’ etc. ^{<D10>}2 Corinthians 10:4, 5.

“In this way ours distinguish between the duties of each power, one from the other, and admonish all men to honor both powers, and to acknowledge both to be the gifts and blessings of God.

“If the bishops have any power of the sword, they have it not as bishops by the command of the gospel, but by human law given unto them by kings and emperors, for the civil government of their goods. This, however, is another function than the ministry of the gospel.

“When, therefore, the question is concerning the jurisdiction of bishops, civil government must be distinguished from ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Again, according to the gospel, or, as they term it, by divine right, bishops, as bishops, that is, those who have the

administration of the word and sacraments committed to them, have no other jurisdiction at all, but only to remit sin, also to inquire into doctrine, and to reject doctrine inconsistent with the gospel, and to exclude from the communion of the church wicked men, whose wickedness is manifest, without human force, but by the word. And herein of necessity the churches ought by divine right to render obedience unto them; according to the saying of Christ, 'He that heareth you, heareth me.' ~~<2016>~~ Luke 10:16. But when they teach or determine anything contrary to the gospel, then the churches have a command of God which forbids obedience to them: 'Beware of false prophets.' ~~<1075>~~ Matthew 7:15. 'Though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, let him be accursed.' ~~<8008>~~ Galatians 1:8. 'We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.' ~~<4738>~~ 2 Corinthians 13:8. Also, 'This power the Lord hath given me to edification, and not to destruction.' ~~<4730>~~ 2 Corinthians 13:10."

This confession is a sound exposition of the doctrine of Christ concerning the temporal and the spiritual powers. It clearly and correctly defines the jurisdiction of the State to be only in things civil; that the sword which is wielded by the powers that be, is to preserve civil justice and peace; and that the authority of the State is to be exercised only over the bodies of men and the temporal concerns of life, that is, of the affairs of this world. This shuts away the State from all connection or interference with things spiritual or religious. It separates entirely religion and the State.

While doing this for the State, it also clearly defines the place of the church. While the State is to stand entirely aloof from spiritual and religious things and concern itself only with the civil and temporal affairs of men, the church on its part is to stand aloof from the affairs of the State, and is not to interfere in the civil and temporal concerns of men. The power of the church is not to be mingled with the power of the State. The power of the church is never to invade the realm, or seek to guide the jurisdiction, of the State. The duty of the clergy is to minister the gospel of Christ and not the laws of men. In dealing with its membership in the exercise of discipline, the church authorities are to act without human power, and solely by the word of God. The ministry of the gospel is with reference only to eternal things, and is not to trouble itself with political administration.

This is Protestantism. This is Christianity. Wherever these principles have been followed, there is Protestantism exemplified in the Church and the State. Wherever these principles have not been followed, there is the principle of the papacy, it matters not what the profession may have been.

THE LUTHERANS IN GERMANY.

In his later years, having refused to walk in the advancing light, and so having less of the word of God and therefore less faith, even Luther swerved from the genuine Christian and Protestant principle, denied any right of toleration to the Zwinglians, and advocated the banishment of “false teachers” and the utter rooting out of the Jews from “Christian” lands.^{f607} At Luther’s death many Protestants set themselves to maintain the doctrines stated by him, and steadily refused to take a single advance step. These thus became Lutherans rather than Protestants, and thus was formed the Lutheran Church. And though this church to this day holds the Augsburg Confession as one of its chief symbols; and though about the end of the seventeenth century “the Lutheran churches adopted the leading maxim of the Arminians, that Christians were accountable to God alone for their religious sentiments, and that no individual could be justly punished by the magistrate for his erroneous opinions, while he conducted himself like a virtuous and obedient subject, and made no attempts to disturb the peace and order of civil society” (Mosheim^{f608}); yet ever since the year 1817, the Lutheran Church has been a part of the Established Church of Prussia. And in the face of the declarations of the Augsburg Confession, the emperor of Germany to-day, as king of Prussia, is the supreme pontiff of the Lutheran Church in Prussia. In the Scandinavian countries also, the Lutheran Church is the State Church.

THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND.

Zwingle, who gave the cast to the Reformation in Switzerland, sanctioned, if he did not really create there, the union of Church and State. His view was that the State is Christian. “The Reformer deserting the paths of the apostles, allowed himself to be led astray by the perverse example of popery.” He himself “resolved to be at one and the same time the man of the State and of the Church,... at once the head of the State and general of the army — this double, this triple, part of the Reformer was the ruin of the Reformation and of himself.” For when war came on in Switzerland, Zwingle girded on his sword, and went with the troops to battle. “Zwingle

played two parts at once — he was a reformer and a magistrate. But these are two characters that ought no more to be united than those of a minister and of a soldier. We will not altogether blame the soldiers and the magistrates: in forming leagues and drawing the sword, even for the sake of religion, they act according to their point of view, although it is not the same as ours; but we must decidedly blame the Christian minister who becomes a diplomatist or a general.”

He who took the sword, perished by the sword. In the first battle that was fought — October 11, A.D. 1531 — twenty-five of the Swiss reform preachers were slain, the chief of whom was Zwingle, who fell stricken with many blows. “If the German Reformer had been able to approach Zwingle at this solemn moment and pronounce those oft-repeated words, ‘Christians fight not with sword and arquebuse, but with sufferings and with the cross,’ Zwingle would have stretched out his dying hand and said, ‘Amen.’” — D’Aubidgne.^{f609}

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

Although the Reformation was begun in England by Tyndale about the same time that it was commenced by Luther in Germany, it attracted no public notice until 1521, when Henry VIII, as the doughty champion of the papacy, promptly took up the enforcement of the pope’s bull; and Luther’s writings were publicly burnt in London, May 21. Cardinal Wolsey was master of ceremonies. “Before, a priest of a stately figure carried a rod, surmounted by a crucifix; behind him another, no less stately, carried the archiepiscopal cross of York; a nobleman, walking at his side, carried his cardinal’s hat. He was attended by nobles, prelates, ambassadors of the pope and the emperor, and these were followed by a long train of mules, carrying trunks with the richest and most splendid coverings. At London, amidst this magnificent procession, the writings of the poor monk of Wittemberg were carried to the flames. On arriving at the cathedral, the proud priest made even his cardinal’s hat be placed upon the altar. The virtuous bishop of Rochester took his station at the foot of the cross, and there, in animated tone, inveighed against heresy. The impious writings of the heresiarch were then brought forward, and devoutly burned in presence of an immense crowd. Such was the first news which England received of the Reformation.” — D’Aubigne.^{f610}

But Henry was not content with this; nor even with opposing the Reformation in his own dominions. He wrote to the Archduke Palatine of Germany, in the following words: —

“This fire, which has been kindled by Luther, and fanned by the arts of the devil, is raging everywhere. If Luther does not repent, deliver him and his audacious treatises to the flames. I offer you my royal co-operation, and even, if necessary, my life.”^{f611}

Nor did he stop here. He entered the lists as a theologian, and wrote against Luther a book entitled the “Defense of the Seven Sacraments Against Martin Luther, by the Most Invincible King of England, France, and Ireland, Henry, Eighth of the Name.” In the book he set himself forth as a sacrifice for the preservation of the church, and also proclaimed the papal principles, in the following words: —

“I will throw myself before the church, I will receive in my breast the poisoned darts of the enemy who is assailing her. To this the present state of affairs calls me. Every servant of Jesus Christ, whatever be his age, rank, or sex, must bestir himself against the common enemy of Christendom.

“Let us arm ourselves with double armor — with heavenly weapons, that by the arms of truth we may vanquish him who combats with the arms of error. But let us also arm ourselves with terrestrial armor, in order that, if he proves obstinate in his wickedness, the hand of the executioner may constrain him to silence; and he may thus, for once at least, be useful to the world by his exemplary punishment.”^{f612}

He denounced Luther as “an infernal wolf, a venomous viper, a limb of the devil,” and other such handsome things. By his partisans and flatterers, Henry’s book was extolled to the skies. It was declared “the most learned work that ever the sun saw,” and, appropriately enough indeed, it was compared with the works of St. Augustine. Henry himself they pronounced a Constantine, a Charlemagne, and even a second Solomon. Henry was no less pleased in fact with his performance, than the others pretended to be. He had his ambassador at Rome deliver to the pope in person a copy of the book; and the ambassador, in presenting it to the pope, who received him in full consistory, said: “The king, my master, assures you that, after

refuting the errors of Luther with his pen, he is ready to combat his adherents with the sword.”^{f613}

The grateful pope, as was to be expected, struck even yet a higher note of praise to Henry. Leo X replied that the book of the king of England could only have been composed with the aid of the Holy Spirit, and in return gave the ambassador both his foot and his cheek to be kissed, saying, “I will do for your master’s book as much as the church has done for St. Jerome and St. Augustine.” To his cardinals Leo said, “We must honor those noble champions who show themselves prepared to cut off with the sword the rotten members of Jesus Christ. What title shall we give to the virtuous king of England?” One suggested, “Protector of the Roman Church,” another, “Apostolic King;” as the final result, a bull was issued by the pope, proclaiming Henry VIII “Defender of the Faith,” and granting ten years’ indulgence to all who would read the king’s book.

The bull was promptly sent by a messenger to Henry, who of course was overjoyed when he received it. A moment after Henry received the bull, the king’s fool entered the room. Henry’s joy was so marked that the fool asked him the cause of it. The king replied, “The pope has just made me ‘Defender of the Faith.’” “The fool being the only wise man in the whole transaction, replied, “Ho! ho! good Harry, let you and me defend one another; but take my word for it, let the faith alone to defend itself.” Henry decided that the new dignity thus bestowed upon him should be publicly proclaimed. “Seated upon an elevated throne, with the cardinal at his right hand, he caused the pope’s letter to be read in public. The trumpets sounded; Wolsey said mass; the king and his court took their seats around a sumptuous table, and the heralds-at-arms proclaimed, “*Henricus Dei gratia Rex Angliae et Franciae, Defensor Fidei et Dominus Hibernaie!*” — “Henry, by the grace of God king of England and France, defender of the faith, and lord of Ireland.”^{f614}

Thus was acquired by the sovereign of England, the title and dignity of “Defender of the Faith,” which has been worn by all the successors of Henry, and is held to-day by Queen Victoria.

Luther was not the man to keep silence, not even when kings spoke. He had faced the emperor; he had defied the pope; and now he both contemns and defies Henry, and all the rest of the papal brood together. Besides meeting and overthrowing the king’s arguments in detail, his ringing words

of defiance of the papacy, and his faith in the word of God only and its power, were a call to all Europe to take refuge under the standard of the Reformation, and are worthy forever to be held in remembrance. The opening and the closing of his reply to Henry is as follows: —

“I will not deal mildly with the king of England; it is in vain (I know it is) to humble myself, to yield, beseech, and try the ways of peace. I will at length show myself more terrible than the ferocious beasts who are constantly butting me with their horns. I will let them feel mine: I will preach and irritate Satan until he wears himself out, and falls down exhausted. ‘If this heretic retracts not,’ says the new Thomas, Henry VIII, ‘he must be burnt.’ Such are the weapons now employed against me; first, the fury of stupid asses and Thomastical swine, and then the fire. Very well! Let these swine come forward, if they dare, and burn me! Here I am, waiting for them. My wish is, that my ashes, thrown, after my death, into a thousand seas, may arise, pursue, and engulf this abominable crew. Living, I will be the enemy of the papacy; burnt, I will be its destruction. Go, swine of St. Thomas; do what seemeth to you good. You shall ever find Luther as a bear in your way, and a lion in your path. He will thunder upon you from all quarters, and leave you no peace until he has brayed your brains of iron, and ground to powder your foreheads of brass. For me, I cease not to cry, ‘The gospel! the gospel! Christ! Christ!’ while my opponents cease not to reply, ‘Customs! customs! ordinances! ordinances! Fathers! Fathers!’ ‘Let your faith,’ says St. Paul, ‘stand not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,’ And the apostle, by this thunderbolt from heaven, overthrows and scatters, like the dust before the wind, all the silly crotchets of this Henry. To all the sayings of Fathers, men, angels, devils, I oppose not the antiquity of custom, not the multitude, but the word of the Eternal Majesty, the gospel, which they themselves are constrained to approve. By it I hold; on it I rest; in it I glory, triumph, and exult over papists, Thomists, Henrys, and all the hellish sty. The King of heaven is with me, and therefore I fear nothing, even should a thousand Augustines, a thousand Cyprians, and a thousand churches, of which Henry is defender, rise up against me. It is a small matter for me to despise and lash an earthly king, who himself has not feared, in his writing,

to blaspheme the King of heaven, and profane his holiness by the most audacious falsehood.

Papists! Will you not desist from your vain pursuits? Do as you please, the result, however, must be, that before the gospel which I, Martin Luther, have preached, popes, bishops, priests, monks, princes, devils, death, sin, and whatever is not Jesus Christ or in Jesus Christ, shall fall and perish.”^{f615}

Soon, however, Henry wanted a divorce from his wife, Catherine, that he might marry Anne Boleyn. The pope, Clement VII, proposed to grant him his wish, and actually signed a “decretal by which he himself annulled the marriage between Henry and Catherine.” He also “signed a valid engagement by which he declared beforehand that all retraction of these acts should be null and void.” — D’Aubigne.^{f616} Both these documents were committed to the legate, Compeggio, whom he was sending to England professedly to conduct the proceedings and accomplish the fact of the divorce; but at the same time gave him positive command that he must never let the decretal go out of his hands. Compeggio departed for England; the political winds suddenly veered, messengers were sent with all speed after him, directing him to delay both his journey, and all the proceedings as much as possible; and especially commanding him not to use the decretal, nor take any other step favorable to the divorce, without a new and express order from the pope himself. The outcome of it all was that the pope, finding it impracticable under the circumstances to offend the emperor, who was Catherine’s nephew, played so long his lingering game with Henry, with the hope of holding both sovereigns, that Henry grew impatient, and divorced both Catherine and the pope. This being accomplished, he proceeded at once, A.D. 1533, to put Anne Boleyn in the place of Catherine, as queen; and himself in the place of the pope, as head of the church in England. It was in the fullest sense of the word that Henry put himself in the place of the pope in the realm of England.

In 1534 the “Act of Supremacy” was passed by Parliament, by which “authority in all matters ecclesiastical was vested solely in the crown. The courts spiritual became as thoroughly the king’s courts as the temporal courts at Westminster. The statute ordered that the king ‘shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and state thereof as all the honors,

jurisdictions, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity belonging, and with full power to visit, repress, redress, reform, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction might or may lawfully be reformed.” — Green.^{f617}

The very pattern of the Inquisition was established in England. At the close of 1534 a statute was made which declared to be treason “the denial of any of the king’s titles,” and as the king in 1535 assumed the title, “On earth supreme head of the Church of England,” any denial of his headship of the church was therefore treason; and Thomas Cromwell pushed this principle to the utmost limit. “Spies were scattered broadcast over the land, secret denunciations poured into the open ear of the minister. The air was thick with tales of plots and conspiracies.... The confessional had no secrets from Cromwell. Men’s talk with their closest friends found its way to his ear. Words idly spoken, the murmurs of a petulant abbot, the ravings of a moonstruck nun, were, as the nobles cried passionately at his fall, tortured into treason. The only chance of safety lay in silence. But even the refuge of silence was closed by a law more infamous than any that has ever blotted the statute-book of England. Not only was thought made treason, but men were forced to reveal their thoughts on pain of their very silence being punished with the penalties of treason. All trust in the older bulwarks of liberty was destroyed by a policy as daring as it was unscrupulous. The noblest institutions were degraded into instruments of terror.” — Green.

^{f618}

That which was now the Church of England was simply that which before was the Catholic Church in England. “In form nothing had been changed. The outer Constitution of the church remained entirely unaltered.” In faith, likewise, nothing had been changed in fact, except in the mere change of the personages who assumed the prerogative of dispensers of it. Henry, as both king and pope, was now the supreme head of the church. “From the primate to the meanest deacon, every minister of it derived from him sole right to exercise spiritual powers. The voice of its preachers was the echo of his will. He alone could define orthodoxy or declare heresy. The forms of its worship and belief were changed and rechanged at the royal caprice.” For as early as 1532, Henry had laid down the proposition that “the king’s majesty hath as well the care of the souls of his subjects as their bodies; and may by the law of God by his Parliament make laws touching and concerning as well the one as the other.” — Green.^{f619}

Such was the “Reformation” accomplished by “Henry, Eighth of the Name,” so far as in him and his intention lay. But to be divorced from the pope of Rome was a great thing for England. And as Henry had set the example of revolt from papal rule when exercised from the papal throne, the English people were not slow in following the example thus set, and revolting from the same rule when exercised from the English throne. It began even in Henry’s reign, in the face of all the terrors of a rule “which may be best described by saying that it was despotism itself personified.” — Macaulay.^{f620} During the regency of Edward VI and under the guidance of Cranmer and Ridley, advance steps were taken even by the Church of England itself — the use of images, of the crucifix, of incense, tapers, and holy water; the sacrifice of the mass, the worship of saints, auricular confession, the service in Latin, and the celibacy of the clergy, were abolished. During the Catholic reaction under Mary, the spirit of revolt was confirmed; and under Elizabeth, when the polity of the Church of England became fixed, and thenceforward, it constantly, and at times almost universally, prevailed.

In short, the example set by Henry has been so well and so persistently followed through the ages that have since passed, that, although the Church of England still subsists, and, although the sovereign of England still remains the head of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith, both the office and the title are of so flexible a character that they easily adapt themselves to the headship and defense of the faith of Episcopalianism in England and of Presbyterianism in Scotland. And yet even more and far better than this, the present sovereign of England, Queen Victoria, has distinctly renounced the claim of right to rule in matters of faith. In 1859 Her Majesty issued a royal proclamation to her subjects in India, in which she said these words: —

“Firmly relying, ourselves, on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, we disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose our convictions on any of our subjects. We declare it to be our royal will and pleasure that none be in any wise favored, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observances, but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law; and we do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects, on pain of our highest displeasure.

“And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity to discharge.”

CALVINISM IN GENEVA.

The views of Calvin on the subject of Church and State, were as thoroughly theocratic as the papal system itself. Augustine was his master and model throughout. When at the age of twenty-eight, at the urgent call of Farel, Calvin settled in Geneva, he drew up a condensed statement of Christian doctrine, in fact a synopsis of his “Institutes,” consisting of twenty-one articles which all the citizens were called up in bunches of ten each, “To profess and swear to, as the confession of their faith.” This method of making a Calvinistic city was gone through with, Calvin himself said, “with much satisfaction.” This oath and confession of faith were made as citizens, not particularly as church members. They were not asked whether they were converted; they were not required to be church members; but simply as men and citizens, were required to take the oath and accept this as the confession of their faith.

In fact, the oath of allegiance as a citizen, and the confession of faith as a Christian, were identical. This was at once to make the Church and the State one and the same thing with the Church above the State. Yea, more than this, it was wholly to swallow up the civil in the ecclesiastical power; for the preachers were supreme. It was but another man-made theocracy, after the model of the papacy. Indeed, according to Calvin’s “Institutes,” the very reason of existence of the State, is only as the support and the servant of the church; and accordingly, when the magistrate inflicts punishment, he is to be regarded as executing the judgment of God. “What we see on the banks of the Leman is a theocracy; Jehovah was its head, the Bible was the supreme code, and the government exercised a presiding and paternal guardianship over all interests and causes, civil and spiritual.” — Wylie.^{f621}

Serious difficulty, however, arose, when it came to enforcing the strictness of scriptural morality, and the Calvinistic restrictions regarding the dress and manner of life of the citizens which the two preachers had adopted.^{f622} All who had been made Christian citizens by the machine method before mentioned, resented it, and desired that the strictness of discipline should

be modified. This the preachers looked upon as an attempt of the civil power to dictate in spiritual matters, and they refused to yield in the least degree. The people insisted, and the preachers stood firm. The dissension soon grew so violent that the preachers refused to administer the sacraments to the people; then the people rose up and banished them from the city, A.D. 1539.

Calvin went to Strasburg, where he remained two years, during which time much disorder prevailed in Geneva, and the friends of Calvin insisted all the time that if only he were recalled, order could be restored. In 1541 the decree of banishment was revoked, and at "the earnest entreaties of the Genevese, Calvin returned." He was no less determined than before to have his own way, and to make his will absolute; and the circumstances under which he returned, paved the way for him to execute his will as he was not suffered to do before. "He entered upon his work with a firm determination to carry out those reforms which he had originally purposed, and to set up in all its integrity that form of church policy which he had carefully matured during his residence at Strasburg." The town was divided into parishes, with an elder or some one appointed by the council of elders, in charge of each parish, to see that discipline was observed.

"His system of church polity was essentially theocratic; it assumed that every member of the State was also under the discipline of the church; and he asserted that the right of exercising this discipline was vested exclusively in the consistory, or body of preachers and elders. His attempts to carry out these views brought him into collision both with the authorities and with the populace, the latter being enraged at the restraints imposed upon the disorderly by the exercise of church discipline, and the former being inclined to retain in their-own hands a portion of that power in things spiritual, which Calvin was bent on placing exclusively in the hands so of the church rulers. His dauntless courage, his perseverance, and his earnestness at length prevailed, and he had the satisfaction, before he died, of seeing his favorite system of church polity firmly established, not only at Geneva, but in other parts of Switzerland, and of knowing that it had been adopted substantially by the Reformers in France and Scotland. Nor was it only in religious matters that Calvin busied himself; nothing was indifferent to him that concerned the welfare and good order of the State or the advantage of its citizens. His work, as has been justly said, 'embraced everything;' he was

consulted on every affair, great and small, that came before the council, — on questions of law, policy, economy, trade, and manufactures, no less than on questions of doctrine and church polity.” — Encyclopedia Britannica.^{f623}

It is plain that when every member of the State was subject to the discipline of the Church, and when this discipline was exercised exclusively by the body of preachers and elders with Calvin at the head of that body, his power was practically unlimited. And by this it is further evident that the system there made and established by Calvin, was but the papal system over again, with Calvin as pope.^{f624} And the use which he made of the power with which he was thus clothed, shows that he was as ready to exert the authority, as he was to sit in the place, of a pope.

The people having just thrown off the yoke of the pope of Rome, were not all ready to bear with meekness the yoke of the pope of Geneva. One of the first to speak out, was Gruet, who attacked him vigorously on his supremacy, called him “bishop of Asculum,” and “the new pope.” Among other points of dissent, Gruet denied the immortality of the soul. He may have been an infidel, but it is not certain; at any rate, he was brought before the council, by which he was condemned and punished with death. Another who dissented was Castalio, master of the public schools of Geneva. He attacked Calvin’s doctrine of unconditional predestination. He was deposed from his office and banished. Another was Jerome Bolsec, a monk who had been converted to Protestantism. He, too, attacked the doctrine of absolute decrees. He was thrown into prison, and after a two days’ debate with Calvin before the council, was banished.

Out of this grew still another. Jacques de Bourgogne, a lineal descendant of the dukes of Burgundy, and an intimate friend and patron of Calvin, had settled at Geneva solely to have the pleasure of his company. Bourgogne had employed Bolsec as his physician, and when Bolsec became involved in his difficulty with Calvin, Bourgogne came to his support, and tried to prevent his ruin. This so incensed Calvin that he turned his attention to the nobleman, who was obliged to leave Geneva, lest a worse thing should befall him.

Another, and the most notable of all the victims of Calvin’s theocracy, was Servetus, who had opposed the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and also infant baptism; and had published a book entitled “Christianity Restored,”

in which he declared his sentiments. At the instance and by the aid of Calvin, he had been prosecuted by the papal Inquisition, and condemned to death for blasphemy and heresy, but he escaped from their prison in Dauphine, in France, and in making his way to Italy, passed through Geneva, and there remained a short time. He was just about to start for Zurich, when at the instigation of Calvin, he was seized, and out of the book before mentioned, was accused of blasphemy. The result, as everybody knows, was that he was burned to death. The followers of Servetus were banished from Geneva.

Calvin's system of government was not confined to Geneva, however, nor did his idea die with him. It occupies almost as large a place in the subsequent history as does the papacy itself, of which throughout it is so close a counterpart. he himself tried during the reign of Edward VI to have it adopted in England. "He urged Cranmer to call together pious and rational men, educated in the school of God, to meet and agree upon one uniform confession of doctrine according to the rule of Scripture," declaring: "As for me, if I can be made use of, I will sail through ten seas to bring it about." — Bancroft.^{f625}

All his personal effort in this direction failed, however. He died May 27, A.D. 1564.

CALVINISM IN SCOTLAND.

It was stated above that before his death Calvin had the satisfaction of knowing that his system of church polity had been adopted in Scotland. No doubt this furnished him much satisfaction indeed. But if he could only have lived to see the time when that system was being worked in Scotland according to its perfect ideal, we may well believe that he would have fairly wept in the fullness of his unspeakable joy.

From A.D. 1638 to 1662, under the Covenanters, the Calvinistic system was supreme in Scotland; and "the arrogance of the ministers' pretensions and the readiness with which these pretensions were granted; the appalling conceptions of the Deity which were inculcated, and the absence of all contrary expression of opinion; the intrusions on the domain of the magistrate; the vexatious interference in every detail of family and commercial life, and the patience with which it was borne, are to an English reader alike amazing. 'We acknowledge,' said they, 'that according to the latitude of the word of God (which is our theame), we are allowed

to treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and smallest, from the king's throne that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant's balance that should be used in faithfulness.' The liberality of the interpretation given to this can only be judged of after minute reading." — Encyclopedia Britannica.^{f626}

In fact it was "one of the most detestable tyrannies ever seen on the earth. When the Scotch Kirk was at the height of its power, we may search history in vain for any institution which can compete with it, except the Spanish Inquisition. Between these two, there is a close and intimate analogy. Both were intolerant, both were cruel, both made war upon the finest parts of human nature, and both destroyed every vestige of religious freedom." — Buckle.

PURITANISM AND THE NEW ENGLAND THEOCRACY.

After Scotland, it was in Puritan New England that the Calvinistic system of government most nearly reached its ideal.

The rise of the Puritans was on this wise: To escape the persecutions by Mary, in her attempt to restore Catholicism as the religion of England, many members of the Church of England fled to Germany. The worship of these while in exile was conducted by some with the rites of the Church of England as established under Edward VI, while others adopted the Swiss or Calvinistic form of worship. This caused a division, and much contention between them. "The chief scene of these disturbances was Frankfort." John Knox took the leadership of those who were inclined to Calvinism, while Cox, who afterward became bishop of Ely, was the chief of those who defended the forms of the Church of England. Those who maintained the English form of worship were called Conformists, and those who advocated Calvinistic forms, were called Non-Conformists. The contentions finally grew so bitter that the Conformists drove the Non-Conformists out of the city.

At the accession of Elizabeth, November, 1558, the exiles returned to England carrying their differences with them. There the Non-Conformists acquired the nick-name of "Puritans." "A Puritan, therefore, was a man of severe morals, a Calvinist in doctrine, and a Non-Conformist to the ceremonies and discipline of the Church [of England], though they did not totally separate from it." — Neal. Yet more than this: they were not only not separate from the Church of England, but it was not the purpose of the

Puritans to separate from either the church, or the government, of England. It was their set purpose to remain in, and a part of, both, to “reform” both, and create and establish instead a Puritan Church of England, and a Puritan government of England.

The controversy, as already stated, turned upon the forms of worship — whether the clergy should wear vestments, whether the church should be governed by bishops, about cathedral churches, and the archdeacons, deans, canons, and other officials of the same; about festivals and holy-days; the sign of the cross, god-fathers, god-mothers, etc. The Conformists held firmly to the form of worship as established under Edward VI; the Puritans insisted on going the full length in renouncing all the remaining forms and ceremonies. The queen was not in favor of adopting even the system established under Edward, but inclined yet more toward the papal system. Under the circumstances, she rather connived at the efforts of the Puritan party until she had made herself secure on the throne. In addition to this, many seeing the queen herself neglecting the forms enjoined by statute, did the same thing. The result was that the Puritan principles so grew in favor that in the convocation of 1562, when a motion was made to abolish most of the usages in dispute, it was lost by only a single vote, the vote standing fifty-eight for the motion and fifty-nine against it. ^{F629}

As Elizabeth saw that the Puritan party was rapidly growing, she thought to check it by enforcing uniformity according to the established usage. In this she was zealously supported, if not rather led, by the archbishop of Canterbury. This attempt at coercion — 1567 — caused the Puritans to add to their objections to caps, surplices, tippets, etc., a strong dislike for the whole system of episcopacy, and a stronger determination to substitute for it the Presbyterian form of ecclesiastical polity. And as “it is manifest that the obstinacy of bold and sincere men is not to be quelled by any punishments that do not exterminate them, and that they were not likely to entertain a less conceit of their own reason when they found no arguments so much relied on to refute it as that of force” (Hallam, the inevitable consequence was that the efforts to enforce uniformity only caused non-conformity to grow more determined and more prevalent.

The Puritans had now grown into a powerful party, and, owing to the difficulties of her position, Elizabeth, whose interest in any matter of religion — unless that perhaps of the papal — was more political than anything else, might have been even yet brought to assent to some of their

demands if the Puritans could have been content with anything like moderation. But they now made such extravagant demands, and asserted such extreme doctrines, that it became at once apparent that they would be content with nothing less than the utter subversion of the State, and the establishment in England of the system by which Calvin had ruled Geneva.

About 1570 this movement took definite shape; and among the leaders in the movement, "Thomas Cartwright was the chief. He had studied at Geneva; he returned with a fanatical faith in Calvinism, and in the system of church government which Calvin had devised; and as Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge, he used to the full the opportunities which his chair gave him of propagating his opinions. No leader of a religious party ever deserved less of after sympathy. Cartwright was unquestionably learned and devout, but his bigotry was that of a mediaeval in-quisitor. The relics of the old ritual, the cross in baptism, the surplice, the giving of a ring in marriage, were to him not merely distasteful, as they were to the Puritans at large; they were idolatrous, and the mark of the beast.

"His declamation against ceremonies and superstition, however, had little weight with Elizabeth or her primates; what scared them was his most reckless advocacy of a scheme of ecclesiastical government which placed the State beneath the feet of the Church. The absolute rule of bishops, indeed, Cartwright denounced as begotten of the devil, but the absolute rule of presbyters he held to be established by the word of God. For the church modeled after the fashion of Geneva he claimed an authority which surpassed the wildest dreams of the masters of the Vatican. All spiritual authority and jurisdiction, the decreeing of doctrine, the ordering of ceremonies, lay wholly in the hands of the ministers of the church. To them belonged the supervision of public morals. In an ordered arrangement of classes and synods, these presbyters were to govern their flocks, to regulate their own order, to decide in matters of faith, to administer 'discipline'. Their weapon was excommunication, and they were responsible for its use to none but Christ." — Green.

The actual relation which the State was to bear toward the Church, the magistrates toward the ecclesiastics, was set forth as follows, in a "Second Admonition to Parliament," — 1572 — "the legislator" of the proposed Puritan republic: —

“It must be remembered that civil magistrates must govern the church according to the rules of God prescribed in his word, and that as they are nurses, so they be servants unto the church; and as they rule in the church, so they must remember to submit themselves unto the church, to submit their scepters, to throw down their crowns before the church, yea, as the prophet speaketh, to lick the dust off the feet of the church.” — Cartwright.^{F631}

“The province of the civil ruler in such a system of religion as this, was simply to carry out the decisions of the presbyters, ‘to see their decrees executed, and to punish the condemners of them.’ Nor was this work of the civil power likely to be light work. The spirit of Calvinistic Presbyterianism excluded all toleration of practice or belief. Not only was the rule of ministers to be established as the legal form of church government, but all other forms, Episcopalian or Separatist, were to be ruthlessly put down. For heresy there was the punishment of death. Never had the doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity. ‘I deny,’ wrote Cartwright, ‘that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death.... Heretics ought to be put to death now. If this be bloody and extreme, I am content to be so counted with the Holy Ghost!’

“The violence of language such as this was as unlikely as the dogmatism of his theological teaching, to commend Cartwright’s opinions to the mass of Englishmen. Popular as the Presbyterian system became in Scotland, it never took any popular hold on England. It remained to the last a clerical, rather than a national, creed; and even in the moment of its seeming triumph under the commonwealth, it was rejected by every part of England save London and Lancashire.^{F633} But the bold challenge which Cartwright’s party delivered to the government in 1572, in an ‘Admonition to the Parliament,’ which denounced the government of bishops as contrary to the word of God, and demanded the establishment in its place of government by presbyters, raised a panic among English statesmen and prelates, which cut off all hopes of a quiet treatment of the merely ceremonial questions which really troubled the consciences of the more advanced Protestants. The natural progress of opinion abruptly ceased, and the moderate thinkers who had pressed for a change in ritual which would have satisfied the zeal of the Reformers, withdrew from union with a

party which revived the worst pretensions of the papacy.” —
Green. ^{F634}

From this time forward, Elizabeth, zealously supported, if not led, by the archbishop of Canterbury, and his subjects, exerted all her power to crush the Puritans. And though the persecution was cruel, they bore it all with patience; first, because every effort that was made to crush them only multiplied their fame and influence a hundred-fold, and, second, because they lived in strong hope that better days, if not their actual triumph, would come when Elizabeth was gone. And as Elizabeth steadily refused to marry, and thus cut off every possibility of heirship to the throne through her, the hopes of the Puritans strengthened as her age increased; because James of Scotland was next in the line of succession, and was not Presbyterianism established in Scotland? And had not James in 1590, with his Scottish bonnet off and his hands raised to heaven declared: —

“I praise God that I was born in the time of the light of the gospel, and in such a place as to be king of such a church, the sincerest [purest] kirk in the world. The church of Geneva keep Pasche and Yule [Easter and Christmas]; what have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbor Kirk of England, their services are an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and I, forsooth, as long as I brook my life, shall maintain the same”? ^{f635}

And had he not in 1591, written a letter to Elizabeth requesting her to “show favor to Mr. Cartwright and his brethren, because of their great learning and faithful travels in the gospel”? Was not James therefore a good Presbyterian? And would he not surely put the Puritans in their long-coveted position in England?

Elizabeth died March 24, 1603, and was at once succeeded by James. Before he left Scotland for London to be crowned king of England, he gave public thanks to God in the church of Edinburgh, that he was leaving “both kirk and kingdom in that state which he intended not to alter any ways, his subjects living in peace.” — Neal. ^{F636}

This, however, as well as the speech before quoted, was but a piece of that “kingcraft” upon which James prided himself. He had been brought up

under Calvinistic discipline in Scotland, and had enough of it; and as a matter of fact, he was only too glad of the opportunity to break loose from all Presbyterian and Puritan influence; and this opportunity he used to the full when he reached London. He called a conference of the two church parties, at which he openly took his stand for Episcopacy and the Church of England as it was, and renounced all connection with the Puritans, or favor for them. He told the Puritans in the conference, "If this be all your party have to say, I will make them conform, or I will harrie them out of the land, or else worse — hang them, that's all." Not long afterward, he declared in his council of State, that "his mother and he from their cradles had been haunted with a Puritan devil, which he feared would not leave him to his grave; and that he would hazard his crown but he would suppress those malicious spirits." — Bancroft.^{F637} Accordingly he issued a proclamation commanding all Puritans to conform or suffer the full extremity of the laws, and the archbishop of Canterbury followed it up "with unrelenting rigor."

Meanwhile, some of the Puritans seeing that the prospect from new Presbytery, was but the same as from old priest, only writ large, drew off from the Puritan party, as well as from the Church of England, and advocated a complete separation from both systems as to church government. They held that each church or assembly of worshipers is entirely independent of all others, and self-governing; that all points of doctrine or discipline are to be submitted to the congregation for discussion and final decision; and that each congregation should elect its own pastor, etc. For this reason they were called Independents or Congregationalists, and were nicknamed Separatists.

Upon these the wrath of both Puritans and Conformists was poured with about equal virulence. As early as 1567, one of these Congregations was formed in London; but it was forcibly broken up, thirty-one of its members being imprisoned for nearly a year. Persecution, however, only caused their numbers to grow, and by 1576 they formed a distinct sect under the leadership of Robert Brown, from whom they were again nicknamed Brownists. And still they were subject to the enmity of both old ecclesiastical parties. Their meetings were broken up by mobs, and the result to individuals is described as follows, by one who wrote at the time an account of a "tumult in Fleet street, raised by the disorderly preachment, pratings, and prattlings of a swarm of Separatists: —

“At length they catcht one of them alone, but they kickt him so vehemently as if they meant to beat him into a jelly. It is ambiguous whether they have kil’d him or no, but for a certainty they did knock him about as if they meant to pull him to pieces. I confesse it had been no matter if they had beaten the whole tribe in the like manner.”^{f638}

In 1592 Bacon wrote concerning them: “As for those which we call Brownists, being, when they were at the most, a very small number of very silly and base people, here and there in corners dispersed, they are now, thanks to God, by the good remedies that have been used, suppressed and worn out; so that there is scarce any news of them.”^{f639} Yet in 1593 there were twenty thousand of them; and in the same year, at the order of Archbishop Whitgift, three of their leading men were hanged, two of whom had already been in prison seven years. The crime of which they were convicted and for which they were executed, was “separation from the Church of England.”

The attitude and the words of King James, were simply a proclamation of the continuance of the war which Elizabeth had already waged against the Puritans and Congregationalists, and caused the Separatist principles and numbers more to grow. The chief of the Separatists was now William Brewster, a prominent man of Scrooby. Assisted by John Robinson, he organized a congregation in 1606, which held its meetings in his own drawing-room at Scrooby Manor. They were so persecuted and abused by all classes, as well as by the officers of the law, that in 1608 they fled to Holland, stopping first at Amsterdam, and afterward going to Leyden in 1609. From there a company of these PILGRIMS sailed, and landed at Plymouth, New England, in 1620.

The success of this venture suggested to the Puritans a new scheme. Was not here an opportunity to establish a complete and unabridged Puritan government? And was not the way fully opened, and the opportunity easy to be improved? Enough! They would do it. The scheme was talked about, pamphlets were written, a company was formed, a grant of land was obtained, and John Endicott, with a company of sixty, was sent over in 1628. They joined a fishing settlement at the place afterward called Salem on Massachusetts Bay.

In 1629 a royal charter was obtained, creating "The Government and Colony of Massachusetts Bay in New England;" and four hundred and six people, led by Francis Higginson, were sent over, and Endicott became governor of the whole colony.

A Puritan or Calvinistic government was at once established and put into working order. A church was immediately organized according to the Congregational form, with Higginson and Samuel Skelton as the ministers. All, however, were not inclined to Puritanism. Two persons of the former company at Salem, John and Samuel Browne, took the the lead in worshiping according to their own wish, conducting their service after the Episcopal order, using the book of common prayer. Their worship was forbidden. The Brownes replied, "You are Separatists, and you will shortly be Anabaptists." The Puritans answered, "We separate, not from the Church of England, but from its corruptions. We came away from the common prayer and ceremonies, in our native land, where we suffered much for non-conformity; in this place of liberty we cannot, we will not, use them. Their imposition would be a sinful violation of the worship of God."^{f640} In return the Brownes were rebuked as Separatists; their defense was pronounced sedition; their worship was declared mutiny; and they were sent back to England as "factious and evil-conditioned men," Endicott declaring that "New England was no place for such as they."

Higginson died in the winter of 1629-30. In 1630 there came over another company led by John Winthrop and Thomas Dudley, who were the governor and deputy-governor to succeed Endicott. "Their embarkation in 1630 was the signal of a general movement on the part of the English Puritans. Before Christmas of that year seventeen ships had come to New England, bringing more than one thousand passengers." — Fiske.^{f641} Dudley's views of toleration and liberty of conscience are expressed in the following lines, which he wrote: —

*"Let men of God in courts and churches watch
O'er such as do a toleration hatch,
Lest that ill egg bring forth a cockatrice
To poison all with heresy and vice."*^{f642}

And Winthrop's estimate of the preachers is seen in his declaration that "I honored a faithful minister in my heart, and could have kissed his feet."^{f643} It was therefore not at all strange that under the government of Winthrop and Dudley in 1631, the following law should be enacted: —

“To the end this body of the commons may be preserved of honest and good men, it is ordered and agreed that, for the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same.”

“Thus the polity became a theocracy; God himself was to govern his people; and the ‘saints by calling,’ . . . were, by the fundamental law of the colony, constituted the oracle of the divine will.... Other States have confined political rights to the opulent, to free-holders, to the first-born; the Calvinists of Massachusetts, refusing any share of civil power to the clergy, established the reign of the visible church, a commonwealth of the chosen people in covenant with God.” — Bancroft. ^{f644}

This was the Calvinistic system precisely. The preachers were not to hold office in itself, but they were to be the rulers of all who did. For, as no man could be a citizen unless he was a member of the church; and as none could become members of the churches or even “propounded to the congregation, except they be first allowed by the elders;” this was to make the preachers supreme. This is exactly the position they occupied. They were consulted in everything, and everything must be subject to their dictation.

Other companies of immigrants continued to come, and the colony rapidly grew. In 1634 there were nearly four thousand in the colony.

In 1631 Roger Williams landed in Boston, and as the death of Higginson had left a vacancy in the church at Salem, the church called Williams to fill his place; but as Winthrop and his “assistants” objected, Williams went to Plymouth Colony.

The leading minister in Massachusetts Colony at this time was John Cotton. He distinctly taught the blessedness of persecution in itself, and in its benefit to the State, in the following words: —

“But the good brought to princes and subjects by the due punishment of apostate seducers and idolaters and blasphemers, is manifold.

“**First**, it putteth away evil from among the people, and cutteth off a gangrene, which would spread to further ungodliness....

“**Secondly**, it driveth away wolves from worrying and scattering the sheep of Christ. For false teachers be wolves,... and the very name of wolves holdeth forth what benefit will redound to the sheep, by either killing them or driving them away.

“**Thirdly**, such executions upon such evil doers causeth all the country to heare and feare and doe no more such wickednesse.... Yea, as these punishments are preventions of like wickednesse in some, so are they wholesome medicines, to heale such as are curable of these eviles....

“**Fourthly**, the punishments executed upon false prophets and seducing teachers, doe bring downe showers of God’s blessings upon the civill state...

“**Fifthly**, it is an honour to God’s justice that such judgments are executed.^{f645}

And Samuel Shepard, a minister of Charlestown, preached an election sermon entitled “Eye Salve,” in which he set forth the following views: —

“Men’s lusts are sweet to them, and they would not be disturbed or disquieted in their sin. Hence there be so many such as cry up tolleration boundless and libertinism so as (if it were in their power) to order a total and perpetual confinement of the sword of the civil magistrate unto its scabbard (a motion that is evidently diestructive to this people, and to the publick liberty, peace, and prosperity of any instituted churches under heaven).

“Let the magistrate’s coercive power in matters of religion, therefore, be still asserted, seeing he is one who is bound to God more than any other man to cherish his true religion;... and how wofull would the state of things soon be among us, if men might have liberty without controll to profess, or preach, or print, or publish what they list, tending to the seduction of others.”^{f646}

In accordance with these principles, every inhabitant of the colony was obliged to attend the services of the Established Church on Sunday under penalty of fine or imprisonment. The fine was not to exceed five shillings, equal to about five dollars of the present day, for every absence.

About 1633 Roger Williams was called a second time to the ministry of the Salem church. This time he was allowed to take the place; but it was not

long before he was again in trouble with the theocrats. He denounced their laws making church membership a qualification for office, and all their laws enforcing religious observances.

He declared that the worst law in the English code was that by which they themselves when in England had been compelled to attend the parish church; and he reproved their inconsistency in counting that persecution in England, and then doing the same things themselves in New England.

They maintained, as argued by Cotton, that “persecution is not wrong in itself. It is wicked for falsehood to presencute truth, but it is the sacred duty of truth to persecute falsehood.” And, as stated by Winthrop, that “we have come to New England in order to make a society after our own model; all who agree with us may come and join that society; those who disagree may go elsewhere; there is room enough on the American continent.”^{f647}

Roger Williams told them that to compel men to unite with those of a different faith is an open violation of natural right; and that to drag to public worship the irreligious and the unwilling, is only to require hypocrisy. “Persons may with less sin be forced to marry whom they cannot love, than to worship where they cannot believe.”^{f648} Accordingly he insisted that “no one should be bound to worship or to maintain a worship against his own consent.”

At this the theocrats inquired with pious amaze, “What, is not the laborer worthy of his hire?” To which Roger replied in words which they could not fail fully to understand, “Yes, from them that hire him.”

The view that the magistrates must be chosen exclusively from membership in the churches, he exploded with the argument that with equal propriety they should select a doctor of physic or the pilot of a ship, because of his standing in the church.

Against the statements of Cotton and Shepard and the claims of the theocrats altogether, as to the right of the magistrate to forestall corrupting influences upon the minds of the people, and to punish error and heresy, he set the evident and everlasting truth that “magistrates are but the agents of the people or its trustees, on whom no spiritual power in matters of worship can ever be conferred, since conscience belongs to the individual, and is not the property of the body politic;... the civil magistrate may not

intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy; this power extends only to the bodies and goods and outward estate of men.”^{f649}

The theocrats raised the alarm that these principles subverted all good government. To which he replied: “There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth or a human combination or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for turns upon these two hinges, that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship’s prayers or worship, nor compelled from their particular prayers or worship, if they practice any.”^{f650} “The removal of the yoke of soul-oppression, as it will prove an act of mercy and righteousness to the enslaved nations, so it is of binding force to engage the whole and every interest and conscience to preserve the common liberty and peace.”^{f651}

He also denied the right of the compulsory imposition of an oath. The magistrates had decided to require an oath of allegiance to Massachusetts, instead of to the king of England. Williams would not take the oath, and his influence was so great that so many others refused also that the government was compelled to drop the project. This caused them to raise a charge against him as the ally of a civil faction. The church at Salem stood by him, and in the face of the enmity of the theocrats elected him their teacher. This was no sooner done than the preachers met together and declared that any one who should obstinately assert that “the civil magistrate might not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostasy and heresy,” was worthy of banishment. A committee of their order was appointed to go to Salem and deal with Williams and the church “in a church way.”

Meantime the people of Salem were punished for choosing him for their teacher, by the withholding of a tract of land to which they had laid claim. Williams was ready to meet the committee at every point in expressing and defining his doctrines, and in refuting all their claims. After the committee had returned, the church by Williams wrote letters to all the churches of which any of the magistrates were members, “that they should admonish the magistrates of their injustice.” By the next general court the whole of Salem was disfranchised until they should apologize for these letters. The town and the church yielded. Roger Williams stood alone. He was able and

willing to do it, and at once declared his “own voluntary withdrawing from all these churches which were resolved to continue in persecuting the witnesses of the Lord,” and “hoped the Lord Jesus was sounding forth in him the blast which should in his own holy season cast down the strength and confidence of those inventions of men.” In October, 1635, he was summoned before the chief representatives of the State. He went and “maintained the rocky strength” of his position, and declared himself “ready to be bound and banished, and even to die in New England,” rather than to renounce his convictions.

By the earnest persuasions of Cotton, the general court of 1635, by a small majority, sentenced him to exile, and at the same time attempted to justify the sentence by the flimsy plea that it was not a restraint on freedom of conscience, but because the application of the new doctrine to their institutions seemed “to subvert the fundamental state and government of the country.” In January, 1636, a warrant was sent to him to come to Boston and take ship for England. He refused to go. Officers were sent in a boat to bring him, but he was gone. “Three days before, he had left Salem, in winter snow and inclement weather, of which he remembered the severity even in his late old age. ‘For fourteen weeks he was sorely tost in a bitter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean.’ Often in the stormy night he had neither fire, nor food, nor company; often he wandered without a guide, and had no house but a hollow tree. But he was not without friends. The respect for the rights of others which had led him to defend the freedom of conscience, had made him the champion of the Indians. He had learned their language during his residence at Plymouth; he had often been the guest of the neighboring sachems; and now, when he came in winter to the cabin of the chief of Pokanoket, he was welcomed by Massassoit; and ‘the barbarous heart of Canonicus, the chief of the Narragansetts, loved him as his son to the last gasp.’ ‘The ravens,’ he relates, ‘fed me in the wilderness.’”^{f652}

The act of 1631 making membership in the church a test of citizenship had involved the theocrats in another dilemma. There was a considerable number of people who were not members of the churches, and because of unfitness could not be admitted. Even more than this, they did not want to be admitted. But as membership in the church was necessary to citizenship, and as they wanted to be, and deemed it their right to be, citizens, they took to organizing churches of their own. But the theocrats were not willing that power should slip through their fingers in any such

way as this; they found not only a way to escape from the dilemma, but with that to make their power more absolute. In 1635 the following law was enacted: —

“Forasmuch as it hath bene found by sad experience, that much trouble and disturbance hath happened both to the Church & civill State by the officers & members of some churches, wch which have bene gathered.... in an vndue manner,... it is... ordered that... this court doeth not, nor will hereafter approue of any such companies of men as shall henceforth ioyne in any pretended way of church fellowship, without they shall first acquainte the magistrates, & the elders of the greatr of the churches in this jurisdicon, with their intencons, and have their approbacon herein. And ffurther, it is ordered, that noe peson, being a member of any churche which shall hereafter be gathered without the approbacon of the magistrates, & the greater pte of the said churches, shall be admitted to the freedom of this comonwealthe.” ^{f653}

In May, 1636, Henry Vane was elected governor. Some time before this Anne Hutchinson, with her family, had come over from Lincolnshire, being followed later by her brother-in-law, John Wheelwright. She was an excellent woman, and made many friends, and at her house held religious meetings for women. The object of these meetings. was to talk over the sermons for mutual edification; but as was natural, they drifted into the discussion of the ministers rather than their sermons. In one of these meetings Mrs. Hutchinson happened to remark that of the ministers “none did preach the covenant of free grace but Master Cotton,” and that they “had not the seal of the Spirit, and so were not able ministers of the New Testament.” This remark soon got into circulation among the preachers, and of course was not at all palatable.

As Cotton was named as the one exemplary minister, in October the ministers went in a body to his house to call him to account. Cotton proposed that the other ministers and Mrs. Hutchinson should have a friendly interview at his house, in order to come to an understanding. She, suspecting a trap, was rather wary at first, and declined to commit herself to any definite statement upon the point at issue, but being urged by the “Rev.” Hugh Peters to deal fairly and honestly with them, she allowed herself at last to be persuaded to say that the report was in substance true, and that she did in truth see a wide difference between Cotton’s preaching

and theirs; “that they could not preach a covenant of grace so clearly as he, because they had not the seal of the Spirit.”

Instead of the preachers’ being reconciled to Mrs. Hutchinson’s view, or to Cotton, their enmity was deepened. The matter spread more and more, and the colony was divided into two parties; and at the head of the Hutchinson party was Vane, the governor.

In January 1637, on a fast-day, John Wheelwright preached in Boston to the effect that “it maketh no matter how seemingly holy men be according to the law, if... they are such as trust to their own righteousness they shall die, saith the Lord. Do ye not after their works; for they say and do not. They make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments; and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues; and greetings in the market place, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and ye shall be saved, for being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. And the way we must take if so be we will not have the Lord Jesus Christ taken from us is this: we must all prepare a spiritual combat, we must put on the whole armor of God, and must have our loins girt up and be ready to fight;... because of fear, in the night, if we will not fight, the Lord Jesus Christ may come to be surprised.” ^{f654}

This brought matters to a crisis. In March the legislature met, and a court was appointed, composed of Henry Vane, twelve magistrates, twelve preachers, and thirty-three deputies. Wheelwright was arraigned before the court. His sermon was brought forth, and an attempt was made to have him admit that when he spoke in the sermon of those under a covenant of works, he meant his brother ministers in the colony. Of course it was easy for him to throw the matter on them. He demanded that they controvert his doctrine. He said he was ready to prove by the Scriptures that the doctrine was true. As to who was meant in the sermon, he told them that “if he were shown any that walked in such a way as he had described to be a covenant of works, them did he mean.” The rest of the ministers were asked by the court if they “did walk in such a way.” “They all acknowledged that they did,” except Cotton, who declared that “Brother Wheelwright’s doctrine was according to God in the parts controverted, and wholly and altogether.”

By hard work the opposition succeeded in having Wheelwright convicted of sedition; but they were not able to secure sentence at once, and had him remanded to the next session. As soon as the decision was known, more than sixty of the leading citizens of Boston signed a petition to the court in behalf of Wheelwright, in which they referred to the persecution as a restriction of the right of free speech, and among other things said: —

“Paul was counted a pestilent fellow, or a mover of sedition, and a ringleader of a sect,... and Christ himselfe, as well as Paul, was charged to bee a teacher of new doctrine.... Now wee beseech you, consider whether that old serpent work not after his old method, even in our dailies.... Thirdly, if you look at the effects of his doctrine upon the hearers, it hath not stirred up sedition in us, not so much as by accident; wee have not drawn the sword, as sometimes Peter did, rashly, neither have wee rescued our innocent brother, as sometimes the Israelites did Jonathan; and yet they did not seditiously. The covenant of free grace held forth by our brother hath taught us rather to become humble suppliants to your worships, and if wee should not prevaile, wee would rather with patience give our cheekes to the smelters.” ^{f655}

It is not necessary to follow particulars farther; the question was made the issue at the next election. Wheelwright's enemies carried the day, electing Winthrop governor. At the next session held in November, he was summoned to appear, and was ordered to submit, or prepare for sentence. He maintained that as he had preached only the truth of Christ, he was guilty of neither sedition nor contempt. The court replied that they had not censured his doctrine, but had left that as it was; but the censure was upon the application by which “he laid the magistrates and ministers and most of the people in this church under a covenant of works.” He was sentenced to be disfranchised and banished, and he was given fourteen days to leave Massachusetts. Like Roger Williams, he was compelled to go forth alone in the bitterness of the New England winter.

Wheelwright was no sooner out of the way than they proceeded to try his friends who had presented the petition, and these men who had not only in the petition disclaimed any thought of sedition, but had said that if their petition was not heard, they “would rather with patience give their cheekes to the smiters,” were held to be public enemies. “Such scruples, however,

never hampered the theocracy. Their justice was trammled neither by judges, by juries, nor by laws.” — Adams.^{F656}

This accomplished, they next proceeded to execute vengeance on Anne Hutchinson, the chief traitor, and the cause of all their dissension. In November, 1637, “she was brought to trial before that ghastliest den of human iniquity, an ecclesiastical criminal court. The ministers were her accusers, who came burning with hate to testify to the words she had spoken to them at their own request, in the belief that the confidence she reposed was to be held sacred. She had no jury to whose manhood she could appeal, and John Winthrop, to his lasting shame, was to prosecute her from the judgment seat. She was soon to become a mother, and her health was feeble; but she was made to stand till she was exhausted; and yet abandoned and forlorn, before those merciless judges, through two long, weary days of hunger and of cold, the intrepid woman defended her cause with a skill and courage which even now, after two hundred and fifty years, kindles the heart with admiration.

“The case for the government was opened by John Winthrop, the presiding justice, the attorney-general, the foreman of the jury, and the chief magistrate of Massachusetts Bay. He upbraided the prisoner with her many evil courses, with having spoken things prejudicial to the honor of the ministers, with holding an assembly in her house, and with divulging the opinions held by those who had been censured by that court.” — Adams.^{f657} The proceedings then continued after the following order: —

Governor Winthrop. — “We have thought good to send for you,... that if you be in an erroneous way, we may reduce you that so you may become a profitable member here among us; otherwise if you be obstinate,... that then the court may take such course that you may trouble us no further. Therefore I would entreat you. . . whether you do not justify Mr. Wheelwright’s sermon and the petition?”

Mrs. Hutchinson. — “I am called here to answer before you, but I hear no things laid to my charge.”

Gov. — “I have told you some already, and more I can tell you.”

Mrs. H. — “Name one, sir.”

Gov. — “Have I not named some already?”

Mrs. H. — “What have I said or done?” . . .

Gov. — “You have joined with them in faction.”

Mrs. H. — “In what faction have I joined them?”

Gov. — “In presenting the petition.”...

Mrs. H. “But I had not my hand to the petition.”

Gov. — “You have counseled them.”

Mrs. H. — Wherein?”

Gov. — “Why, in entertaining them.”

Mrs. H. — “What breach of law is that, sir?”

Gov. — “Why, dishonoring of parents.”...

Mrs. H. — “I may put honor upon them as the children of God, and as they do honor the Lord.”

Gov. — “We do not mean to discourse with those of your sex, but only this: you do adhere unto them, and do endeavor to set forward this faction, and so you do dishonor us.”

Mrs. H. — “I do acknowledge no such thing, neither do I think that I ever put any dishonor upon you.”

Dep. Gov. — “I would go a little higher with Mrs. Hutchinson. Now.... if she in particular hath disparaged all our ministers in the land that they have preached a covenant of works, and only Mr. Cotton a covenant of grace, why this is not to be suffered.”. . .

Mrs. H. — “I pray, sir, prove it, that I said they preached nothing but a covenant of works.”...

Dep. Gov. — “If they do not preach a covenant of grace, clearly, then, they preach a covenant of works.”

Mrs. H. — “No, sir; one may preach a covenant of grace more clearly than another, so I said.”

Rev. Hugh Peters. — “That which concerns us to speak unto, as yet we are sparing in, unless the court command us to speak, then

we shall answer to Mrs. Hutchinson, notwithstanding our brethren are very unwilling to answer. Myself and others had heard that the prisoner said we taught a covenant of works; we sent for her, and though she was ‘very tender’ at first, yet upon being begged to speak plainly, she explained that there ‘was a broad difference’ between our Brother Mr. Cotton and ourselves. I desired to know the difference. She answered ‘that he preaches the covenant of grace and you the covenant of works,’ and that you are not able ministers of the New Testament, and know no more than the apostles did before the resurrection.”

Mrs. H. — “If our pastor would show his writings, you should see what I said, and that things are not so as is reported.”

Mr. Wilson. — “Sister Hutchinson, for the writings you speak of, I have them not.” . . .

Peters was followed by five other preachers, who first with hypocritical meekness expressed themselves as loth to speak in this assembly concerning that gentlewoman, yet to ease their consciences in the relation wherein they stood to the commonwealth and unto God, they felt constrained to state that the prisoner had said they were not able ministers of the New Testament, and that the whole of what Hugh Peters had testified was true. The-court then adjourned till the next day.

When the court opened the next day, Mrs. Hutchinson began her defense by calling as her witnesses Messrs. Leverett, Coggeshall, and Cotton. And the inquisitorial mill again began to grind.

Gov. Winthrop. — “Mr. Coggeshall was not present.”

Coggeshall. — “Yes, but I was; only I desired to be silent till I should be called.”

Gov. — “Will you... say that she did not say so?”

Mr. C. — “Yes, I dare say that she did not say all that which they lay against her.”

Mr. Peters. — “How dare you look into the court to say such a word?”

Mr. C. — “Mr. Peters takes upon him to forbid me. I shall be silent.”...

Gov. — Well, Mr. Leverett, what were the words? I pray speak.”

Mr. Leverett. — To my best remembrance,... Mr. Peters did with much vehemency and entreaty urge her to tell what difference there was between Mr. Cotton and them, and upon his urging of her she said: ‘The fear of man is a snare, but they that trust upon the Lord shall be safe.’ And... that they did not preach a covenant of grace so clearly as Mr. Cotton did, and she gave this reason of it, because that as the apostles were for a time without the Spirit, so until they had received the witness of the Spirit they could not preach a covenant of grace so clearly.”

Cotton was next called, and took his place as witness.

Mr. Cotton. — “I must say that I did not find her saying they were under a covenant of works, nor that she said they did preach a covenant of works.”

Gov. — “You say you do not remember; but can you say she did not speak so?”

Mr. C. — “I do remember that she looked at them as the apostles before the ascension.”...

Dep. Gov. — They affirm that Mrs. Hutchinson did say they were not able ministers of the New Testament.”

Mr. C. — “I do not remember it.” ^{f658}

Mrs. Hutchinson believed also in the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit, and in the promise of Christ that the Spirit will guide the Christian, especially in the understanding of the Scriptures. She therefore taught that “the Holy Ghost dwells in a justified person,” and that it is the duty of Christians to “follow the bidding of the Holy Spirit.” For this she was regarded by the formalistic Puritans as little less than a raving fanatic, and her teachings as tending to anarchy. And as “there was nothing which the orthodox Puritan so steadfastly abhorred as the anarchical pretense of living by the aid of a supernatural light,” she was denounced as “weakening the hands and hearts of the people toward the ministers,” and as being “like Roger Williams, or worse.” ^{f659}

Now at her trial, knowing that although the court was worsted in its case as to the main point, and that she had no hope of escape without an attack

upon this phase of her belief, she chose rather to introduce the matter herself than to allow the court to force her upon ground of their own choosing. She therefore stated that she knew by the Spirit of God that her teachings were the truth, and closed a short speech as follows: —

Mrs. H. — “Now if you condemn me for speaking what in my conscience I know to be truth, I must commit myself unto the Lord.”

Mr. Nowell. — “How do you know that that was the Spirit?”

Mr. H. — “How did Abraham know that it was God?”

Dep. Gov. — “By an immediate voice.”

Mrs. H. — “So to me by an immediate revelation.”

She next stated to the court her conviction that the Lord had showed to her that she would be delivered out of the hands of the court, and referred to some passages in the book of Daniel. In the condition in which the poor woman was, it is not to be wondered at that under the continued and cruel goading of the court, she should speak the following words: —

Mrs. H. — “You have power over my body, but the Lord Jesus hath power over my body and soul; and assure yourselves thus much, you do as much as in you lies to put the Lord Jesus Christ from you, and if you go on in this course you begin, you will bring a curse upon you and your posterity, and the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”

Gov. — “Daniel was delivered by miracle. Do you think to be delivered so too?”

Mrs. H. — “I do here speak it before the court. I look that the Lord should deliver me by his providence.”...

Dep. Gov. — “I desire Mr. Cotton to tell us whether you do approve of Mrs. Hutchinson’s revelations as she hath laid them down.”

Mr. C. — “I know not whether I understand her; but this I say, If she doth expect a deliverance in a way of providence, then I cannot deny it.”

Gov. —... “I see a marvelous providence of God to bring things to this pass.... God by a providence hath answered our desires, and made her

to lay open herself and the ground of all these disturbances to be by revelations.”...

Court. — “We all consent with you.”

Gov. — “Ey, it is the most desperate enthusiasm in the world.”...

Mr. Endicott. — “I speak in reference to Mr. Cotton.... Whether do you witness for her or against her?”

Mr. C. — “This is that I said, sir, and my answer is plain, that if she doth look for deliverance from the hand of God by his providence, and the revelation be... according to a word [of Scripture], that I cannot deny.”

Mr. Endicott. — “You give me satisfaction.”

Dep.Gov. — “No, no; he gives me none at all.”

Mr. C. — “I pray, sir, give me leave to express myself. In that sense that she speaks I dare not bear witness against it.”

Mr. Nowell. — “I think it is a devilish delusion.”

Gov. — “Of all the revelations that ever I read of, I never read the like ground laid as is for this. The enthusiasts and Anabaptists had never the like.”...

Mr. Peters. — “I can say the same;... and I think that is very disputable which our Brother Cotton hath spoken.”...

Gov. — “I am persuaded that the revelation she brings forth is delusion.”

All the court (except two or three ministers). — “We all believe it, we all believe it.”...

Coddington. — “I beseech you do not speak so to force things along, for I do not for my own part see any equity in the court in all your proceedings. Here is no law of God that she hath broken, nor any law of the country that she hath broke, and therefore deserves no censure; and if she say that the elders preach as the apostles did, why they preached a covenant of grace, and what wrong is that to them?...

Therefore I pray consider what you do, for here is no law of God or man broken.”

Mr. Peters. — “I confess I thought Mr. Cotton would never have took her part.”

Gov. — “The court hath already declared themselves satisfied... concerning the troublesomeness of her spirit and the danger of her course amongst us, which is not to be suffered. Therefore if it be the mind of the court that Mrs. Hutchinson... shall be banished out of our liberties, and imprisoned till she be sent away, let them hold up their hands.”

All but three consented.

Gov. — “Those contrary minded hold up yours.”

Messrs. Coddington and Colburn only.

Gov. — “Mrs. Hutchinson, the sentence of the court you hear is that you are banished from out of our jurisdiction as being a woman not fit for our society, and are to be imprisoned till the court shall send you away.”

Mrs. Hutchinson. — “I desire to know wherefore I am banished.”

Gov. — “Say no more: the court knows wherefore, and is satisfied.”

f660

Here the proceedings in the court ended. She was committed to Joseph Welde of Roxbury, whose brother, one of the preachers, had pronounced her a Jezebel. There the preachers continued their tormenting questioning and cross-questioning, until the poor woman was driven so near to distraction that they with “sad hearts” could frame a charge against her of being possessed with Satan. They therefore wrote to the church at Boston offering to make proof of the same, upon which she was summoned to appear to answer before the church.

When she came, one of the ruling elders read a list of twenty-nine “errors,” of all of which they accused her. She admitted that she had maintained all of them, and then asked a pointed question herself.

Mrs. H. — “By what rule did such an elder come to me pretending to desire light, and indeed to entrappe me?”

The elder. — “I came not to entrappe you, but in compassion to your soul.”

The inquisition continued from eight o'clock in the morning until eight o'clock at night, when sentence of admonition was pronounced. The case was then adjourned for a week, when she was caused once more to appear upon her trial, and was charged, amongst other things, with having denied “inherent righteousness.” Of course she was convicted upon all the charges, “so that the church with one consent cast her out.... After she was excommunicated, her spirit, which seemed before to be somewhat dejected, revived again, and she gloried in her sufferings.”

“And all this time she had been alone; her friends were far away. That no circumstance of horror might be lost, she and one of her most devoted followers, Mary Dyer, were nearing their confinements during this time of misery. Both cases ended in misfortunes over whose sickening details Thomas Welde and his reverend brethren gloated with a savage joy, declaring that ‘God himselfe was pleased to step in with his casting vote... as clearly as if he had pointed with his finger.’ Let posterity draw a veil over the shocking scene.” — Adams. ^{f661}

Happily she escaped with her life. A few days after her condemnation, the governor sent her a warrant banishing her from the territory of Massachusetts. At the solicitation of Roger Williams, she and her friends went to Narragansett Bay. Miantonomoh made them a present of the island of Rhode Island, where they settled.

In 1636 about a hundred people, under the leadership of Thomas Hooker, a minister second only to Cotton in the estimate of the colonists, removed from Massachusetts Colony to the valley of the Connecticut, and established there the towns of Springfield, Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield; and January 14, 1639, Springfield preferring to remain in the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, the three remaining towns established a form of government under eleven “fundamental orders,” the preamble of which is as follows: —

“Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine providence so to order and dispose of things that we, the inhabitants and residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and upon the river of Connecticut and the lands thereunto adjoining; and well knowing where a people are gathered together, the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require; do therefore associate and conjoin ourselves to be as one public state or commonwealth; and do for ourselves and our successors and such as shall be adjoined to us at any time hereafter, enter into combination and confederation together, to maintain and pursue the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess, as also the discipline of the churches which according to the truth of the said gospel is now practiced amongst us; as also in our civil affairs to be guided and governed according to such laws, rules, orders, and decrees as shall be made, ordered, and decreed.”^{f662}

Order number four was to the effect that the governor should “be always a member of some approved congregation, and formerly of the magistracy within this jurisdiction.” The oath of office for the governor was as follows: —

“I, _____, being now chosen to be governor within this jurisdiction, for the year ensuing, and until a new be chosen, do swear by the great and dreadful name of the everliving God, to promote the public good and peace of the same, according to the best of my skill; as also will maintain all lawful privileges of this commonwealth; as also that all wholesome laws that are or shall be made by lawful authority here established, be duly executed; and will further the execution of justice according to the rule of God’s word; so help me God in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.”^{f663}

The oath of the magistrate was substantially the same. Unlike Massachusetts, church membership was not required in order to be a voter. Persons became citizens by vote of the major part of the town where they lived, or the major part of such as should be then present and taking the “oath of fidelity.”

In 1637 a colony of Puritan immigrants with John Davenport as their pastor, arrived in Boston, and remained until the spring of 1638, then founded the town and colony of New Haven. In 1639 a colony from New Haven settled the town of Milford, and another company from England settled the town of Guilford. In the same year a form of government was established, and “by the influence of Davenport it was resolved that the Scriptures are the perfect rule of the commonwealth; that the purity and peace of the ordinances to themselves and their posterity were the great end of civil order; and that church members only should be free burgesses.” — Bancroft. ^{f664} A committee of twelve was appointed to nominate seven men to become magistrates. In August the seven met together to put into working order the forms of the new government. “Abrogating every previous executive trust, they admitted to the court all church members; the character of civil magistrates was next expounded ‘from the sacred oracles; ‘ and the election followed. Then Davenport, in the words of Moses to Israel in the wilderness, gave a charge to the governor to judge righteously; ‘The cause that is too hard for you,’ such was part of the minister’s text, ‘bring it to me, and I will hear it.’ Annual elections were ordered; and God’s word established as the only rule in public affairs.” The other towns followed this example, and thus “the power of the clergy reached its extreme point in New Haven, for each of the towns was governed by seven ecclesiastical officers known as ‘pillars of the church.’ These magistrates served as judges, and trial by jury was dispensed with, because no authority could be found for it in the laws of Moses.” — Fiske. ^{f665}

In 1643 the four colonies of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and new Haven formed a league called the United Colonies of New England, the purpose of which was defined as follows: —

“Whereas wee all came into these parts of America with one and the same end and ayme; namely, to advaunce the kingdome of our Lord Jesus Christ and to enjoy the liberties of the gospell in puritie with peace; And, whereas, in our settleinge (by a wise Providence of God) wee are further dispersed vpon the sea coasts and riuers than was at first intended, so that wee cannot according to our desire with convenience communicate in one gournment and iurisdiccon,... we therefore doe conceiue it our bounden dutye without delay to enter into a present consotiation amongst our selues for mutuall help and strength in all our future concernments:

That as in nation and religion so in other respects wee bee and continue one according to the tenor and true meaneing of the ensuing articles: Wherefore it is fully agreed and concluded by and between the parties of jurisdiccons aboue named, and they jointly and seuerally doe by these presents agree and conclude that they all bee and henceforth bee called by the name of The United Colonies of New England.

“1. The said United Colonies for themselves and their posterities do joyntly and seuerally hereby enter into a firme and perpetuall league of friendship and amytye for offence and defence, mutuall advise, and succour vpon all just occasions both for prescrueing and propagating the truth and liberties of the gospell and for their owne mutuall safety and wellfare....

“6. It is also agreed that for the managing and concluding of all affaires proper and concerning the whole Confederacon two commissioners shall be chosen by and out of eich of these foure jurisdiccons; namely, two for the Massachusetts, two for Plymouth, two for Connectacutt, and two for New Haven, being all in church fellowship with us which shall bring full power from their seuerall generall courts respectively to heare examine, weigh, and determine all affairs,” etc. ^{f666}

The population of the four colonies was about twenty-four thousand, Massachusetts having about fifteen thousand, and the other three colonies about three thousand each. The Federal Commissioners formed an advisory board rather than a legislative body. The formation of this league strengthened the theocracy.

By the strictness of the rules which had been framed by the preachers to regulate the admission of members to the churches, there were so few that joined the churches, that the membership, which was supposed to include at least the great majority of the people, in fact embraced not more than one third of them. And now as a demand began to be made for freedom of worship according to other than Congregational forms, the Congregational clergy saw that something must be done more firmly to confirm their power

Accordingly at Cambridge, August, 1648, after two years' reflection, there was framed a “Platform of Church Discipline Gathered out of the Word of God.” It was in fact the establishment of the Congregational Church upon

the basis of the confederacy of the four colonies; for throughout, although it professed to maintain the principles of the independence of each congregation, it provided “councils composed of elders, and other messengers of churches to advise, to admonish, and to withhold fellowship from a church,” but not to exercise special acts of discipline, or jurisdiction, in any particular church. And further it provided that if any church should separate itself from the communion of the churches, the magistrates might compel them to conform. “The Westminster Confession was promulgated as the creed; the powers of the clergy were minutely defined, and the duty of the laity stated to be ‘obeying their elders and submitting themselves unto them in the Lord.’ The magistrate was enjoined to punish ‘idolatry, blasphemy, heresy,’ and to coerce any church becoming ‘schismatical.’” — Adams. ^{f667}

In October, 1649, the platform was referred to the general court for consideration and adopted, and was further submitted by them to the churches for their approval. In October, 1651, it was confirmed by each of the legislatures. Thus was the theocracy of Massachusetts completed and clothed with all the power of the commonwealth. And as its power was increased, so were its bitter fruits vastly increased. In 1649 Governor Winthrop died, and was succeeded by John Endicott; and in 1652 John Cotton died, and was succeeded by John Norton, and these two men, John Endicott and John Norton, have been not inaptly described as “two as arrant fanatics as ever drew breath.” And with the accession of these two men to the headship of the complete and fully furnished theocracy, the New England reign of terror may be said to have begun.

THE SUFFERINGS OF THE BAPTISTS.

Of all the pests which so far the New England Puritans dreaded and hated, the Baptists or, as they were nicknamed, “the Anabaptists,” were the greatest. It was not one of the least of the offenses of Roger William’s that he was a Baptist. Not long after Roger Williams’s banishment, that Thomas Shepard of Charlestown in the sermon before referred to entitled “Eye Salve,” had told the governor and the magistrates that “Anabaptists have ever been looked at by the godly leaders of this people as a scab;” and the president of Harvard College said that “such a rough thing as a New England Anabaptist is not to be handled over tenderly.” According to these principles, therefore, the general court of Massachusetts in 1644 —

“Ordered and agreed that if any person or persons, within this jurisdiction, shall either openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy, or their lawful right and authority to make war, or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, and shall appear to the court willfully and obstinately to continue therein, after due time and means of conviction, every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment.” ^{f668}

The next year, however, a strong petition was presented for the repeal of the law because of the offense that had been “taken threat by the godly in England, ‘but many of the elders entreated that the law might continue still in force.’” The law remained, but the representative of the colony who went to England in 1646 explained to Parliament that “‘it is true we have a severe law, but wee never did or will execute the rigor of it upon any... But the reason wherefore wee are loath either to repeale or alter the law is because wee would have it... to beare witnesse against their judgment,... which we conceive... to bee erroneous.” In pursuance of this law and in the same year, a Baptist by the name of Painter, for refusing to let his child be sprinkled, “was brought before the court, where he declared their baptism to be antichristian.” He was sentenced to be whipped, which he bore without flinching.

And now in 1651 three Baptist ministers, John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes, and John Crandall, went from the Providence plantation to Lynn, Massachusetts, to visit an aged Baptist. They arrived on Saturday, July 19, and the next day they worshiped together in his private house. While Mr. Clarke was preaching, two constables entered the house with a warrant to arrest “certain erroneous persons being strangers.” The three ministers were carried off at once to the tavern, and were notified that they must attend worship at the parish church in the afternoon. They protested, saying that if they were forced into the meeting-house, they should be obliged to dissent from the service. The constable told them that was nothing to him. He was ordered to bring them to church, and to church they must go. As they entered the meeting-house, the congregation was at prayers, and the three prisoners took off their hats; but as soon as the prayer was over, they put on their hats again, and began reading in their seats. The officers were ordered to take off their hats again.

When the service was over, Elder Clarke asked permission to speak. His request was granted on condition that he would not speak about what he had just heard preached. He began to explain why he had put on his hat, saying that he “could not judge that they were gathered according to the visible order of the Lord.” He was allowed to proceed no further, and the three were shut up for the night. The following Tuesday they were taken to Boston and put in prison. July 31, they were tried before the court of assistants, and were fined, Clarke twenty pounds, Holmes thirty, and John Crandall five, “or each to be well whipped.” At the beginning of the trial Elder Clarke had asked that they be shown the law under which they were being tried, and now he made the same request again, but Endicott broke in, “You have deserved death. I will not have such trash brought into our jurisdiction. You go up and down, and secretly insinuate things into those that are weak, but you cannot maintain it before our ministers; you may try a dispute with them.”

As they were sent away from the court to prison, Elder Holmes says, “As I went from the bar, I exprest myself in these words: ‘I blesse God I am counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus; whereupon John Wilson (their pastor, as they call him) strook me before the judgment-seat, and cursed me, saying, ‘The curse of God... goe with thee;’ so we were carried to the prison.”

The Baptists were ready to defend their doctrines as well as to attack the popish ceremonies of the Puritans; therefore Elder Clarke, as soon as they had arrived at the prison, wrote a letter to the court, and proposed to debate the Baptist principles with any of their ministers. He was asked in reply what the Baptist principles were that he would debate. Clarke drew up four propositions, the first stating their faith in Christ; second, that baptism, or dipping in water, is one of the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that a visible believer or disciple of Christ Jesus (that is, one who manifests repentance toward and faith in Jesus Christ) is the only person to be baptized or dipped in water etc.; third, that every such believer in Christ may in point of liberty, and ought in point of duty, to improve that talent which the Lord had given him, and in the congregation may ask for information to himself; or if he can, may speak by way of prophecy, for edification, and upon all occasions and in all places as far as the jurisdiction of his Lord extends, may and ought to walk as a child of light; and, fourth, “I testify that no such believer or servant of Christ Jesus hath any liberty, much less authority, from his Lord, to smite his fellow-

servant, nor with outward force, or arm of flesh to constrain, or restrain, his conscience, nor his outward man for conscience' sake, or worship of his God, where injury is not offered to any person, name, or estate of others, every man being such as shall appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and must give an account of himself to God; and, therefore, ought to be fully persuaded in his own mind for what he undertakes, because he that doubteth is damned if he eat, and so also if he act, because he doth not eat or act in faith, and what is not of faith is sin."

There was at first some talk, or rather a bluff, that Cotton would debate with him; but after consulting together, Cotton declined, and as Elder Clarke's fine had been paid by his friends, he was released, and ordered to go out of the colony as soon as possible. They all three refused to pay the fine that was imposed. Crandall was admitted to bail, but they resolved to hold Elder Holmes, and make him an example. What happened to him he himself tells in a letter to his brethren in London, as follows: —

"I desired to speak a few words: but Mr. Nowel answered, 'It is not now a time to speak,' whereupon I took leave, and said. 'Men, brethren, fathers, and countrymen, I beseech you to give me leave to speak a few words, and the rather because here are many spectators to see me punished, and I am to seal with my blood, if God give strength, that which I hold and practice in reference to the word of God and the testimony of Jesus. That which I have to say, in brief, is this although I am no disputant, yet seeing I am to seal with my blood what I hold, I am ready to defend by the word, and to dispute that point with any that shall come forth to withstand it.' Mr. Nowel answered, now was no time to dispute; then said I, 'I desire to give an account of the faith and order which I hold,' and this I desired three times; but in comes Mr. Flint, and saith to the executioner, 'Fellow, do thine office, for this fellow would but make a long speech to delude the people,' so I, being resolved to speak, told the people, 'That which I am to suffer for is the word of God, and testimony of Jesus Christ.' 'No,' saith Mr. Nowel, 'it is for your error, and going about to seduce the people; 'to which I replied, 'Not for error, for in all the time of my imprisonment, wherein I was left alone, my brethren being gone, which of all your ministers came to convince me of error? And, when upon the governor's words, a motion was made for a public dispute, and often renewed upon fair terms, and desired by hundreds, what was

the reason it was not granted?’ Mr. Nowel told me, it was his fault who went away and would not dispute; but this the writings will clear at large. Still Mr. Flint calls to the man to do his office; so before, and in the time of his pulling off my clothes, I continued speaking, telling them that I had so learned that for all Boston I would not give my body into their hands thus to be bruised upon another account, yet upon this I would not give an hundredth part of a wampum peague to free it out of their hands; and that I made as much conscience of unbuttoning one button, as I did of paying the thirty pounds in reference thereunto. I told them, moreover, that the Lord having manifested his love towards me in giving me repentance towards God, and faith in Christ, and so to be baptized in water by a messenger of Jesus, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, wherein I have fellowship with him in his death, burial and resurrection, I am now come to be baptized in afflictions by your hands, that so I may have further fellowship with my Lord, and am not ashamed of his sufferings, for by his stripes am I healed. And as the man began to lay the strokes upon my back, I said to the people. ‘Though my flesh should fail, and my spirit should fail, yet God would not fail;’ so it pleased the Lord to come in, and to fill my heart and tongue as a vessel full, and with an audible voice I break forth, praying the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge, and telling the people that now I found he did not fail me, and therefore now I should trust him forever who failed me not; for in truth, as the strokes fell upon me. I had such a spiritual manifestation of God’s presence, as I never had before, and the outward pain was so removed from me, that I could well bear it, yea, and in a manner felt it not, although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength, spitting in his hand three times, with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes. When he had loosed me from the post, having joyfulness in my heart, and cheerfulness in my countenance, as the spectators observed, I told the magistrates, ‘You have struck me with roses;’ and said, moreover, ‘Although the Lord hath made it easy to me, yet I pray God it may not be laid to your charge.’”

When the whipping was over, two men, John Hazel and John Spur, went up to the suffering man, and shook hands with him, Hazel not speaking anything at all, and Spur simply saying, “Blessed be the Lord;” yet both

were fined forty shillings, with the choice of paying the fine or being whipped. They both refused to pay the fine, but a friend paid Spur's, and after imprisonment for a week, another paid Hazel's. The whipping of Holmes was thirty lashes with a three-thonged whip of knotted cord wielded with both hands, and was so severe that when taken back to prison, his lacerated body could not bear to touch the bed. For many days he was compelled to rest propped up on his hands and knees. In prison an old acquaintance came "with much tenderness like the good Samaritan," to comfort him and dress his wounds, and even against him information was given, and inquiry made as to who was the surgeon. When Elder Holmes's letter reached his friends in London, they published it, upon which Sir Richard Saltonstall wrote to the Boston preachers the following letter: —

"Reverend and dear friends, whom I unfeignedly love and respect: It doth not a little grieve my spirit to hear what sad things are reported daily of your tyranny and persecution in New England; that you fine, whip, and imprison men for their consciences. First, you compel such to come into your assemblies as you know will not join with you in worship, and when they show their dislike thereof, or witness against it, then you stir up your magistrates to punish them for such (as you conceive) their public affronts. Truly, friends, this practice of compelling any in matters of worship to do that whereof they are not fully persuaded, is to make them sin, for so the apostle tells us (~~61423~~ Romans 14:23); and many are made hypocrites thereby, conforming in their outward man for fear of punishment. We pray for you and wish your prosperity every way; hoped the Lord would have given you so much light and love there, that you might have been eyes to God's people here, and not to practice those courses in a wilderness, which you went so far to prevent. These rigid ways have laid you very low in the hearts of the saints. I do assure you I have heard them pray in public assemblies, that the Lord would give you meek and humble spirits, not to strive so much for uniformity as to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. When I was in Holland, about the beginning of our wars, I remember some Christians there, that then had serious thoughts of planting in New England, desired me to write to the governor thereof, to know if those that differ from you in opinion, yet holding the same foundation in religion, as Anabaptists, Seekers, Antinomians, and the like, might be permitted

to live among you; to which I received this short answer from your then governor, Mr. Dudley: ‘God forbid,’ said he, ‘our love for the truth should be grown so cold that we should tolerate errors.’

It is important to know what answer was made to this, and to know the arguments that were used by the New England theocracy to justify these wicked persecutions. The preachers answered Sir Richard’s letter, by the hand of their chief, John Cotton. And the letter runs as follows: —

“Honored and dear Sir: My Brother Wilson and self do both of us acknowledge your love, as otherwise formerly, so now in late lines we received from you, that you grieve in spirit to hear daily complaints against us; it springeth from your compassion for our afflictions therein, wherein we see just cause to desire you may never suffer like injury in yourself, but may find others to compassionate and condole with you. For when the complaints you hear of are against our tyranny and persecution in fining, whipping, and imprisoning men for their consciences, be pleased to understand we look at such complaints as altogether injurious in respect of ourselves, who had no hand or tongue at all to promote either the coming of the persons you aim at into our assemblies, or their punishment for their carriage there. Righteous judgments will not take up reports, much less reproaches against the innocent. The cry of the sins of Sodom was great and loud, and reached unto heaven; yet the righteous God (giving us an example what to do in the like case) he would first go down to see whether their crimes were altogether according to the cry, before he would proceed to judgment. ~~OUR~~ Genesis 18:20, 21. And when he did find the truth of the cry, he did not wrap up all alike promiscuously in the judgment, but spared such as he found innocent. We are amongst those (if you knew us better) you would account of as (as the matron of Abel spake of herself) peaceable in Israel. ~~OUR~~ 2 Samuel 10:19. Yet neither are we so vast in our indulgence or toleration as to think the men you speak of suffered an unjust censure. For one of them, Obadiah Holmes, being an excommunicate person himself, out of a church in Plymouth patent, came into this jurisdiction and took upon him to baptize, which I think himself will not say he was compelled here to perform. And he was not ignorant that the rebaptizing of an elder person, and that by a private person out of office and under excommunication, are all of them manifest

contestations against the order and government of our churches, established, we know, by God's law, and he knoweth by the laws of the country. And we conceive we may safely appeal to the ingenuity of your own judgment. whether it would be tolerated in any civil state, for a stranger to come and practise contrary to the known principles of the church estate? As for his whipping, it was more voluntarily chosen by him than inflicted on him. His censure by the court was to have paid, as I know, thirty pounds, or else to be whipt: his fine was offered to be paid by friends for him freely; but he chose rather to be whipt; in which case, if his sufferings of stripes was any worship of God at all, surely it could be accounted no better than will worship. The other, Mr. Clarke, was wiser in that point, and his offense was less, so was his fine less, and himself, as I hear, was contented to have it paid for him, whereupon he was released. The imprisonment of either of them was no detriment. I believe they fared neither of them better at home; and I am sure Holmes had not been so well clad for years before.

“But be pleased to consider this point a little further: You think to compel men in matter of worship is to make them sin, according to ~~61423~~ Romans 14:23. If the worship be lawful in itself, the magistrate compelling to come to it, compelleth him not to sin, but the sin is in his will that needs to be compelled to a Christian duty. Josiah compelled all Israel, or, which is all one, made to serve the Lord their God. ~~4863~~ 2 Chronicles 34:33. Yet his act herein was not blamed, but recorded among his virtuous actions. For a governor to suffer any within his gates to profane the Sabbath, is a sin against the fourth commandment, both in the private householder and in the magistrate; and if he requires them to present themselves before the Lord, the magistrate sinneth not, nor doth the subject sin so great a sin as if he did refrain to come. But you say it doth but make men hypocrites, to compel men to conform the outward man for fear of punishment. If it did so, yet better be hypocrites than profane persons. Hypocrites give God part of his due, the outward man; but the profane person giveth God neither outward nor inward man. Nevertheless, I tell you the truth, we have tolerated in our church some Anabaptists, some Antinomians, and some Seekers, and do so still at this day. ^{f669}

In 1655 Thomas Gould of Charlestown refused to have his baby sprinkled and christened. The regular preacher ordered the church “to lay him under admonition, which the church was backward to do.” Not long afterward he was at church as the law required him to be, and when the time of sprinkling the children came, he went out. He was spoken to about it, but told them he could not stay because he “lookt upon it as no ordinance of Christ. They told me that now I had made known my judgment, I might stay.... So I stayed, and sat down in my seat, when they were at prayer and administering the service to infants. Then they dealt with me for my unreverent carriage.” Their dealing with him was to admonish him and exclude him from the communion.

In October, 1656, he was accused before the county court for denying baptism to his child. Of course he was convicted. He was admonished and given till the next term to consider his ways. During this time they made it so unpleasant for him that he ceased attending the church at Charlestown, and went to church at Cambridge instead. But this, being an apparent slight upon the minister, was only a new offense. Although not actually punished, he was subjected to petty annoyances, being again and again summoned both to the church and to the court to be admonished, until in May 28, 1665, he withdrew entirely from the Congregational Church, and with eight others formed a Baptist church. This being “schismatical,” was counted as open rebellion, and Gould and his brethren were summoned to appear before the church the next Sunday. They told the magistrates that they could not go at that time, but the following Sunday they would be there; but the minister refused to wait, and in his sermon “laid out the sins of these men, and delivered them up to Satan.”

They were called before one court after another, until their case reached the general court in October. Those among them who were freeman were disfranchised, and if they should be convicted again of continued schism, were to be imprisoned until further order. In April, 1666, they were fined four pounds, and were imprisoned until September, when they were ordered to be discharged upon payment of fines and costs. In April, 1668, they were ordered by the governor and council to appear at the meeting-house at nine o'clock on the morning of April 14, to meet six ministers who would debate with them. The debate, however, did not amount to much except that it gave to the ministers an opportunity to denounce the Baptists as they wished. The Baptists, asking for

liberty to speak, were told that they stood there as delinquents, and ought not to have liberty to speak. Two days were spent in this way, when at the end of the second day, “Rev.” Jonathan Mitchell pronounced the following sentence from ^{f670}Deuteronomy 17:9-12:

“And thou shalt come unto the priests and the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire; and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment: And thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall choose, shall show thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee. According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do; thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee, to the right hand nor to the left. And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away evil from Israel.

May 27, Gould and two of his brethern as “obstinate and turbulent Anabaptists,” were banished under penalty of perpetual imprisonment. They remained. Accordingly they were imprisoned. By this persecution much sympathy was awakened in the community, and a petition in their behalf was signed by sixty-six of the inhabitants of Charlestown, among whom were some of the most prominent citizens. The petition was to the legislature, and prayed for mercy upon the prisoners, saying, “They be aged and weakly men;...the sense of this their... most deplorable and afflicted condition hath sadly affected the hearts of many... Christians, and such as neither approve of their judgment or practice; especially considering that the men are reputed godly, and of a blameless conversation... We therefore most humbly beseech this honored court, in their Christian mercy and bowels of compassion, to pity and relieve these poor prisoners.” ^{f670} The petition was by vote declared scandalous and reproachful. The two persons who had taken the lead in getting it up, were fined, one ten and the other five pounds, and all the others who had signed the petition were compelled to sign a document expressing their sorrow for giving the court such just grounds of offense.

Report of these proceedings having reached England, thirteen of the Congregational ministers wrote, by the hand of Robert Mascall, a letter to their brethren in New England, in which they said: —

“O, how it grieves and affects us, that New England should persecute! Will you not give what you take? Is liberty of conscience your due? And is it not as due unto others who are sound in the faith? Amongst many Scriptures, that in the fourteenth of Romans much confirms me in liberty of conscience thus stated. To him that esteemeth anything unclean, to him it is unclean. Therefore though we approve of the baptism of the immediate children of church members, and of their admission into the church when they evidence a real work of grace, yet to those who in conscience believe the said baptism to be unclean, it is unclean. Both that and mere ruling elders, though we approve of them, yet our grounds are mere interpretations of, and not any express scripture. I cannot say so clearly of anything else in our religion, neither as to faith or practice. Now must we force our interpretations upon others, pope-like? How do you cast a reproach upon us who are Congregational in England, and furnish our adversaries with weapons against us! We blush and are filled with shame and confusion of face, when we hear of these things. Dear brother, we pray that God would open your eyes, and persuade the heart of your magistrates, that they may no more smite their fellow-servants, nor thus greatly injure us their brethren, and that they may not thus dishonor the name of God. My dear brother, pardon me, for I am affected; I speak for God, to whose grace I commend you all in New England; and humbly craving your prayers for us here, and remain your affectionate brother, ROBERT MASCALL.

“Finsbury, near Morefield, March 25, 1669.” ^{f671}

It seems that the imprisoned Baptists were by some means released after about a year’s confinement, but the next year afterward Gould and Turner were arrested and imprisoned “a long time.”

The cases which we have cited are not by any means all the persecutions and oppressions that fell upon the Baptists; but these are sufficient to show that the persecution was shameful enough, even had these been all the cases that ever occurred. The persecution continued even beyond the date

which we have now reached, but the Baptists were assisted in their splendid fight for freedom of thought and of worship, and relief came the quicker to them, by the no less heroic and more fearfully persecuted Quakers.

THE SUFFERINGS OF THE QUAKERS.

In July, 1656, Mary Fisher and Anne Austin, two Quaker women, landed in Boston. By some means, news of their coming had preceded them. Before they were allowed to land at all, Richard Bellingham, the deputy-governor, Governor Endicott being absent, sent officers aboard the ship, “searched their trunks and chests, and took away the books they found there, which were about one hundred, and carried them ashore, after having commanded the said women to be kept prisoners aboard; and the said books were, by an order of the council, burnt in the market-place by the hangman.” The women were soon taken from the ship, however, and at once “shut up close prisoners, and command was given that none should come to them without leave; a fine of five pounds being laid on any that should otherwise come at or speak with them, tho’ but at the window. Their pens, ink, and paper were taken from them, and they not suffered to have any candle-light in the night season; nay, what is more, they were stript naked, under pretense to know whether they were witches, tho’ in searching no token was found upon them but of innocence. And in this search they were so barbarously misused that modesty forbids to mention it. And that none might have communication with them, a board was nailed up before the window of the jail.” ^{f672} August 18, the following order was issued to the jailer: —

To the Keeper of the Boston Jail: —

You are by virtue hereof to keep the Quakers formerly committed to your custody as dangerous persons, industrious to improve all their abilities to seduce the people of this jurisdiction, both by words and letters, to the abominable tenets of the Quakers, and to keep them close prisoners, not suffering them to confer with any person, nor permitting them to have paper or ink.

“Signed, EDWARD RAWSON, “Sec. of the Boston Court.

August 18, 1656.” ^{f673} They were not only denied food by the authorities, but “liberty was denied even to send them provisions.”

“Seeing they were not provided with victuals, Nicholas Upshal, one who lived long in Boston, and was a member of the church there,” bought of the jailer for five shillings a week the privilege of furnishing them with food. September 7, another order was issued to the jailer, commanding him “to search as often as he saw meet, the boxes, chests, and things of the Quakers formerly committed to his custody, for pen, ink, and paper, papers and books, and to take them from them.” ^{f674}

“After having been about five weeks prisoners, William Chichester, master of a vessel, was bound in one hundred pound bond to carry them back, and not suffer any to speak with them, after they were put on board; and the jailer kept their beds... and their Bible, for his fees.” ^{f675} During the imprisonment they were frequently examined by the ministers with a view to getting some hold on them by which they might be dealt with for the heresy of schism, or some other such crime, but all in vain. It was well for the two women that they happened to be sent away when they were, for not long afterward Endicott returned, and was not a little displeased with Bellingham, the deputy-governor, for dealing so gently with them, declaring that if he had been there, he “would have had them well whipped,” although as yet the colony had no law at all concerning Quakers.

These two women had not been long gone before eight other Quakers arrived in Boston. They were subjected to the same sort of treatment to which the other two had been. In the same month of September, the Commissioners of the United Colonies met at Plymouth, and the Boston court called upon them to stir up Plymouth Colony to vigilance, especially against the Quakers. The letter ran as follows: —

“Having heard some time since that our neighboring colony of Plymouth, our beloved brethren, in great part seem to be wanting to themselves in a due acknowledgment and encouragement of the ministry of the gospel, so as many pious ministers have (how justly we know not) deserted their stations, callings, and relations; our desire is that some such course may be taken, as that a pious orthodox ministry may be restated among them, that so the flood of errors and principles of anarchy may be prevented. Here hath arrived amongst us Several persons professing themselves Quakers, fit instruments to propagate the kingdom of Satan, for the securing

of our neighbors from such pests, we have imprisoned them all till they be dispatched away to the place from whence they came.” ^{f676}

“The commissioners gave advice accordingly,” but Bradford, who was governor of Plymouth, would not take any such steps. After his death, however, severe measures were adopted.

October 14, 1656, the general court of Massachusetts enacted the following law: —

“Whereas there is an accursed sect of heretics lately risen in the world, which are commonly called Quakers, who take upon them to be immediately sent of God and infallibly assisted by the Spirit, to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising governments, and the order of God in the church and commonwealth, speaking evil of dignities, reproaching and reviling magistrates and ministers, seeking to turn the people from the faith, and gain proselytes to their pernicious ways: This court taking into consideration the premises, and to prevent the like mischief as by their means is wrought in our land, doth hereby order, and by the authority of this court be it ordered and enacted that what master or commander of any ship, bark, pink, or catch, shall henceforth bring into any harbor, creek, or cove, within this jurisdiction, any Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretics, shall pay, or cause to be paid, the fine of one hundred pounds to the treasurer of the county, except it appear he want true knowledge or information on their being such, and in that case he hath liberty to clear himself by his oath, when sufficient proof to the contrary is wanting. And for default of good payment, or good security for it, he shall be cast into prison, and there to continue till the said sum be satisfied to a treasurer as aforesaid. And the commander of any catch, ship, or vessel, being legally convicted, shall give in sufficient security to the governor, or any one or more of the magistrates, who have power to determine the same, to carry them back to the place whence he brought them, and on his refusal to do so, the governor or any one or more of the magistrates, are hereby empowered to issue out his or their warrants to commit such master or commander to prison, there to continue till he give in sufficient security to the content of the governor, or any of the magistrates as aforesaid. And it is hereby further ordered and enacted, that what Quaker soever shall

arrive in this country from foreign parts, or shall come into this jurisdiction from any parts adjacent, shall be forthwith committed to the house of correction, and at their entrance to be severely whipped, and by the master thereof to be kept constantly to work, and none suffered to converse or speak with them during the time of their imprisonment, which shall be no longer than necessity requires. And it is ordered, if any person shall knowingly import into any harbor of this jurisdiction any Quaker's books or writings concerning their devilish opinions, he shall pay for such book or writing, being legally proved against him or them, the sum of five pounds; and whosoever shall disperse or sell any such book or writing, and it be found with him or her, or in his or her house, and shall not immediately deliver the same to the next magistrate, shall forfeit or pay five pounds for the dispersing or selling of every such book or writing. And it is hereby further enacted that if any person within this colony shall take upon them to defend the heretical opinions of the Quakers, or any of their books or papers as aforesaid, being legally proved, shall be fined for the first time forty shillings; and if they persist in the same, and shall again defend it the second time, four pounds; if they shall again defend and maintain said accursed heretical opinions, they shall be committed to the house of correction till there be convenient passage to send them out of the land, being sentenced to the court of assistants to banishment. Lastly, it is hereby ordered that what person or persons soever shall revile the person of magistrates or ministers as is usual with the Quakers, such person or persons shall be severely whipped, or pay the sum of five pounds.” ^{f677}

When this law was published, Nicholas Upshal, the kind and Christian old gentleman who had bought the privilege of feeding Mary Fisher and Anne Austin, when they were in prison, “publicly testified against it.” The next morning he was summoned to answer before the general court. He told them that “the execution of that law would be a forerunner of a judgment upon their country, and therefore in love and tenderness which he bare to the people and the place, desired them to take heed, lest they were found fighters against God.” He was fined twenty pounds, although a member of one of the churches. And then having absented himself from church on account of these things, he was fined three pounds, and banished, although winter was now come, and he “a weakly, ancient man.” ^{f678}

Notwithstanding these laws and penalties, and the spirit to inflict the penalties in the severest way, the Quakers continued to come. In fact, wherever such laws were, that was the very place where the Quakers wished to be, because they were opposed to every kind of soul-oppression and every form of the union of Church and State. Not only in this, but in almost everything else, their views made them objects of special hatred to the theocrats of Massachusetts. They recognized no such distinction among Christians as clergy and laity, and could neither be coaxed nor forced to pay tithes. They refused to do military service, and would not take an oath. They would not take their hats off either in church or in court. "In doctrine their chief peculiarity was the assertion of an 'inward light,' by which every individual is to be guided in his conduct of life." And "the doctrine of the 'inward light,' or of private inspiration, was something especially hateful to the Puritan." — Fiske.^{f679} Another thing no less hateful to the Puritan than this, was their refusal to keep Sunday in the Puritan way. They called "in question the propriety of Christians turning the Lord's day into a Jewish Sabbath." — Fiske.^{f680} They were denounced as infidels, blasphemers, agents of the devil, and were counted as easily guilty of every heresy and every crime in the Puritan theoretical catalogue.

Admission to the confederacy of the New England colonies had been absolutely refused Rhode Island, on account of its principles of liberty of conscience; but hatred of the Quakers led Massachusetts colony in 1657 to ask Rhode Island to join the confederacy in the endeavor to save New England from the Quakers. "They sent a letter to the authorities of that colony, signing themselves their loving friends and neighbors, and beseeching them to preserve the whole body of colonists against 'such a pest,' by banishing and excluding all Quakers, a measure to which 'the rule of charity did oblige them.'" — Fiske.^{f681}

But Roger Williams was still president of Rhode Island, and, true to his principles, he replied: "We have no law amongst us whereby to punish any for only declaring by words their minds and understandings concerning things and ways of God as to salvation and our eternal condition. As for these Quakers, we find that where they are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely and only opposed by arguments in discourse, there they least of all desire to come. Any breach of the civil law shall be punished, but the freedom of different consciences shall be respected."^{f682}

This reply enraged the whole confederacy. Massachusetts threatened to cut off the trade of Rhode Island. In this strait Rhode Island, by Roger Williams, appealed for protection to Cromwell, who now ruled England. The appeal presented the case as it was, but that which made it of everlasting importance, as the grandest and most touching appeal in all history, is the piteous plea, "But whatever fortune may befall, let us not be compelled to exercise any civil power over men's consciences." ^{f683}

In this year, October 14, another law was passed against Quakers, in which it was enacted that —

"If any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall henceforth entertain and conceal any such Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretics, knowing them so to be, every such person shall forfeit to the country forty shillings for every such hour's entertainment and concealment of any Quaker or Quakers, etc., as aforesaid, and shall be committed to prison as aforesaid, till forfeiture be fully satisfied and paid: and it is further ordered that if any Quaker or Quakers shall presume, after they have once suffered what the law requires, to come into this jurisdiction, every such male Quaker shall for the first offense have one of his ears cut off, and be kept at work in the house of correction till he can be sent away at his own charge, and for the second offense shall have his other ear cut off: and every woman Quaker that has fulfilled the law here that shall presume to come into this jurisdiction, shall be severely whipped, and kept at the house of correction at work, till she be sent away at her own charge, and so also for her coming again she shall be alike used as aforesaid: and for every Quaker, he or she, that shall presume a third time herein again to offend, they shall have their tongues burned through with a red-hot iron, and be kept at the house of correction close to work, till they be sent away at their own charge. And it is further ordered that all and every Quaker arising from among ourselves, shall be dealt with, and suffer the like punishments, as the law provides against foreign Quakers." ^{f684}

The Quakers, however, not only continued to come, and to come again when imprisoned, whipped, and banished; but their preachings, and much more their persecutions, raised up others in the colonies. This result

followed so promptly that May 20, 1658, the following statute was enacted: —

“That Quakers and such accursed heretics, arising among ourselves, may be dealt with according to their deserts, and that their pestilent errors and practices may be speedily prevented, it is hereby ordered, as an addition to the former laws against Quakers, that every such person or persons, professing any of their pernicious ways by speaking, writing, or by meeting on the Lord’s day, or at any other time, to strengthen themselves, or seduce others to their diabolical doctrines, shall, after due means of conviction, incur the penalty ensuing; that is, every person so meeting, shall pay to the country for every time ten shillings; and every one speaking in such meeting, shall pay five pounds apiece; and in case any such person, after having been punished by scourging or whipping for such, according to the former law, shall be still kept at work in the house of correction, till they put in security with two sufficient men, that they shall not any more vent their hateful errors, nor use their sinful practices, or else shall depart this jurisdiction at their own charges, and if any of them return again, then each such person shall incur the penalty of the law formerly made for strangers.” ^{f685}

In 1658 “Rev.” John Norton, supported by the rest of the clergy, circulated a petition praying that the penalty of death should be visited upon all Quakers who should return after having been banished. The Board of Commissioners of the United Colonies met in Boston in September. The petition was presented to the Board, which in response advised the general court of each colony to enact such a law. Accordingly, October 16, the general court of Massachusetts enacted the following law: —

“Whereas there is a pernicious sect, commonly called Quakers, lately risen up, who by word and writing have published and maintained many dangerous and horrid tenets, and do take upon them to change and alter the received and laudable customs of our nation, not giving civil respects to equals, or reverence to superiors; whose actions tend to undermine civil government, and to destroy the order of the churches, by denying all established forms of worship, and by withdrawing from orderly church fellowship, allowed and proved by all orthodox professors of truth, and instead

thereof, and in opposition thereto, frequently meet by themselves, insinuating themselves into the minds of the simple, or such as are least affected to the order and government of the church and commonwealth, whereby diverse particular inhabitants have been infected, notwithstanding all former laws made, have been upon the experience of their arrogant and bold determinations, to disseminate their practice amongst us, prohibiting their coming into this jurisdiction, they have not been deterred from their impious attempts to undermine our peace and hazard our ruin:

“For prevention thereof, this court doth order and enact that every person or persons, of the accursed sect of Quakers, who is not an inhabitant of, but is found within, this jurisdiction, shall be apprehended without warrant, where no magistrate is at hand, by any constable, commissioner, or selectman, and conveyed from constable to constable, to the next magistrate who shall commit the said person to close prison, there to remain (without bail) till the next court of assistants, where they shall have a legal trial: and being convicted [Note: — “For which conviction, it was counted sufficient that they appeared with their hats on and said ‘thee’ and ‘thou’] to be of the sect of the Quakers, shall be sentenced to be banished upon pain of death: and that every inhabitant of this jurisdiction being convicted to be of the aforesaid sect, either by taking up, publishing, or defending the harrid opinion of the Quakers, or stirring up of mutiny, sedition, or rebellion against the government, or by taking up their abusive and destructive practices, viz., denying civil respect to equals and superiors, and withdrawing from our church assemblies, and instead thereof frequenting meetings of their own ;in opposition to our church order, or by adhering to, or approving of, any known Quaker, and the tenets practiced, that are opposite to the orthodox received opinions of the godly, and endeavoring to disaffect others to civil government and church order, or condemning the practice and proceedings of this court against the Quakers, manifesting thereby their plotting with those whose design is to overthrow the order established in Church and State, every such person convicted before the said court of assistants, in manner aforesaid, shall be committed to close prison for one month, and then, unless they choose voluntarily to depart this jurisdiction, shall give bond for their good behavior, and

appear at the next court, where continuing obstinate, and refusing to retract and reform their aforesaid opinions, they shall be sentenced to banishment upon pain of death; and any one magistrate upon information given him of any such person, shall cause him to be apprehended, and shall commit any such person, according to his discretion, till he comes to trial as aforesaid.”^{f686}

Nor were any of these laws in any sense a dead letter. They were enforced in the regular Puritan way. In 1657 the following order was issued by Governor Endicott: —

“To the marshall general of h;is deputy: You are to take with you the executioner, and repair to the house of correction, and there see him cut of the right ears of John Copeland, Christopher Holder, and John Rouse, Quakers, in execution of the sentence of the court of assistants for the breach of the law instituted, ‘Quakers.’”^{f687}

In the latter of the same year the following order was issued by the court:

“Whereas Daniel Southwick and Provided Southwick, son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick,absenting themselves from the public ordinances, have been fined by the courts of Salem and Ipswich, pretending they have no assistance, and resolving not to work, the court, upon perusal of the law, which was made upon account of the dates, in answer to what should be done for the satisfaction of the fines, resolves that the treasurers of the several counties are and shall be fully empowered to sell said persons to any of the English nation, at Virginia or Barbadoes, to answer the said fines.”^{f688}

With this latter sentence there is connected an important series of events. As stated in this order, these two persons were son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick. Lawrence Southwick and his wife Cassandra, were an aged couple who had been members of the Salem church until about the close of 1656. They had three children, Joseph, who was a man grown, and the two mentioned above, who were but mere youth. The old gentleman and his wife were arrested at the beginning of the year 1657, upon a charge of harboring Quakers. The old gentleman was released, but as a Quaker tract was found upon his wife, she was imprisoned seven weeks and fined forty shillings. If they were not Quakers before, this made them such, and

likewise some of their friends. A number of them now withdrew from the Salem church, and worshiped by themselves. All were arrested. Lawrence and Cassandra Southwick and their son Joseph, were taken to Boston to be dealt with. Upon their arrival there, February 3, without even the form of a trial they were whipped and imprisoned eleven days, the weather being extremely cold. In addition to this, they were fined four pounds and thirteen shillings, for six weeks' absence from church on Sun days, and their cattle were seized and sold to pay this fine.

The following summer two Quakers, William Leddra and William Brend, went to Salem. They with five others, among whom were the Southwicks who before had suffered, were arrested for meeting together. They were all taken to Boston, and put all together in a room in the prison, of which the windows were boarded up close. Food was denied them unless they would work to pay for it. "To work when wrongfully confined, was against the Quaker's conscience." — Adams." ^{f689} They therefore went five days without anything to eat. This, however, was only a part of their sufferings, for on the second day of their imprisonment, they all were severely whipped, and then with raw wounds were thrown back into the close dark room, in the July heat, with nothing to lie upon but the bare boards. On the second day afterwards they were informed that they could go if they would pay the constables and jail fees. They refused to pay anything. The next day the jailer, in order to force them to yield, took Brend, and with irons bound his neck and heels together, and kept him that way for sixteen hours, from five o'clock in the morning till nine o'clock at night.

The next day Brend was put to the mill and ordered to work. He could not have worked if he would, as he could scarcely move; but he would not have worked if he could and so he refused. Then in a rage 'the gaoler took a pitched rope, about an inch thick, and gave him twenty blows over his back and arms with; all his strength, till the rope untwisted; then he fetched another rope, thicker and stronger, and told Brend that he would cause him to bow to the law of the country, and make him work. Brend thought this in the highest degree unreasonable, since he had committed no evil, and was wholly unable to work, having been kept five days without eating, and whipped also, and now thus unmercifully beaten. Yet in the morning the gaoler relented not, but began to beat again with his pitched rope on the poor man's bruised body, and foaming at the mouth like a madman, with violence laid four score and seventeen more blows upon him, as other prisoners, who beheld this cruelty with grief and passion reported. And if

his strength and his rope had not failed him, he would have laid on more. He thought also to give him the next morning as many blows more... To what condition these blows must have brought the body of Brend, who had nothing on but a serge cossack over-shirt, may easily be conceived. His back and arms were bruised and bleeding, and the blood hanging, as it were, in bags under his arms, and so into one was his flesh beaten that the sign of a particular blow could not be seen. His body being thus cruelly tortured, he lay down upon the boards so extremely weakened that the natural parts decaying, and his strength failing, his body turned cold ; there seemed, as it were, a struggle between life and death; his senses were stopped, and he had for some time neither seeing, feeling, nor hearing; till at length a divine power prevailing, life broke through death, and the breath of the Lord was breathed in his nostrils.” ^{f690}

The people now, horrified at the outrage, would bear no more. A cry was raised, they rushed to the jail, and rescued the tortured prisoner. This rather frightened the government. Endicott sent his own family doctor to succor Brend, but the surgeon pronounced the case hopeless — that the flesh would “rot from off his bones ,”and he must die. The cry of the people grew louder, and their indignation more fierce. They demanded that the barbarous jailer should be brought to justice. The magistrate posted up on the church door a promise that he should be brought to trial, but here the “Rev.” John Norton stepped forth, declaring: “Brend endeavored to beat our gospel ordinances black and blue; if he then be beaten black and blue, it is but just upon him and I will appear in his behalf that did so.” He rebuked the magistrates for their faintness of heart, and commanded them to take down the notice from the church door. They obeyed, and the cruel jailer was not only justified, but was commanded to whip the Quakers who were yet in prison “twice a week if they refused to work, and the first time to add five stripes to the former ten, and each time to add three to them.” ^{f691}

The other prisoners now presented a petition to the court praying to be released. Their petition was dated, “From the House of Bondage in Boston, wherein we are made captives by the wills of men, although made free by the Son (~~Rev~~ John 8:36), in which we quietly rest, this sixteenth of the fifth month, 1658.” They were brought into court for examination. They made so strong a defense that there appeared some prospect of their acquittal; but the preachers rallied in force. The “Rev. “Charles Chauncy, in “the Thursday lecture,” preached as follows: —

“Suppose you should catch six wolves in trap [there were six Salem Quakers],... and ye cannot prove that they killed either sheep or lambs: and now ye have them, they will neither bark nor bite; yet they have the plain marks of wolves. Now I leave it to your consideration whether ye will let them go alive; yea or nay?”^{f692}

By their diligence the preachers not only prevented any acquittal, but succeeded in forcing through the law of October 16, 1658, above quoted (page 643), inflicting capital punishment upon all who remained, or returned after sentence of banishment. The very day on which this law was passed, the prisoners were brought into court, and sentence of banishment was pronounced, the Southwicks being commanded to leave before the spring elections. They did not go. In May, 1659, they were called up again, and charged with rebellion for not going as commanded. They pleaded that they had no place to go to, and that they had done nothing to deserve either banishment or death, though all they had in the world had been taken from them. Major-General Dennison replied that ‘they stood against the authority of the country in not submitting to their laws: that he should not go about to speak much concerning the error of their judgments: but, added he, ‘You and we are not able well to live together, and at present the power is in our hand, and therefore the stronger must send off.’”^{f693}

Accordingly the sentence of banishment was again pronounced under the penalty of death. “The aged couple were sent to Shelter Island, but their misery was well-nigh done; they perished within a few days of each other, tortured to death by flogging and starvation.” — Adams.^{f694} Their son Joseph was sent away in a ship to England.

Then the two children, Daniel and Provided, were brought before the court. They were asked why they had not come to church. Daniel replied, “If you had not so persecuted our father and mother, perhaps we might have come.” They were fined. As parents and home and all were gone, it was impossible for them to pay any fine; and as there was not much prospect of the government’s making anything out of an attempt to force children to work, even by flogging, the sentence quoted on page 645 was pronounced. commanding the county treasures to sell them to recover the fine.

The treasurer of Salem took the children to Boston, and went to a ship’s captain who was about to sail for Barbadoes, and began to bargain for their

passage to that place to be sold. The captain said he was afraid they would corrupt his ship's company.

The treasurer. — “Oh no, you need not fear that, for they are poor, harmless creatures, and will not hurt anybody.”

The captain — “Will they not so? And will ye offer to make slaves of so harmless creatures?” ^{f695}

Harmless creatures as they were, however, it seems that they were really sent away thus to be sold.

In September, 1659, three Quakers, William Robinson, Marmaduke Stevenson, and Mary Dyer, who had but lately come to Boston, were banished. Mrs. Dyer was wife of the secretary of Rhode Island. She returned home. Robinson and Stevenson went as far as Salem, where they turned about and went back to Boston. Not long afterward, Mrs. Dyer returned. October 20, they were brought before the general court. Being called to the bar, Governor Endicott commanded the officer to pull off the men's hats. He then said: —

“We have made several laws to keep the Quakers from amongst us, and neither whipping, nor imprisonment, nor cutting off ears, nor banishment upon pain of death, can keep them from us. Neither I nor any of us desire the death of any of them. Give ear and hearken to your sentence of death.” ^{f696}

He then sentenced them one by one to be hanged. October 27 was the day set for the execution. For fear the people might effect a rescue, a guard was put upon the prison. As the day drew near, the dissatisfaction of the people became more marked, and when the time came, it was deemed necessary to have a company of two hundred armed men, to make sure that the theocrats might accomplish the hanging. The three prisoners marched hand in hand to the scaffold on Boston Common, with drums beating before them to drown any words that they might speak. As the procession moved along, “Rev.” John Wilson, the Boston preacher, with others of the clergy, stood ready to join in the march. Wilson tauntingly cried out, “Shall such jakes as you come in before authority, with your hats on?” Robinson replied, “Mind you, mind you, it is for not putting off the hat we are put to death.” When they reached the gallows, Robinson attempted to speak to the people, but Wilson interrupted him with, “Hold your

tongue, be silent; thou art going to die with a lie in thy mouth.” The two men were then bound and hanged. The rope was placed round Mrs. Dyer’s neck, but her son just then arrived from Rhode Island, and upon his earnest entreaty and promise to take her away, they let her go. The bodies of the two men were tumbled into a hole in the ground, and left exposed with no sort of burial. The next spring, however, Mrs. Dyer returned again. June 1, she was again marched to the gallows. At the last moment she was told that she might go if she would promise to stay away. She answered, “In obedience to the will of the Lord, I came, and in his will I abide faithful unto death.” And so they hanged her. ^{f697}

In November, William Leddra, who had been banished, returned to Boston. He was at once arrested, but public opinion was now so strong against the persecution that the government made every effort to persuade him to go away. But he would not go. He was kept in prison four months, and at last, in March, he was sentenced to be hanged. A few days before his execution, he was called before the court, and as he was being questioned, Wenlock Christison, another Quaker who had that moment returned from banishment, walked into the court room, and, standing before the judges with uplifted hand, said: “I am come here to warn you that ye shed no more innocent blood.” He was arrested and taken at once to jail.

Leddra was hanged, but Christison remained; and as he had openly rebuked the judges, his case was the more notorious. But as the discontented murmurings of the people grew louder and louder, the government hesitated to proceed. The theocrats, however, were not yet ready to yield, and so they brought him to trial before the general court, both the governor and the deputy-governor being present.

Endicott. — “Unless you renounce your religion, you shall die.”

Christison — “Nay; I shall not change my religion, nor seek to save my life; neither do I intend to deny my Master; but if I lose my life for Christ’s sake, and the preaching of the gospel, I shall save my life.”

Endicott. — “What have you to say for yourself, why you should not die?”

Christison. — “By what law will you put me to death?”

Endicott. — “We have a law, and by our law you are to die.”

Christison. — “So said the Jews of Christ, ‘We have a law, and by our law he ought to die!’ Who empowered you to make that law?”

One of the Board. — “We have a patent, and are the patentees; judge whether we have not power to make laws.”

Christison. — “How, have you power to make laws repugnant to the laws of England?”

Endicott. — “No.”

Christison. — “Then you are gone beyond your bounds, and have forfeited your patent; and that is more than you can answer. Are you subjects to the king? yea or nay?”

One of the Court. — “Yea, we are so.”

Christison. — “Well, so am I. Therefore seeing that you and I are subjects to the king, I demand to be tried by the laws of my own nation.”

One of the Court. — “You shall be tried by a bench and a jury.”

Christison. — “That is not the law, but the manner of it; for I never heard nor read of any law that was in England, to hang Quakers.”

Endicott. — “There is a law to hang Jesuits.”

Christison. — “If you put me to death, it is not because I go under the name of a Jesuit, but of a Quaker. Therefore I appeal to the laws of my own nation.”

One of the Court. — “You are in our hands, you have broken our law, and we will try you.”

In the very midst of the trial, a letter was brought in and handed to the court. It was from Edward Wharton, yet another Quaker who had returned from banishment. The letter states: “Whereas you have banished me on pain of death, yet I am at home in my own house at Salem, and therefore purpose that you will take off your wicked sentence from me, that I may go about my occasions out of your jurisdiction.”

The trial was over; but what should they do with the Quaker? They were afraid to sentence him, and they could not bear to confess defeat by letting

him go. The court debated among themselves more than two weeks what to do. “Endicott was exasperated to frenzy, for he felt the ground crumbling beneath him; he put the fate of Christison to the vote, and failed to carry a condemnation. The governor seeing this division, said, ‘I could find it in my heart to go home; being in such a rage, that he flung something furiously on the table... Then the governor put the court to vote again; but this was done confusedly, which so incensed the governor that he stood up and said, ‘You that will not consent, record it: I thank God I am not afraid to give judgment... Wenlock Christison, hearken to your sentence: You must return unto the place from whence you came, and from thence to the place of execution, and there you must be hanged until you are dead, dead, dead.’” ^{f698}

The sentence of the court was to put Christison to death; but they never dared to execute it. “Even the savage Endicott knew well that all the train bands of the colony could not have guarded Christison to the gallows from the dungeon where he lay condemned.” — Adams. ^{f699}

The sentence of death, as such, they were thus forced to abandon; but they still hoped to accomplish the same thing by another, and as their chief apologist defined, a “humaner policy.” For this purpose the “Vagabond Act” was passed May 22, 1661, by which it was enacted that, “Any person convicted before a county magistrate of being an undomiciled or vagabond Quaker, was to stripped naked to the middle, tied to the cart’s tail, and flogged from town to town, to the border. Domiciled Quakers to be proceeded against under Act of 1658 to banishment, and then treated as vagabond Quakers. The death penalty was still preserved, but not enforced.” — Adams. ^{f700}

The first victim of this new and “humaner” law was Joseph Southwick, who returned from banishment in 1661, and in the “seventh month” was sentenced to its penalty. On the trial, Endicott told him that they had made the new law “to save his life, in mercy to him.” He inquired whether it were not as good to take his life now, as to whip him after their manner, twelve or fourteen times on the cart’s tail through their towns, and then put him to death afterward? He was sentenced to be flogged through Boston, Roxbury, and Dedham. “The peculiar atrocity of flogging from town to town lay in this: that the victim’s wounds became cold between the times of punishment, and in the winter sometimes frozen, which made the torture intolerably agonizing.” — Adams. ^{f701}

In response to their sentence, Joseph Southwick said: "Here is my body; if you want a further testimony of the truth I profess, take it and tear it in pieces.... It is freely given up, and as for your sentence, I matter it not." Then "they tied him to a cart, and lashed him for fifteen miles and while he 'sang to the praise of God,' his tormentor swung with all his might a tremendous two-handed whip, whose knotted thongs were made of twisted cat-gut; thence he was carried fifteen miles from any town into the wilderness." — Adams. ^{f702} And there they left him.

In the middle of the winter of 1661-62, a Quaker woman, Elizabeth Hooton, was subjected to the same torture, being whipped through Cambridge, Watertown, and Dedham.

In 1662 three Quaker women fell under the notice of "Rev." John Rayner; "and as the magistrate was ignorant of the technicalities of the law, the elder acted as clerk, and drew up for him the following warrant: —

"To the constables of Dover, Hampton, Salisbury, Newbury, Rowley, Ipswich, Wenham, Linn Boston, Roxbury, Dedham, and untill these vagabond Quakers are carried out of this jurisdiction:

—

"You and every one of you are required, in the king's majesty's name, to take these vagabond Quakers, Anne Coleman, Mary Tomkins, and Alice Ambrose, and make them fast to the cart's tail, and driving the crat through your several towns, to whip them on their backs, not exceeding ten stripes apiece on each of them in each town, and so to convey them from constable to constable, till they come out of this jurisdiction, as you will answer it at your peril: and this shall be your warrant. Per me, "**RICHARD WALDEN**.

"At Dover, dated December The 22d, 1662."

"The Rev. John Rayner pronounced judgement of death by flogging; for the weather was bitter, the distance to be walked was eighty miles, and the lashes were given with a whip, whose three-twisted, knotted thongs cut to the bone.

"So, in a very cold day, your deputy, Walden, caused these women to be stripp'd naked from the middle upward, and tyed to a cart, and after awhile cruelly whipp'd them whilst the priest [John Rayner], stood and looked, and laughed at it.... They went with the

executioner to Hampton, and through dirt and snow at Salisbury, half way the leg deep, the constable forced them after the cart's tail at which he whipp'd them.'

"Had the Rev. John Rayner but followed the cart, to see that his three hundred and thirty lashes were all given with the same ferocity which warmed his heart to mirth at Dover, before his journey's end he would certainly have joyed in giving thanks to God over the women's gory corpses, freezing amid the snow. His negligence saved their lives, for when the ghastly pilgrims passed through Salisbury, the people, to their eternal honor, set the captives free." — Adams. ^{f703}

There are many other instances of these horrible tortures to both men and women; but these, without any mention of the hanging of witches, are enough to explain and to justify the deserved and scathing sentence of the historian of the United States, that "the creation of a national and uncompromising church led the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to the indulgence of the passions which disgraced their English persecutors, and Laud was justified by the men whom he had wronged." — Bancroft. ^{f704}

Yet it must not be supposed that the legislation with respect to the views of the Baptists and the Quakers was exceptional in its nature or even its severity; only, as the laws regarding them were more openly disregarded, the penalties were inflicted upon them in greater measure than upon any others. There was a law running as follows: —

"Albeit faith is not wrought by the word, nevertheless, seeing that blasphemy of the true God cannot be excused by an ignorance or infirmity of human nature,' therefore, 'no person in this jurisdiction, whether Christian or pagan, shall wittingly and willingly presume to blaspheme his holy Name, either by willful or obstinate denying the true God, or his creation or government of the world, or shall curse God, or reproach the holy religion of God, as if it were but a public device to keep ignorant men in awe, nor shall utter any other eminent kind of blasphemy of like nature or degree,' under penalty of death."

Another law subjected to fine, whipping, banishment, and finally to death, "any who denied the received books of the Old and New, Testaments to be the infallible word of God." — Hildreth. ^{f705}

Another and about the mildest form of punishment is shown by the following law, enacted in 1646: —

“It is therefore ordered and decreed, that if any Christian (so-called) within this jurisdiction shall contemptuously behave himself towards the word preached or the messenger thereof called to dispense the same in any congregation, when he faithfully executes his service and office therein according to the will and word of God, either by interrupting him in his preaching, or by charging him falsely with an error which he hath not taught in the open face of the church, or like a son of Korah, cast upon his true doctrine or himself any reproach, to the dishonor of the Lord who hath sent him, and to the disparagement of that his holy ordinance, and making God’s ways contemptible or ridiculous, that every such person or persons (whatsoever censure the church may pass) shall for the first scandal, be convented and reprov’d openly by the magistrate, at some lecture, and bound to their good behavior; and if a second time they break forth into the like contemptuous carriages, they shall either pay five pounds to the public treasure, or stand two hours openly upon a block or stool four foot high, upon a lecture day, with a paper fixed on his breast, written with capital letters, ‘A WANTON GOSPELLER:’ that others may fear and be ashamed of breaking out into the like wickedness.” ^{f706}

Yet Massachusetts, though the worst, was not by any means the only one, of the colonies that had an established religion, and that per-consequence persecuted. The other Puritan colonies were of the same order. Plymouth and New Haven were second only to Massachusetts, and Connecticut was not far behind. New Haven had a law against Quakers, ordering that: —

“Every Quaker that comes into this jurisdiction shall be severely whipped, and be kept at work in the house of correction; and the second time, be branded in one hand, and kept at work as aforesaid; the third time be branded in other hand, and the fourth time, to be bored through the tongue with a red-hot iron.”

That the law was by no means a nullity, is seen by the fact that Humphrey Norton, merely passing through Southbold on his way to one of the Dutch plantations, was apprehended, without being asked whither he was going, and committed to the marshall, conveyed to New Haven, and there cast

into prison, chained to a post, and none suffered to visit him in the bitter cold winter.... At length, he was had before the court, where was their priest [minister], John Davenport, to whom Humphrey Norton had sent some religious queries; and the priest having spoken what he pleased in answer to those queries, Humphrey attempted to reply, but was prevented by their tying a great iron key across his mouth, so that he could not speak. After that he was had again to prison, and after ten days more, sentenced to be severely whipped, and burned in the hand with the letter ‘H’ for heresy, and to be sent out of the colony, and not to return upon pain of the utmost penalty they could inflict by law, and to pay ten pounds towards the charge of the court and colony. And they ordered this sentence to be executed the same day. Accordingly, the drum was beat, and the people gathered; ‘the poor man was fetched, and stripped to the waist, and set with his back towards the magistrates, and had given, in their view, thirty-six cruel stripes, and then turned, and his face set towards them, his hand made fast in the stocks, where they had set his body before, and burned very deep with a red-hot iron: then he was sent to prison again, and there kept, till a Dutchman, a stranger to him, paid down twenty nobles for his fine and fees. It was remarkable that as soon as he had suffered this cruel sentence, and was let loose from the stocks, he knelt down, and prayed to the Lord, to the astonishment of his persecutors.’” ^{f707}

The “Blue Laws” of Connecticut are proverbial; yet they were copied almost bodily from the Massachusetts code. For instance, the “Wanton Gosseller” statute of Massachusetts was adopted by Connecticut, word for word, with only the change of the inscription to “An Open and Obstinate Contemner of God’s Holy Ordinances.”

Nor was it alone in New England that Church and State were united. It was so to a greater or less extent in every one of the thirteen original colonies in America, except Rhode Island. In New England the established religion was Congregationalism, while in all the colonies south from New York to Georgia, except only Pennsylvania, the Church of England was the favored one. In Pennsylvania there was no union with any particular denomination as such, but no one could hold office or even vote except “such as possess faith in Jesus Christ.” And protection from compulsory religious observances was guaranteed to no one, except those “who confess and acknowledge one almighty and eternal

God to be the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the world.” As all were thus required to be religious, and to possess faith in Jesus Christ, it was therefore required “that according to the good example of the primitive Christians, every first day of the week, called the Lord’s day, people shall abstain from their common daily labor, that they may the better dispose themselves to worship God according to their understandings.” ^{f708}

Maryland, while held by the Roman Catholics, was freer than any other colony, except Rhode Island; yet even there, as in Pennsylvania, it was only toleration that was guaranteed, and that only to persons “professing to believe in Jesus Christ.” But in 1692 the Episcopalians took possession, and although other forms of religion were still tolerated, “Protestant Episcopacy was established by law,” and so continued until the Revolution.

The Church and State system in Georgia, and even its practical working as late as 1737, may be seen in the persecution of John Wesley. The case grew out of Wesley’s refusing the sacrament to certain women, and this was made only the opportunity to vent their spite upon him in whatever else they could trump up. The first step was taken thus: —

“GEORGIA. SAVANNAH SS.

“To all Constables, Tythingmen, and others whom these may concern: You and each of you are hereby required to take the body of John Wesley, clerk, and bring him before one of the bailiffs of the said town, to answer the complaint of William Williamson and Sophia his wife, for defaming the said Sophia, and refusing to administer to her the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, in a publick congregation, without cause; by which the said William Williamson is damag’d one thousand pound sterling. And for so doing, this is your warrant, certifying what you are to do in the premises. Given under my hand and seal the eighth day of August, Anno Dom., 1737. ***THO. CHRISTIE.***”

Wesley was arrested, and brought before the recorder for examination. When questioned upon this matter, he replied that “the giving or refusing the Lord’s Supper being a matter purely ecclesiastical, I could not acknowledge their power to interrogate me upon it.” The case was deferred to the next regular sitting of the court. When the court convened, the judge charged the grand jury to “beware of spiritual tyranny, and to oppose the new illegal authority that was usurped over their consciences.”

The grand jury, says Wesley, was thus composed: “One was a Frenchman who did not understand English, one a Papist, one a profest infidel, three Baptists, sixteen or seventeen others, dissenters, and several others who had personal quarrels against me, and had openly vow’d revenge.”

A majority of this grand jury framed an indictment of ten counts, as follows: —

“That John Wesley, clerk, has broken the laws of the realm, contrary to the peace of our sovereign lord the king, his crown and dignity.

“**1.** By speaking and writing to Mrs. Williamson against her husband’s consent.

“**2.** By repelling her from the holy communion.

“**3.** By not declaring his adherence to the Church of England.

“**4.** By dividing the morning service on Sundays.

“**5.** By refusing to baptize Mr. Parker’s child otherwise than by dipping, except the parents would certify it was weak, and not able to bear it.

“**6.** By repelling Wm. Gough from the holy communion.

“**7.** By refusing to read the burial service over the body of Nathaniel Polhill.

“**8.** By calling himself ordinary of Savannah.

“**9.** By refusing to receive Wm. Agliorly as a godfather, only because he was not a communicant.

“**10.** By refusing Jacob Matthews for the same reason, and baptizing an Indian trader’s child with only two sponsors.

The prosecution was made to drag along with Wesley neither convicted nor acquitted, but held, as he describes it, as a sort of “prisoner at large,” until, willing to bear it no longer, he determined to go back to England. That he should leave Georgia and go somewhere was just what the Georgians wanted, and although a pretense of opposing his going was made, they were glad when he left, December 2, 1737.¹⁷⁰⁹

Of the Southern colonies, Virginia took the lead, and was next to Massachusetts in intolerance and persecution. The colony was divided into parishes, and all the inhabitants were taxed to maintain the worship of the Episcopal Church. All the people were required to attend the churches of the establishment. The rights of citizenship were dependent upon membership in the Episcopal Church. Whoever failed to attend church any Sunday “without an allowable excuse,” was to be fined one pound of tobacco, and if any one should be absent from Sunday service for a month, the fine was fifty pounds of tobacco.

Virginia, however, though standing in the lead of the Southern colonies in the severity of its religious legislation, was the first of all the colonies to separate Church and State, and to declare and secure by statute the religious rights of all men.

From this review of Protestantism, it plainly appears that after Martin Luther, until the rise of Roger Williams, not a single Reformer preached in sincerity the principles of Christianity and of Protestantism as to the rights of conscience, and that in not a single place except the colony of Rhode Island, was there even recognized, much less exemplified, the Christian and Protestant principle of the separation of Church and State, of the religious and civil powers.

Throughout this whole period we find that in all the discussions, and all the work, of the professed champions of the rights of conscience, there everywhere appears the fatal defect that it was only their own rights of conscience that they either asserted or defended. In other words, their argument simply amounted to this: It is our inalienable right to believe and worship as we choose. It is likewise our inalienable right to compel everybody else to believe and worship as we choose.

But this is no assertion at all of the rights of conscience. The true principle and assertion of the rights of conscience is not our assertion of our right to believe and worship as we choose. This always leaves the way open for the additional assertion of our right to compel others to believe and worship as we choose, should occasion seem to demand; and there are a multitude of circumstances that are ever ready strongly to urge that occasion does demand.

The true principle and the right assertion of the rights of conscience is our assertion of every other man’s right to believe and worship as he chooses,

or not to worship at all if he chooses. This at once sweeps away every excuse and every argument that might ever be offered for the restriction or the invasion of the rights of conscience by any person or any power.

This is the Christian doctrine. This is the Roger Williams doctrine. This is the genuine Protestant doctrine, for it is “the logical consequence of either of the two great distinguishing principles of the Reformation, as well of justification by faith alone as of the equality of all believers.” — Bancroft.^{f710}

In the promulgation of the principles of Protestantism, and in the work of the Reformation, the names of MARTIN LUTHER and ROGER WILLIAMS can never rightly be separated. Williams completed what Luther began; and together they gave anew to the world, and for all time, the principles originally announced by Him who was the Author and Finisher of the faith of both — JESUS CHRIST, THE AUTHOR OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

CHAPTER 24.

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

THEN came the American Revolution, overturning all the principles of the papacy, and establishing for the enlightenment of all nations, THE NEW REPUBLIC, — the first national government upon the earth that accords with the principles announced by Jesus Christ for mankind and for civil government.

The American Revolution did not consist in the establishment of a government independent of Great Britain, but in the ideas concerning man and government that were proclaimed and established by it. This Revolution is the expression of two distinct ideas. First, that government is of the people; and, second, that government is of right entirely separate from religion.

The first decided step in this grand revolution was taken when the Declaration of Independence was signed. That immortal document declares: —

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.”

Thus in two sentences was annihilated the despotic doctrine which, springing from the usurped authority of the papacy, to sit in the place of God and to set up and pull down kings, and to bestow kingdoms and empires at its will, had now become venerable, if not absolutely hallowed, by the precedents of a thousand years — the doctrine of the divine right of kings; and in the place of the old, false, despotic theory of the sovereignty of the government and the subjection of the people, there was declared the

self-evident truth, the subjection of government, and the sovereignty of the people.

In declaring the equal and inalienable right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, there is not only declared the sovereignty of the people, but also the entire capability of the people. The declaration, in itself, presupposes that men are men indeed, and that as such they are fully capable of deciding for themselves as to what is best for their happiness, and how they shall pursue it, without the government's being set up as a parent or guardian to deal with them as with children.

In declaring that governments are instituted, by the governed, for certain ends, and that when any government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness, it is likewise declared that instead of the people's needing to be cared for by the government, the government must be cared for by the people.

This is confirmed by the national Constitution, which is but the complement of the Declaration. Thus says —

THE PREAMBLE:

“We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

And Article IX of Amendments says: —

“The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

And Article X of Amendments says: —

“The powers not delegated to the United States by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

In declaring the objects of government to be to secure to the people the rights which they already possess in full measure and inalienable degree, and to effect their safety and happiness in the enjoyment of those rights; and in declaring the right of the people, in the event named, to alter or abolish the government which they have, and institute a new one on such principles and in such form as to them seems best; there is likewise declared not only the complete subordination but also the absolute impersonality of government. It is therein declared that the government is but a device, a piece of political machinery, framed and set up by the people, by which they would make themselves secure in the enjoyment of the inalienable rights which they already possess as men, and which they have by virtue of being men in society and not by virtue of government; — the right which was theirs before government was; which is their own in the essential meaning of the term; and “which they do not hold by any subinfeudation, but by direct homage and allegiance to the Owner and Lord of all” (Stanley Matthews^{f711}), their Creator, who has endowed them with those rights. And in thus declaring the impersonality of government, there is wholly uprooted every vestige of any character of paternity in the government.

In declaring the equality of all men in the possession of these inalienable rights, there is likewise declared the strongest possible safeguard of the people. For this being the declaration of the people, each one of the people stands thereby pledged to the support of the principle thus declared. Therefore, each individual is pledged, in the exercise of his own inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, so to act as not to interfere with any other person in the free and perfect exercise of his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Any person who so acts as to restrict or interfere with the free exercise of any other person’s right to life, or liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, denies the principle, to the maintenance of which he is pledged, and does in effect subvert the government. For, rights being equal, if one may so act, every other one may do so; and thus no man’s right is recognized, government is gone, and only anarchy remains. Therefore, by every interest, personal as well as general, private as well as public, every individual among the people is pledged in the enjoyment of his right to life, or liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, so to conduct himself as not to interfere in the least degree with the equal right of every other one to the free and full exercise of his enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. “For the

rights of man, as man, must be understood in a sense that can admit of no single exception; for to allege an exception is the same thing as to deny the principle. We reject, therefore, with scorn, any profession of respect to the principle which, in fact, comes to us clogged and contradicted by a petition for an exception.... To profess the principle and then to plead for an exception, let the plea be what it may, is to deny the principle, and it is to utter a treason against humanity. The rights of man must everywhere all the world over be recognized and respected.” — Isaac Taylor.^{f712}

The Declaration of Independence, therefore, announces the perfect principle of civil government. If the principle thus announced were perfectly conformed to by all, then the government would be a perfect civil government. It is but the principle of self-government — government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And to the extent to which this principle is exemplified among the people, to the extent to which the individual governs himself, just to that extent and no further will prevail the true idea of the Declaration, and the republic which it created.

Such is the first grand idea of the American Revolution. And it is the scriptural idea, the idea of Jesus Christ and of God. Let this be demonstrated.

The Declaration holds that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Now the Creator of all men is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and “is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also.” And as he “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth” (~~<4173>~~ Acts 17:26), “there is no respect of persons with God.” ~~<801>~~ Romans 2:11. Nor is this the doctrine of the later scripture only; it is the doctrine of all the Book. The most ancient writings in the Book have these words: “If I did despise the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant when they contended with me; what then shall I do when God riseth up? and when he visiteth, what shall I answer him? Did not he that made me in the womb, make him?” ~~<801>~~ Job 30:13- 15. And, “The Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward: he doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger in giving him food and raiment. Love ye therefore the stranger.” “The stranger that dwelleth with you, shall be unto

you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself.”

~~<51017>~~Deuteronomy 10:17-19; ~~<01834>~~Leviticus 19:34.

All men are indeed created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

As to civil government, the Scripture commands, “Render to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s;” and Christ himself paid tribute to Caesar, “thus recognizing the rightfulness of civil government to be.” But more than this, it is plainly declared, “The powers that be are ordained of God.”

~~<61017>~~Romans 13:1. This scripture has long been used to sustain the papal fable of the divine right of kings, but such use was always only a perversion. It is proper and interesting to have a scriptural answer to the question. How then are the powers that be ordained of God? And to this question, the Scriptures do give a clear answer.

Let us read: “In the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah king of Judah, came this word unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Thus saith the Lord to me: Make thee bonds and yokes, and put them upon thy neck, and send them to the king of Edom, and to the king of Moab, and to the king of the Ammonites, and to the king of Tyrus, and to the king of Zidon, by the hand of the messengers which come to Jerusalem unto Zedekiah king of Judah, and command them to say unto their masters, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Thus shall ye say unto your masters: I have made the earth, the man and the beasts that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me. And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son’s son, until the very time of his land come, and then many nations and great kings shall serve themselves of him. And it shall come to pass that the nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish, saith the Lord, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand.”

In this scripture it is clearly shown that the power of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was ordained of God; nor to Nebuchadnezzar alone, but to his son and his son’s son: which is to say that the power of the Babylonian

empire, as an imperial power, was ordained of God. Nebuchadnezzar was plainly called by the Lord, “My servant;” and the Lord says, “And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon.” He further says that whatever “nation and kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I punish.”

Another instance: In the above scripture it is stated that the power of Babylon should continue through Nebuchadnezzar and his son and to his son’s son, and that all nations should serve Babylon until that time, and that then nations and kings should serve themselves of him. Other prophecies show that Babylon was then to be destroyed. ²⁵¹³Jeremiah 51:28 says that the king of the Medes, and all his land, with the captains and rulers, should be prepared against Babylon to destroy it. ²³¹⁰Isaiah 21:2 shows that Persia (Elam) should accompany Media in the destruction of Babylon. ²⁵¹³Isaiah 45:1-4 names Cyrus as the leader of the forces, more than a hundred years before he was born, and one hundred and seventy-four years before the time. And of Cyrus, the prophet said from the Lord, “I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways; he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price, nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts.” ²⁵¹³Isaiah 45:13. But in the conquest of Babylon, Cyrus was only the leader of the forces. The kingdom and rule were given to Darius the Mede; for, said Daniel to Belshazzar, on the night when Babylon fell, “Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians.” Then the record proceeds: “In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Median took the kingdom.” Of him we read in ²⁷¹⁰Daniel 11:1, the words of the angel Gabriel to the prophet: “I, in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him.”

There can be no dispute, therefore, that the power of Babylon, as exercised by Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, and that of Medo-Persia as exercised by Darius and Cyrus and their successors, was ordained of God. It would be easy to follow the same truth onward to the power of Grecia, in Alexander and his successors, and to Rome, as indeed it was Nero who was emperor when this letter was written to the Christians at Rome, in which is this declaration that “the powers that be are ordained of God.”

Was then the power exercised by Nebuchadnezzar and his successors unto Nero — was this power bestowed upon any of these directly, or in a miraculous way?

Did God send a prophet or a priest to anoint any of these rulers to be king or emperor? or did he send a heavenly messenger, as he did to Moses and to Gideon? — Neither. Nebuchadnezzar was king because he was the son of his father, who had been king. How then did his father become king? In 625 B. C., Babylonia was but one province of the empire of Assyria; Media was another. Both revolted, and at the same time. The king of Assyria gave Nabopollasar command of a large force, and sent him to Babylonia to quell the revolt, while he himself led other forces into Media, to put down the insurrection there. Nabopollasar did his work so well in Babylonia that the king of Assyria rewarded him with the command of that province, with the title of king of Babylon.

Thus Nabopollasar received his power from the king of Assyria. The king of Assyria received his from his father, Asshur-bani-pal; Asshur-bani-pal received his from his father, Esar-haddon; Esar-haddon received his from his father, Sennacherib; Sennacherib received his from his father, Sargon; and Sargon received his from the troops in the field, that is, from the people; for the army of Assyria was not a standing army, as those of modern nations are, but it was the male portion of the nation itself, at war. Thus it was, and thus only, that the power of Nebuchadnezzar and his son and his son's son, was ordained of God. It was simply providential, and was brought about and worked out as is anything and everything else in the realm of the providence of God. It was so, likewise, with all the others. And it has always been so in every case, in every government, that ever was on earth, except only in the nation of Israel.

Yet more than this, except in the nation of Israel, it is not, and never has been, personal sovereigns in themselves that have been referred to in the statement that "the powers that be are ordained of God." It is not the persons that be in power, but the powers that be in the person, that are ordained of God. The inquiry of Romans 13:3, is not, Wilt thou then not be afraid of the person? But it is, "Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power?" It is not the person, therefore, but the power that is represented in the person, that is under consideration here. And that person derives his power from the people, as is clearly proved by the scriptural examples and references given.

And this is the American doctrine, — the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. In the discussions which brought forth the Declaration and developed the Revolution, the doctrine found expression in the following forceful and eloquent words: “Government is founded not on force, as was the theory of Hobbes; nor on compact, as was the theory of Locke and of the revolution of 1688; nor on property, as was asserted by Harrington. It springs from the necessities of our nature, and has an everlasting foundation in the unchangeable will of God. Man came into the world and into society at the same instant. There must exist in every earthly society a supreme sovereign, from whose final decision there can be no appeal but directly to heaven. This supreme power is originally and ultimately in the people; and the people never did in fact freely, nor can rightfully, make an unlimited renunciation of this divine right. Kingcraft and priestcraft are a trick to gull the vulgar. The happiness of mankind demands that this grand and ancient alliance should be broken off forever.

“The omniscient and omnipotent Monarch of the universe has, by the grand charter given to the human race, placed the end of government in the good of the whole. The form of government is left to the individuals of each society; its whole superstructure and administration should be conformed to the law of universal reason. There can be no prescription old enough to supersede the law of nature and the grant of God Almighty, who has given all men a right to be free. If every prince since Nimrod had been a tyrant, it would not prove a right to tyrannize. The administrators of legislative and executive authority, when they verge toward tyranny, are to be resisted; if they prove incorrigible, are to be deposed.

“The first principle and great end of government being to provide for the best good of all the people, this can be done only by a supreme legislative and executive, ultimately in the people, or whole community, where God has placed it; but the difficulties attending a universal congress, gave rise to a right of representation. Such a transfer of the power of the whole to a few was necessary; but to bring the powers of all into the hands of one or some few, and to make them hereditary, is the interested work of the weak and the wicked. Nothing but life and liberty are actually hereditary. The grand political problem is to invent the best combination of the powers of legislation and execution! They must

exist in the State, just as in the revolution of the planets; one power would fix them to a center, and another carry them off indefinitely; but the first and simple principle is, EQUALITY and THE POWER OF THE WHOLE....

“The British colonists do not hold their liberties or their lands by so slippery a tenure as the will of the prince. Colonists are men, the common children of the same Creator with their brethren of Great Britain. The colonists are men: the colonists are therefore freeborn; for, by the law of nature, all men are freeborn, white or black. No good reason can be given for enslaving those of any color. Is it right to enslave a man because his color is black, or his hair short and curled like wool, instead of Christian hair? Can any logical inference in favor of slavery be drawn from a flat nose or a long or short face? The riches of the West Indies, or the luxury of the metropolis, should not have weight to break the balance of truth and justice. Liberty is the gift of God, and cannot be annihilated.

“Nor do the political and civil rights of the British colonists rest on a charter from the crown. Old Magna Charta was not the beginning of all things, nor did it rise on the borders of chaos out of the unformed mass. A time may come when Parliament shall declare every American charter void; but the natural, inherent, and inseparable rights of the colonists, as men and as citizens, can never be abolished.... The world is at the eve of the highest scene of earthly power and grandeur that has ever yet been displayed to the view of mankind. Who will win the prize, is with God. But human nature must and will be rescued from the general slavery that has so long triumphed over the species.” — James Otis.^{f713}

Thus spoke an American “for his country and for the race,” bringing to “the conscious intelligence of the people the elemental principles of free government and human rights.” Outside of the theocracy of Israel, there never has been a ruler or an executive on earth whose authority was not, primarily or ultimately, expressly or permissively, derived from the people.

It is not particular sovereigns whose power is ordained of God, nor any particular form of government. It is the genius of government itself. The absence of government is anarchy. Anarchy is only governmental confusion. But says the scripture, “God is not the author of confusion.”

God is the God of order. He has ordained order, and he has put within man himself that idea of government, of self-protection, which is the first law of nature, and which organizes itself into forms of one kind or another, wherever men dwell on the face of the earth. And it is for men themselves to say what shall be the form of government under which they will dwell. One people has one form; another has another. This genius of civil order springs from God; it matters not whether it be exercised through one form of government or through another, the governmental power and order thus exercised is ordained of God. If the people choose to change their form of government, it is still the same power; it is to be respected still, because in its legitimate exercise, it is still ordained of God.

It is demonstrated, therefore, that where the Declaration of Independence says that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, it asserts THE ETERNAL TRUTH OF GOD.

The second grand idea of the American Revolution — that government is of right entirely separate from religion — is the logical sequence of the first.

RELIGION is defined as “the recognition of God as an object of worship, love, and obedience.” And again, as “man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God.” And the first governmental definition of the word in the United States, declared that “religion” is “the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it.”

Now governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, can never of right exercise any power not delegated by the governed. But religion pertaining solely to man’s relation to God, and the duty which he owes to his Creator, in the nature of things can never be delegated. It is utterly impossible for any person ever, in any degree, to transfer to another any relationship to God or any duty which he owes to his Creator. To attempt to do so would be to deny God and renounce religion, and even then the thing would not be done — his relationship to God would still abide as firmly as ever.

Logically and rightfully, therefore, the government of the United States disavows any jurisdiction or power in things religious. Religion is not, and never can rightly be made, in any sense a requisite to the governmental authority of the United States, because the supreme law declares that —

“No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.”^{f714}

The government cannot rightly legislate in any sense upon matters of religion, because the supreme law says that —

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”^{f715}

By this clause, Congress is forbidden to make any law looking toward any establishment of a national religion, or approving or disapproving any religion already established in any State — as several of the States had established religious when this amendment was adopted. By it likewise Congress is forbidden to make any law prohibiting the free exercise of religion by any individual in all the land. That is to say that Congress is forbidden to make any law bearing in any way whatever on the subject of religion; for it is impossible to make a law on the subject of religion without interfering with the free exercise of religion. No law can ever be made even in favor of any religion without prohibiting the free exercise of that religion. No man can ever sanction legislation in favor of the religion in which he believes without robbing himself of the free exercise of that religion. Congress, therefore, is absolutely forbidden ever to make any law on the subject of religion in any way whatever.

Consistently with all this, and as the crown of all, religion is not in any sense a requisite to the citizenship of the United States, for again the supreme law declares: —

“The government of the United States is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion.”^{f716}

Thus logically by the Declaration and explicitly by the Constitution, the government of the United States is completely separated from religion. And such is the second grand idea of the American Revolution.

And it is also the scriptural idea, the idea of Jesus Christ, and of God. Let this be demonstrated, and it will be proved that the American system of government is complete and the idea perfect. And demonstrated it can easily be.

To the definition that religion is the recognition of God, as an object of worship, love, and obedience, the scripture responds: “It is written, as I

live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.” ^{<541>}Romans 14:11, 12.

And, to the statement that religion is man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God, the scripture responds: “Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself before God.” ^{<542>}Romans 14:22. “For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” ^{<450>}2 Corinthians 5:10.

No government can ever account to God for any individual. No man nor any set of men can ever have faith for another. No government will ever stand before the judgment-seat of Christ to answer even for itself; much less for the people or for any individual. Therefore, no government can ever of right assume any responsibility in any way in any matter of religion.

As to religion and government, Christ commanded, “Render to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” To Caesar — to government — there is to be rendered only that which is Caesar’s; while that which is God’s is to be rendered to God alone. Men are not to render to Caesar that which is God’s, nor are they to render to God by Caesar that which is God’s. That which is Caesar’s is to be rendered to him alone. That which is God’s is to be rendered to him alone. Now, as religion pertains to man’s relations to God, it is to be rendered to God alone. It does not pertain to government; it never can be rendered to government. Christ has forbidden that it should be so rendered. Therefore, the word of Jesus Christ does distinctly and decidedly separate religion from earthly government. Nor is this the only passage of Scripture on this subject. It is the doctrine of the Book. In the former part of this chapter, we have shown by the Scriptures that earthly governments — the powers that — are ordained of God. By the scriptures cited, we have seen that the power of Babylonia, as represented by Nebuchadnezzar, and the power of Media and Persia, as represented by Darius and Cyrus, was distinctly declared to be ordained of God. Now it is important to inquire, Unto what was this power ordained? Was there any limit set to it? In short, Was this power which was ordained of God, ordained to be exercised in things pertaining to God, that is, in matters of religion? These questions are clearly answered in the Scriptures.

In the third chapter of Daniel we have the record that Nebuchadnezzar made a great image of gold, set it up in the plain of Dura, and gathered together the princes, the governors, the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counselors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to the dedication of the image; and they stood before the image that had been set up. Then a herald from the king cried aloud: "To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up; and whoso falleth not down and worshipeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace."

In obedience to this command, all the people bowed down and worshiped before the image, except three Jews, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. This disobedience was reported to Nebuchadnezzar, who commanded them to be brought before him, when he asked them if they had disobeyed his order intentionally. He himself then repeated his command to them.

These men knew that they had been made subject to the king of Babylon by the Lord himself. It had not only been prophesied by Isaiah (~~2301~~ Isaiah 39), but also by Jeremiah. At the final siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the Lord, through Jeremiah, told the people to submit to the king of Babylon, and that whosoever would do it, it should be well with them; whosoever would not do it, it should be ill with them. Yet these men, knowing all this, made answer to Nebuchadnezzar thus: "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thy hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."

Then the three men were cast into the fiery furnace, heated seven times hotter than it was wont to be heated; but suddenly Nebuchadnezzar rose up in haste and astonishment, and said to his counselors, "Did we not cast three men bound into the midst of the fire?" They answered, "True, O king." But he exclaimed, "Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God." The men were called forth. "Then Nebuchadnezzar spake and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed

the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God."

Here stand the following facts: First, God gave power to the kingdom of Babylon; second, he suffered his people to be subjected as captives to that power; third, by a wonderful miracle he defended his people from a certain exercise of that power. Did God contradict or oppose himself? — Far from it. What, then, do these facts show? — They show conclusively that this was an undue exercise of the power which God had given. By this it is demonstrated that the power of the kingdom of Babylon, although ordained of God, was not ordained unto any such purpose as that for which it was exercised; that though ordained of God, it was not ordained to be exercised in things pertaining to God, or men's rights of religion; and it was written for the instruction of future ages, and for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come.

Another example: Darius, king of Media and Persia, made Daniel prime minister of his dominion. But a number of the presidents and princes, envious of the position given to Daniel, attempted to undermine and displace him. After earnest efforts to find occasion against him in matters pertaining to the kingdom, they were forced to confess that there was neither error nor fault anywhere in his conduct. Then said these men, "We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God." They therefore assembled together to the king, and told him that all the presidents of the kingdom, and the governors, and the princes, and the captains, had consulted together to establish a royal statute, and to make a decree that whoever should ask a petition of any god or man, except the king, for thirty days, should be cast into the den of lions. Darius, not suspecting their object, signed the decree.

Daniel knew that the decree had been made, and signed by the king. It was hardly possible for him not to know it, being prime minister. Yet notwithstanding his knowledge of the affair, he went into his chamber, and his windows being open toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks before God, as he did aforetime. He did not even close the windows. He simply paid no attention at all to the decree that had been made, although it forbade his doing as he did, under the penalty of being thrown to the lions.

As was to be expected, the men who had secured the passage of the decree, “found” him praying and making supplications before his God. They went at once to the king, and asked him if he had not signed a decree that every man who should ask a petition of any god or man within thirty days except of the king, should be cast into the den of lions. The king replied that this was true, and that, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, it could not be altered. Then they told him that Daniel did not regard the king, nor the decree that he had signed, but made his petition three times a day.

The king realized in a moment that he had been entrapped; but there was no remedy. Those who were pushing the matter, held before him the law, and said, “know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree or statute which the king establisheth may be changed.” Nothing could be done; the decree, being law, must be enforced. Daniel was cast to the lions. In the morning the king came to the den and called to Daniel, and Daniel replied, “O king, live forever; my God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lion’s mouths, that they have not hurt me; forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, I have done no hurt.”

Thus again God has shown that although the powers that be are ordained of God, they are not ordained to act in things that pertain to men’s relationship to God. God declares the man innocent, who disregards or violates the law that interferes with man’s relationship to God, or that presumes to dictate in matters of religion.

These cases show plainly that, according to the mind of God, religion and earthly government are to be entirely separated. It follows, therefore, that the Constitution of the United States is in harmony with the will of God as expressed in the Scriptures of truth, upon the subject of religion and the State.

Yet, for reasons which will appear later, there is now an attempt to make it appear that this was the result of forgetfulness, if not rather hostility to the Christian religion. But nothing could be farther from the truth than both of these suggestions. So far from its having been the result of forgetfulness, it was by direct design: and so far from its having resulted from hostility to Christianity, it was out of respect for it and for the rights of men which that religion inculcates.

It is impossible for it to have been in any way a matter of forgetfulness, because the Constitution speaks expressly upon the subject. Yet, though the Constitution had been wholly silent on the question, the fact could not be justly attributed to forgetfulness or carelessness; because the work of the Convention was not the adoption of the Constitution. After the Convention had finished its labors, that which they had done was submitted for approval to the thirteen States, every one of which was most vigilantly wakeful to detect every possible defect in it; and as we shall presently see, this point was discussed by the States when the proposed Constitution came before them for approval.

And that the Constitution was made as it is, in this matter entirely out of respect to religion and to Christianity in particular, is susceptible of the strongest proof. In fact, Christian churches were the chief factors in the movement. We have already shown that the Constitution is the complement of the Declaration of Independence; and that this phase of the Constitution is but the logical sequence of the Declaration. Nor is this all; it is the direct fruit of the Declaration. The history of this matter is worth reviving.

June 12, 1776, a convention of the Colonial House of Burgesses of Virginia, adopted a Declaration of Rights, composed of sixteen sections, every one of which, in substance, afterward found a place in the Declaration of Independence and the national Constitution. The sixteenth section reads as follows: —

“That religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence, and therefore all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love, and charity toward each other.” ^{F717}

This was followed, July 4, by the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson of Virginia. The Declaration of Independence had no sooner been published abroad, than the Presbytery to Hanover in Virginia, at its very first meeting, openly took its stand in the recognition of the new and independent nation, and addressed to the Virginia House of Assembly the following memorial: —

“To the Honorable, the General Assembly of Virginia: The memorial of the Presbytery of Hanover humbly represents: That your memorialists are governed by the same sentiments which have inspired the United States of America, and are determined that nothing in our power and influence shall be wanting to give success to their common cause. We would also represent that dissenters from the Church of England in this country have ever been desirous to conduct themselves as peaceable members of the civil government, for which reason they have hitherto submitted to various ecclesiastic burdens and restrictions that are inconsistent with equal liberty. But now when the many and grievous oppressions of our mother country have laid this continent under the necessity of casting off the yoke of tyranny, and of forming independent governments upon equitable and liberal foundations, we flatter ourselves that we shall be freed from all the incumbrances which a spirit of domination, prejudice, or bigotry has interwoven with most other political systems. This we are the more strongly encouraged to expect by the Declaration of Rights, so universally applauded for that dignity, firmness, and precision with which it delineates and asserts the privileges of society, and the prerogatives of human nature; and which we embrace as the Magna Charta of our commonwealth, that can never be violated without endangering the grand superstructure it was designed to sustain. Therefore, we rely upon this Declaration as well as the justice of our honorable legislature, to secure us the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of our own consciences: and we should fall short in our duty to ourselves, and the many and numerous congregations under our care, were we, upon this occasion, to neglect laying before you a statement of the religious grievances under which we have hitherto labored, that they may no longer be continued in our present form of government.

“It is well known that in the frontier counties, which are justly supposed to contain a fifth part of the inhabitants of Virginia, the dissenters have borne the heavy burdens of purchasing glebes, building churches, and supporting the established clergy, where there are very few Episcopalians, either to assist in bearing the expense, or to reap the advantage; and that throughout other parts of the country there are also many thousands of Zealous friends and

defenders of our State, who, besides the invidious and disadvantageous restrictions to which they have been subjected, annually pay large taxes to support an establishment from which their consciences and principles oblige them to dissent; all which are confessedly so many violations of their natural rights, and, in their consequences, a restraint upon freedom of inquiry and private judgment.

“In this enlightened age, and in a land where all of every denomination are united in the most strenuous efforts to be free, we hope and expect that our representatives will cheerfully concur in removing every species of religious as well as civil bondage. Certain it is, that every argument for civil liberty gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion; and there is no argument in favor of establishing the Christian religion but may be pleaded, with equal propriety, for establishing the tenets of Mohammed by those who believe the Alcoran; or, if this be not true, it is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the Christian faith, without erecting a claim to infallibility, which would lead us back to the Church of Rome.

“We beg leave farther to represent, that religious establishments are highly injurious to the temporal interests of any community. Without insisting upon the ambition and the arbitrary practices of those who are favored by government or the intriguing, seditious spirit which is commonly excited by this, as well as by every other kind of oppression, such establishments greatly retard population, and, consequently, the progress of arts, sciences, and manufactures. Witness the rapid growth and improvement of the Northern provinces compared with this. No one can deny that the more early settlements and the many superior advantages of our country, would have invited multitudes of artificers, mechanics, and other useful members of society, to fix their habitation among us, who have either remained in their place of nativity, or preferred worse civil governments, and a more barren soil, where they might enjoy the rights of conscience more fully than they had a prospect of doing in this; from which we infer that Virginia might have now been the capital of America, and a match for the British arms,

without depending on others for the necessities of war, had it not been prevented by her religious establishment.

“Neither can it be made to appear that the gospel needs any such civil aid. We rather conceive that, when our blessed Saviour declares his kingdom is not of this world, he renounces all dependence upon State power; and as his weapons are spiritual, and were only designed to have influence on the judgment and heart of men, we are persuaded that if mankind were left in quiet possession of their inalienable religious privileges, Christianity, as in the days of the apostles, would continue to prevail and flourish in the greatest purity by its own native excellence, and under the all-disposing providence of God.

“We would also humbly represent, that the only proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence, the security of the life, liberty, and property of the citizens, and to restrain the vicious and encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws, equally extending to every individual; but that the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge.

“Therefore we ask no ecclesiastical establishments for ourselves; neither can we approve of them when granted to others. This, indeed, would be giving exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges to one set of men, without any special public services, to the common reproach and injury of every other denomination. And for the reason recited, we are induced earnestly to entreat that all laws now in force in this commonwealth, which countenance religious domination, may be speedily repealed; that all of every religious sect may be protected in the full exercise of their several modes of worship; exempted from all taxes for the support of any church whatsoever, farther than what may be agreeable to their own private choice or voluntary obligation. This being done, all partial and invidious distinction will be abolished, to the great honor and interest of the State, and every one be left to stand or fall according to his merit, which can never be the case so long as any one denomination is established in preference to the others.

“That the great Sovereign of the universe may inspire you with unanimity, wisdom, and resolution, and bring you to a just determination on all the important concerns before you, is the fervent prayer of your memorialists.” ^{F718}

The Presbytery of Hanover was immediately joined in the good work by the Baptists and the Quakers, who sent up petitions to the same purpose. The Episcopalian was the established church of Virginia, and had been ever since the planting of the colony. The Episcopalians and the Methodists sent up counter-memorials, pleading for a continuance of the system of established religion. Two members of the assembly, Messrs. Pendleton and Nicolas, championed the establishment, and Jefferson, as ever, espoused the cause of liberty and right. After nearly two months of what Jefferson pronounced the severest contest in which he was ever engaged, the cause of freedom prevailed, and December 6, 1776, the Assembly passed a law repealing all the colonial laws and penalties prejudicial to dissenters, releasing them from any further compulsory contributions to the Episcopal Church, and discontinuing the State support of the Episcopal clergy after January 1, 1777.

A motion was then made to levy a general tax for the support of all denominations, but it was postponed till a future Assembly. To the next Assembly petitions were sent strongly pleading for the general assessment. But the Presbytery of Hanover, still strongly supported by the Baptists and the Quakers, was again on hand with a memorial, in which it referred to the points previously presented, and then proceeded as follows: —

“We would also humbly represent, that the only proper objects of civil government are the happiness and protection of men in the present state of existence, the security of the life, liberty, and property of the citizens, and to restrain the vicious and to encourage the virtuous by wholesome laws, equally extending to every individual; but that the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can only be directed by reason and conviction, and is nowhere cognizable but at the tribunal of the universal Judge.

“To illustrate and confirm these assertions, we beg leave to observe, that to judge for ourselves, and to engage in the exercise of religion agreeably to the dictates of our own consciences, is an

inalienable right, which, upon the principles on which the gospel was first propagated, and the Reformation from popery carried on, can never be transferred to another. Neither does the church of Christ stand in need of a general assessment for its support; and most certain we are that it would be of no advantage, but an injury to the society to which we belong; and as every good Christian believes that Christ has ordained a complete system of laws for the government of his kingdom, so were are persuaded that by his providence he will support it to its final consummation. In the fixed belief of this principle, that the kingdom of Christ and the concerns of religion are beyond the limits of civil control, we should act a dishonest, inconsistent part, were we to receive any emoluments from human establishments for the support of the gospel.

“These things being considered, we hope that we shall be excused for remonstrating against a general assessment for any religious purpose. As the maxims have long been approved, that every servant is to obey his master, and that the hireling is accountable for his conduct to him from whom he receives his wages; in like manner, if the legislature has any rightful authority over the ministers of the gospel in the exercise of their sacred office, and if it is their duty to levy a maintenance for them as such, then it will follow that they may revive the old establishment in its former extent, or ordain a new one for any sect they may think proper; they are invested with a power not only to determine, but it is incumbent on them to declare who shall preach, what they shall preach, to whom, when, and in what places they shall preach; or to impose any regulations and restrictions upon religious societies that they may judge expedient. These consequences are so plain as not to be denied, and they are so entirely subversive of religious liberty, that if they should take place in Virginia, we should be reduced to the melancholy necessity of saying with the apostles in like cases, ‘Judges ye whether it is best to obey God or men,’ and also of acting as they acted.

“Therefore, as it is contrary to our principles and interest, and, as we think, subversive of religious liberty, we do again most earnestly entreat that our legislature would never extend any assessment for religious purposes to us or to the congregations under our care.”^{F719}

In 1779 they defeated the bill, which had been ordered to a third reading. But in the first Assembly after the war was over, in 1784, it was brought up again, this time with Patrick Henry as its leading advocate. It was entitled "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion." James Madison stood with Jefferson. As the bill was about to pass, they succeeded in carrying a motion to postpone it till the next session, but in the meantime, to have it printed and generally circulated. As soon as this had been accomplished, Madison wrote, also for general circulation and signature, a Memorial and Remonstrance, to be presented to the next Assembly, in opposition to the bill. This document reads as follows: —

"We, the subscribers, citizens of the said commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration a bill printed by order of the last session of General Assembly, entitled, 'A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion,' and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill —

"1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth 'that religion, or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence.' The religion, then, of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated in their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men. It is unalienable, also, because what is here a right towards men is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society. Before any man can be considered as a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the universe: and if a member of civil society who enters into any subordinate association must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular civil society do it with a saving of his allegiance to the universal

Sovereign. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance. True it is, that no other rule exists by which any question which may divide a society can be ultimately determined than the will of the majority; but it is also true that the majority may trespass upon the rights of the minority.

“2. Because, if religion be exempt from the authority of the society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body. The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited. It is limited with regard to the co-ordinate departments: more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free government requires not merely that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power be invariably maintained, but more especially that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are tyrants. The people who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves nor by any authority derived from them, and are slaves.

“3. Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment upon our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of the noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects? that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute three pence only, of his property, for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

“4. Because the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensable in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. ‘If all men are by nature equally free and independent,’ all men are to be considered as

entering into society on equal conditions: as relinquishing no more, and therefore, retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights. Above all, are they to be considered as retaining an ‘equal title to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience.’ Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and to observe, the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to them whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man. To god, therefore, not to man, must an account of it be rendered. As the bill violates equality by subjecting some to peculiar burdens, so it violates the same principle by granting to others peculiar exemptions. Are the Quakers and Menonists the only sects who think a compulsive support of their religions unnecessary and unwarrantable? Can their piety alone be intrusted with the care of public worship? Ought their religions to be endowed above all others with extraordinary privileges by which proselytes may be enticed from all others? We think too favorably of the justice and good sense of these denominations to believe that they either covet pre-eminences over their fellow-citizens, or that they will be seduced by them from the common opposition to the measure.

“5. Because the bill implies either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truths, or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension, falsified by the contradictory opinions of rulers in all ages and throughout the world; the second, an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

“6. Because the establishment proposed by the bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian religion itself, for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world. It is a contradiction to fact; for it is known that this religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them; and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence and the ordinary care of providence. Nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a religion not invented by human policy must have pre-existed and been supported before it was established by human policy. It is, moreover, to weaken in those who profess this religion a pious confidence in its innate excellence and the patronage of its Author; and to foster in those who

still reject it a suspicion that its friends are too conscious of its fallacies to trust it to its own merits.

“7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost fifteen centuries has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less, in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both superstition, bigotry, and persecution. Inquire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest luster; those of every sect point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy. Propose a restoration of this primitive state, in which its teachers depended on the voluntary rewards of their flocks; — many of them predict its downfall. On which side ought their testimony to have greatest weight; — when for, or when against, their interest?

“8. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of civil government only as it is a means of supporting religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If religion be not within the cognizance of civil government, how can its legal establishment be necessary to civil government? What influence, in fact, have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty may have found in established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property; by neither invading the equal right of any sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

“Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a luster to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a

melancholy mark is the bill, of sudden degeneracy! Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority. Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the carrier of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer of this cruel scourge in foreign regions must view the bill as a beacon on our coast warning him to seek some other haven, where liberty and philanthropy, in their due extent, may offer a more certain repose from his troubles.

“Because it will have a like tendency to banish our citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy, would be the same species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

“Because it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with religion has produced among its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the Old World in consequence of vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord by proscribing all differences in religious opinion. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American theater has exhibited proofs that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If with the salutary effects of this system under own eyes, we begin to contract the bounds of religious freedom, we know no name which will too severely reproach our folly. At least let warning be taken at the first-fruits of the threatened innovation. The very appearance of the bill has transformed ‘that Christian forbearance, love, and charity,’ which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies, which may not be appeased. What mischiefs may not be dreaded, should this enemy to the public quiet be armed with the force of law?

“Because the policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. The first wish of those who enjoy this precious gift ought to be that it may be imparted to the whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those who have as yet received it with the number still remaining under the dominion of false religions, and how small is the former? Does the policy of the bill tend to lessen the disproportion? No; it at once discourages those who are strangers to the light of revelation from coming into the region of it, and countenances by example the nations who continue in darkness in shutting out those who might convey it to them. Instead of leveling, as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill, with an ignoble and unchristian timidity, would circumscribe it with a wall of defense against the encroachments of error.

“Because attempts to enforce, by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of society. If it be difficult to execute any law which is not generally deemed necessary or salutary, what must be the case where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? And what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the government on its general authority?

“Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens; and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured. ‘The people of the respective counties are, indeed, requested to signify their opinion respecting the adoption of the bill, to the next session of the Assembly.’ But the representation must be made equal before the voice either of the representatives or of the counties will be that of the people. Our hope is, that neither of the former will, after due consideration, espouse the dangerous principle of the bill. Should the event disappoint us, it will still leave us in full confidence that a fair appeal to the latter will reverse the sentence against our liberties.

“Because finally, ‘The equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion, according to the dictates of conscience,’ is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its

origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the declaration of those rights ‘which pertain to the good people of Virginia as the basis and foundation of government,’ it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather with studied emphasis. Either, then, we must say that the will of the legislature is the only measure of their authority, and that in the plenitude of that authority they may sweep away all our fundamental rights, or that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred. Either we must say that they may control the freedom of the press, may abolish the trial by jury, may swallow up the executive and judiciary powers of the State; nay, that they may despoil us of our very right of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary assembly, or we must say that they have no authority to enact into a law the bill under consideration.

“We the subscribers, say that the General Assembly of this commonwealth have no such authority. And in order that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to ti this remonstrance; earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may, on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront his holy prerogative, or violate the trust committed to them; and, on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of his blessing, redound to their own praise, and establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the happiness of the commonwealth.” ^{F720}

This incomparable remonstrance was so generally signed that the bill for a general assessment was not only defeated, but in its place there was passed, December 26, 1785, “An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom,” written by Thomas Jefferson, and reading as follows: —

“Well aware that Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his almighty power to do; that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil

as well as ecclesiastical, who being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as such endeavoring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world, and through all time; that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagations of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporal rewards which, proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labors for the instruction of mankind; that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions, more than our opinions in physics or geometry; that, therefore, the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to the offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which, in common with his fellow-citizens, he has a natural right; that it tends also to corrupt the principles of that very religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing, with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments, those who will externally profess and conform to it; that though indeed these are criminal who do not withstand such temptation, yet neither are those innocent who lay the bait in their way; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles, on the supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because he being of course judge of that tendency, will make his opinions the rule of judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt actions against peace and good order; and, finally, that truth is great, and prevail will if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to

error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate, errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.

“Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly, that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

“And though we well know that this Assembly, elected by the people for the ordinary purposes of legislation only, have no power to restrain the acts of succeeding Assemblies, constituted with the powers equal to our own, and that therefore to declare this act irrevocable, would be of no effect in law, yet we are free to declare, and do declare, that the rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.”^{F722}

Now during this very time events were shaping and plans were being laid for the formation of a federal government for the American Union, to take the place of the helpless Confederation of States, and it is not too much to say that to James Madison, more than to any other single individual, except perhaps George Washington, is due the credit of bringing it all to a happy issue. And these contests in Virginia, by which there had been severed the illicit and corrupting connection between religion and the State, had awakened the public mind and prepared the way for the formation of a Constitution which would pledge the nation to a complete separation from all connection with religion in any way. Accordingly, the Constitution, as originally proposed by the convention, declared on this point that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.” Yet this was not allowed by the people of the States to be enough. One of the objections that was urged oftenest and strongest was that it did not make the freedom of religion secure enough.

In the Virginia Convention for the ratification of the Constitution, Madison said: —

“There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation. I can appeal to my uniform conduct on this subject, that I have warmly supported religious freedom. It is better that this security should be depended upon from the general legislature, than from one particular State. A particular State might concur in one religious project.” ^{F723}

In the Massachusetts Convention, there was objection made to the clause prohibiting a religious test, that “there is no provision that men in power should have any religion; a papist or an infidel is as eligible as Christians.” To this a minister replied, “No conceivable advantage to the whole will result from a test.” Another said, “It would be happy for the United States if our public men were to be of those who have a good standing in the church.” Again, a minister replied, “Human tribunals for the consciences of men are impious encroachments upon the prerogatives of God. A religious test, as a qualification for office, would have been a great blemish.” ^{F724} And Elder Isaac Backus, the Baptist minister, whose “Church History of New England” we have quoted in this book, said: —

“Mr. President, I have said very little to this honorable convention; but I now beg leave to offer a few thoughts upon some points in the Constitution proposed to us, and I shall begin with the exclusion of any religious test. Many appear to be much concerned about it; but nothing is more evident, both in reason and the Holy Scriptures, than that religion is ever a matter between God and individuals; and, therefore, no man or men can impose any religious test without invading the essential prerogatives of our Lord Jesus Christ. Ministers first assumed this power under the Christian name; and then Constantine approved of the practice when he adopted the profession of Christianity as an engine of State policy. And let the history of all nations be searched from that day to this, and it will appear that the imposing of religious tests has been the greatest engine of tyranny in the world. And I rejoice to see so many gentlemen who are now giving in their rights of conscience in this great and important matter. Some serious minds discover a concern lest if all religious test should be excluded, the Congress would

hereafter establish popery, or some other tyrannical way of worship. But it is most certain that no such way of worship can be established without any religious test.” ^{F725}

New York, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Virginia, and North Carolina, all proposed amendments more fully to secure religious rights. The first Congress under the Constitution met March 4, 1789, and in September of the same year the first Amendment was adopted, declaring that “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” And in 1797 the treaty with Tripoli was framed by an ex-Congregational clergyman, signed by President Washington, and approved by the Senate of the United States, declaring that “the government of the United States is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion.”

This completed the testimony of the supreme law of the land, expressive of the will of the American people that the government of the United States is, and of right ought to be FREE AND INDEPENDENT OF ALL ECCLESIASTICAL OR RELIGIOUS CONNECTION, INTERFERENCE, OR CONTROL. And the proof is abundant and absolutely conclusive, that it was all intentional, and that it was altogether out of respect for Christianity and the inalienable rights of men. Much has been said — none too much — of the wisdom of our fathers who set to the world this glorious example. Yet in this particular thing it would be an impeachment of their common sense to suppose they could have done otherwise. They had before them the history of the world, pagan, papal, and Protestant, from the cross of Christ to the Declaration of Independence, and, with the exception of the feeble example of toleration in Holland, and of religious freedom in Rhode Island, all the way it was one uninterrupted course of suffering and torture of the innocent; of oppression, riot, bloodshed, and anarchy by the guilty; and all as the result of the alliance of religion and the State.

The simplest process of deduction would teach them that it could not be altogether an experiment to try the total system of government without such a union, to be worse than all so far had proved with such union.

Our fathers were indeed wise, and it was that sort of wisdom that is the most profitable and the rarest — the wisdom of common sense. From all that was before them they could see that the State dominating religion and using religion for State purposes, is the pagan idea of government; that

religion dominating the State and using the civil power for religious purposes, is the papal idea of government; that both these ideas had been followed in the history of Protestantism; therefore they decided to steer clear of both, and by a clear-cut and distinct separation of religion and the State, establish the government of the United States upon THE CHRISTIAN IDEA.

Accordingly we can no more fittingly close this chapter than by quoting the noble tribute paid by the historian of the United States Constitution, to the principles of that grandest symbol of human government, and “most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man.”

“In the earliest States known to history, government and religion were one and indivisible. Each State had its special deity, and often these protectors, one after another, might be overthrown in battle, never to rise again. The Peloponnesian War grew out of a strife about an oracle. Rome, as it sometimes adopted into citizenship those whom it vanquished, introduced, in like manner, and with good logic for that day, the worship of their gods.

“No one thought of vindicating religion for the conscience of the individual, till a voice in Judea, breaking day for the greatest epoch in the life of humanity, by establishing a pure, spiritual, and universal religion for all mankind, enjoined to render to Cesar only that which is Cesar’s. The rule was upheld during the infancy of the gospel for all men. No sooner was this religion adopted by the chief of the Roman empire, than it was shorn of its character of universality, and enthralled by an unholy connection with the unholy State; and so it continued till the new nation, — the least defiled with barren scoffings of the eighteenth century, the most general believer in Christianity of any people of that age, the chief heir of the Reformation in its purest forms, — when it came to establish a government for the United States, refused to treat faith as a matter to be regulated by a corporate body, or having a headship in a monarch or a State.

“Vindicating the right of individuality even in religion, and in religion above all, the new nation dared to set the example of accepting in its relations to God the principle first divinely ordained

of God in Judea. It left the management of temporal things to the temporal power; but the American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power.”^{F726}

Thus with “perfect individuality extended to conscience,” the Constitution of the United States as it is, stands as the sole monument of all history representing the principle which Christ established for earthly government. And under it, in liberty, civil and religious, in enlightenment, and in progress, this nation has deservedly stood as the beacon light of the world, for more than a hundred years.

CHAPTER 25.

THE GREAT CONSPIRACY.

IT would seem that all people in the United States would be glad of the opportunity to rejoice evermore that by its supreme law this nation is pledged to religious freedom. It would seem that everybody ought to be glad of the opportunity to herald to all the world the fame of a nation under whose protection all people might dwell wholly unmolested in the full enjoyment of religious rights and the liberty to worship or not to worship according to the dictates of their own consciences.

Such, however, is not the case. As religious bigotry knows no such thing as enlightenment or progress; as ecclesiastical ambition never can be content without the power to persecute; so from the beginning, complaint has been made against the character of the United States Constitution as it respects religion, and constant effort has been made to weaken its influence, undermine its authority, and subvert its precepts.

From the very beginning, this feature of the Constitution has been denounced as foolish, atheistical, the strictly national sin, and the cause of epidemics, etc., particularly by ministers of such religion as had not sufficient power of truth to support itself, and doctors of a divinity so weak and sickly that it could not protect itself, much less protect and bless its worshipers or anybody else.

October 27, 1789, "The First Presbytery Eastward in Massachusetts and New Hampshire," sent to President Washington an address in which they complained because there was no "explicit acknowledgment of the only true God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent, inserted somewhere in the Magna Charta of our country." September 20, 1793, in a sermon preached in New York City on a fast day on account of the yellow fever in Philadelphia, and entitled "Divine Judgments," Dr. John M. Mason magnified the "irreligious" feature of the Constitution as one of the chief causes of the calamities of which he was speaking. He solemnly observed that had "such momentous business" as forming a Constitution, been transacted by Mohammedans, or even the savages, they would have done it "in the name of God" or "paid some homage to the Great Spirit." Yes, that is all true enough; and their god would have been as cruel and savage as

the Mohammedan and other national gods have always been. But happily for us and all the rest of the world, the noble men who framed the Constitution were neither Mohammedans nor savages. They were men enlightened by the principles and precepts of Christianity, and by a knowledge of history; and were endowed with respect for the rights of men.

In 1803 Samuel B. Wylie, D. D., of the University of Pennsylvania, preached a sermon in which he inquired: "Did not the framers of this instrument... in this resemble the fool mentioned in ~~1940~~ Psalm 14:1, 3, who said in his heart, 'There is no God'?" In 1811 Samuel Austin, D. D., a New England Congregationalist, afterward president of the University of Vermont, preached a sermon in Worcester, Mass., in which he declared that this "capital defect" in the national Constitution "will issue inevitably in the destruction" of the nation.

In 1812 President Dwight of Yale College preached a sermon in the college chapel, in which he lamented the failure of the Constitution to recognize a God, declaring that "we commenced our national existence, under the present system, without God." The next year he recurred to the same thing, saying that "the grossest nations and individuals, in their public acts and in their declarations, manifestoes, proclamations, etc., always recognize the superintendency of a Supreme Being. Even Napoleon did it." Of course Napoleon did it. It is such characters as he that are most likely to do it; and then, having covered himself with the hypocritical panoply, to ruin kingdoms, desolate nations, and violate every precept of morality and every principle of humanity. Yes, Napoleon did it; and so did Charlemagne before him, and Clovis, and Justinian, and Theodosius, and Constantine, to say nothing of hundreds of the popes. But the fathers of this republic were not such as any of these, the noblest pledge of which is the character of the Constitution as it respects religion, for all of which every Christian can most reverently thank the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In 1819, on a thanksgiving day appointed by the governor of Pennsylvania, Dr. Duffield preached a sermon at Carlisle, in which he declared the Constitution "entirely atheistical." Other such testimonies as the foregoing might be given to a wearisome extent, but with one more these must suffice. ^{F851} In 1859 Prof. J. H. McIlvaine, D. D., of the College of New Jersey, afterward of Princeton College, published an article in the Princeton Review for October, in which he really lamented that "the practical effect"

of the Constitution as it is, with respect to religion, “is the neutrality of the government with respect to all religion; “ and seemed much to be grieved “that no possible governmental influence can be constitutionally exerted for or against any form of religious belief.” If only our fathers in forming the national government and making the Constitution, had created a national god and established its worship under penalties of fine, imprisonment, whipping, branding, banishment, or death, and had drawn up a national creed so that the question of orthodoxy, with all its riotous and bloody accompaniments, could have been the grand issue in every congressional or presidential election, no doubt all these distressed doctors of divinity would have been delighted. Fortunately for the country and for the human race, the noble men who established this government had in view the protection and preservation of the inalienable rights of all the people, rather than the clothing of religious bigots with governmental power to force upon others their false religious views.

So far, however, all these criticisms and denunciations had been merely individual. Though they were strongly seconded by the legislative, judicial, and executive authorities in almost all the States, there was as yet no organized attack upon the Constitution, or regular war upon its principles. But in 1863 such an organization was effected and such a war was begun. In February of that year, “ A convention for prayer and Christian conference” was held in Xenia, Ohio, to consider in particular the state of the country. It was composed of representatives of eleven different religious denominations from seven States. The convention met February 3, and on the fourth, Mr. John Alexander, a United Presbyterian and covenanter, then of Xenia, later and now (1891) of Philadelphia, presented for the consideration of the Convention, a paper in which he bewailed the “human frailty and ingratitude” of the makers of the Constitution, and deplored the national sin of which they and all their posterity were guilty, because they had “well-nigh legislated God out of the government;” and closed with the following words: —

“We regard the Emancipation Proclamation of the President and his recommendation to purge the Constitution of slavery, as among the most hopeful signs of the times.

“We regard the neglect of God and his law, by omitting all acknowledgment of them in our Constitution, as the crowning, original sin of the nation, and slavery as one of its natural

outgrowths. Therefore the most important step remains yet to be taken, — to amend the Constitution so as to acknowledge God and the authority of his law; and the object of this paper is to suggest to this convention the propriety of considering this subject, and of preparing such an amendment to the Constitution as they may think proper to propose in accordance with its provisions.

“In order to bring the subject more definitely before the convention, we suggest the following as an outline of what seems to us to be needed in the preamble of that instrument, making it read as follows (proposed amendment in brackets): —

“WE, THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, [recognizing the being and attributes of Almighty God, the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, the law of God as the paramount rule, and Jesus, the Messiah, the Saviour and Lord of all,] in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.”

The convention approved the spirit and design of the paper, and ordered its publication. The following July 4, “a few delegates” met in Pittsburg, issued an address to the country, and formed a plan for the calling of a National Convention, which met in Allegheny, January 27, 1864. It is reported as “an earnest, prayerful, and most encouraging meeting.” It adopted a series of resolutions and a memorial to Congress, which latter is worth quoting, as showing the rapid growth of their designs upon the national Constitution. It runs as follows: —

“To the Honorable, the Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled: —

“We, citizens of the United States, respectfully ask your Honorable bodies to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States, so as to read in substance as follows: —

““We, the people of the United States, [humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power in civil government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the nations, and his revealed will as the supreme law of the land, in order to

constitute a Christian government], and in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, [and secure the inalienable rights and the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves, our posterity, and all the people,] do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

“And further: that such changes with respect to the oath of office, slavery, and all other matters, should be introduced into the body of the constitution, as may be necessary to give effect to these amendments in the preamble. And we, your humble petitioners, will ever pray,” etc.

“Resolved, That a special committee be appointed to carry the Memorial to Washington, lay it before the President, and endeavor to get a special message to Congress on the subject, and to lay said Memorial before Congress.”

The Prof. J. H. Mc Ilvaine, D. D., LL. D., before referred to, was made chairman of this special committee; and, as may well be supposed, was a diligent agent in this particular office, as well as an earnest worker for the bad cause, till the day of his death.

At this Allegheny meeting a permanent organization was effected, called “The National Association to Secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United states,” with Mr. John Alexander as the first president, and Zadok Street, a Quaker, as vice-president.^{F852}

It is not necessary to trace the particulars of the thing any further; suffice it to say that a national convention has been held each year since in the principal eastern cities — Pittsburg, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and as far west as Cincinnati. The official organ of the Association is the *Christian Statesman*, established in 1867, and published in Philadelphia. In the latest official manual of the association — 1890 — we find that the president is Hon. Felix R. Brunot, of Pittsburg, who has held the office since 1869; that there are one hundred and twenty-five vice-presidents, from thirty States, the District of Columbia, and Utah, among whom are eleven bishops, twelve college presidents and three ex-college presidents, eleven college professors, four ex-governors, three editors, — Drinkhouse of the Methodist-Protestant, Baltimore; Fitzgerald of the Christian

Advocate, Nashville; ¹⁸⁵³ and Howard of the Cumberland Presbyterian, Nashville, — and such a store of Reverends, D. D.'s, LL. D.'s and Rev. D. D.'s and Rev. D. D. LL. D.'s, that we cannot take the time or space to designate them; though it may not be amiss to mention such well-known names as Joseph Cook of Boston; President Seelye of Amherst, Dr. T. L. Cuyler of Brooklyn, and Herrick Johnson of Chicago. Besides all these, there is an executive committee of eighteen, and seven district secretaries. Article II of the constitution of the association reads as follows: —

“The object of this society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the family, the religious element in education, the oath, and public morality as affected by the liquor traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.”

Now it is evident that were these principles adopted as the legal basis of the government, none but professed Christians could hold any office or place of trust under the government. And it is just as certainly evident that the consequence would be that every political hack, every demagogue, every unprincipled politician, in the United States would become a professed Christian; and every popular religious body would be joined by a horde of hypocrites. But instead of trembling at such a prospect, the National Reformers actually rejoice at it. In the National Reform Convention held at Cincinnati, January 31 to February 1, 1872, “Rev.” T. P. Stevenson, corresponding secretary of the Association and editor of the Christian Statesman, delivered an address in which he said: —

“The acknowledgment, in the terms of the proposed Amendment or any similar terms, of the revealed will of God as of supreme authority, would make the law I have quoted from the Bible [~~1821~~ Exodus 18:21], supreme law in this land, and candidates and constituencies would govern themselves accordingly. If it be objected that men would become hypocrites to obtain office, we can only say that the hypocrisy which abstains from blasphemy and

licentiousness, and conforms the outward life to the morality of the Christian religion, is a species of hypocrisy which we are exceedingly anxious to cultivate, and which all our laws restraining immorality are adapted and intended to produce.”

And in the *Christian Statesman*, of November 1, 1883, “Rev.” W. J. Coleman, one of the principal exponents of the National Reform religion, replied to some questions that had been put by a correspondent who signed himself “Truth Seeker.” We copy the following: —

“What effect would the adoption of the Christian Amendment, together with the proposed changes in the Constitution, have upon those who deny that God is the Sovereign, Christ the Ruler, and the Bible the law? This brings up the conscience question at once.... The classes who would object are as ‘Truth Seeker’ has said, Jews, infidels, atheists, and others. These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand toward it if recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would disfranchise every logically consistent infidel.”

Notice, it is only the logically consistent dissenter that would be disfranchised. By the same token, then, the logically inconsistent could all be citizens. That is, the man of honest intention, of firm conviction, and of real principle, who valued his principles more than he did political preference, would be disfranchised; while the time-servers, the men of no convictions and of no principle, could all be acceptable citizens. In other words, the honest man, if he be a dissenter, could not be a citizen; but every hypocrite could be a citizen. Therefore the inevitable result of the National Reform theory and purpose is to put a premium upon hypocrisy. And through it the professed Christian churches of the country would become, in fact, that which the Revelation has shown in prophecy, “a hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.”

~~61812~~ Revelation 18:2.

The word of God says, “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” ~~61423~~ Romans 14:23. Even the voluntary doing of any duty toward God, without faith, is sin; and to compel men to do it is nothing else than to compel them to commit sin. More than this, to proffer obedience to God, from interested motives, is sin and hypocrisy. Now the National Reform scheme proposes

to offer political inducements to men to proffer obedience to God. The National Reform scheme does propose to have every member of the State proffer service to God, and conform to religious observances, from none other than interested motives. For men to tender obedience or homage to God, while they have no love for him in their hearts, is both to dishonor him and to do violence to their own nature. And to bribe or compel men to do this very thing, is the direct aim of the National Reform Association. Its success therefore would so increase hypocrisy and multiply sin, under the cloak of godliness, that national ruin would as certainly follow as it did the same system practiced upon the Roman empire.

From the proposition made in the memorial to Congress — to change the body of the Constitution so as to fit their proposed preamble — it will be seen that if their purpose could be made effective, there would not be left enough of the Constitution as it now is to be of any use to anybody. According to their purpose, the Bible, as the revealed will of Christ who is to be made the Ruler, is to be the supreme law. That in effect, then would become the Constitution. Then this supreme law would necessarily need to be authoritatively interpreted. They are all ready for this, however. They have the whole scheme completed. They know that the changes which they propose, mean much: but above all things else that they intend that these changes shall bring about, is the putting of the clergy in the place of the supreme interpreter of the new supreme law of the land. In the Christian Statesman of February 21, 1884, one of their leaders, the Rev. J. C. K. Milligan, announced the following program: —

“The changes will come gradually, and probably only after the whole frame-work of bible legislation has been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally; an outpouring of the Spirit might soon secure it. The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the final decision of most points will be developed there. ‘Many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in paths; for the

law shall go forth of Zion.’ There certainly is no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy than the leaders and teachers in our churches.”

This passage, the expressions of which might easily be paralleled to any extent from the columns of the *Christian Statesman*, simply puts in condensed form the plans and ultimate aims of the National Reform Association. And by it, it is seen at once that it is a revival of the original scheme of John Calvin, and is the very image of the papal scheme of the fourth century.

According to this National Reform scheme, it is intended once more to destroy all distinction between moral and civil affairs. Once more all things pertaining to the government are to be made moral, with the clergy in the place of interpreters on all points. In the same article from which the above quotation is taken, there was also written the following concerning their proposed amendment: —

“In brief, its adoption will at once make the morality of the ten commandments to be the supreme law of the land, and anything in the State Constitutions and laws that is contrary to them will become unconstitutional.”

Now the ten commandments are for the universe, the supreme standard of morals. They are the law of God, the supreme moral Governor. Every duty enjoined in the Bible — that is to say, every duty of man — finds its spring in some one of the ten commandments. This law takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. To violate that law, even in thought, is sin. For said Christ: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” And again: “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.” ^{<187>}Matthew 5:27, 28, 21, 22. And “whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.” ^{<187>}1 John 3:15.

This is sufficient to show that the ten commandments deal with the thoughts, with the heart, with the conscience. By this law is the knowledge

of sin (~~418B~~ Romans 3:20); in fact, the inspired definition of sin is, “Sin is the transgression of the law.” ~~418A~~ 1 John 3:4. And as already shown, the law may be transgressed by thinking harshly or impurely of another; it is immoral to do so.

But it is the government of God alone which has to do with the thoughts and intents of the hearts, and with the eternal interests of men.

Governments of men have to do only with the outward acts and the temporal affairs of men, and this without reference to any question of God or religion. The law of the government of God is moral: the laws of the governments of men are only civil.

The moral law is thus defined: “The will of God, as the supreme moral ruler, concerning the character and conduct of all responsible beings; the rule of action as obligatory on the conscience or moral nature.” “The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai.”

This definition is evidently according to Scripture. The Scriptures show that the ten commandments are the law of God; that they express the will of God; that they pertain to the conscience, and take cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart; and that obedience to these commandments is the duty that man owes to God.

Says the scripture, “Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil.”

~~412B~~ Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14.

This quotation with the ones above given from the sermon on the Mount, are sufficient to show that obedience to the moral law, from the heart and in the very thought, — that this only is morality; which is therefore correctly defined as, “The relation of conformity or non-conformity to the true moral standard or rule.... The conformity of an act to the divine law.” The moral law being the law of God, morality being conformity to that law, and that law pertaining to the thoughts and intents of the heart, it follows that in the very nature of the case, the enforcement of that law, or the requirement of conformity thereto, lies beyond the jurisdiction, and even the reach of, any human government.

Under the law of God, to hate is murder; to covet is idolatry; to think impurely of a woman, is adultery. These things are all equally immoral, equally violations of the moral law; but no civil government seeks to punish on account of them. A man may hate his neighbor all his life; he may covet everything on earth; he may think impurely of every woman that he sees, — he may keep this up all his days: but so long as these things are confined to his thought, the civil power cannot touch him. It would be difficult to conceive of a more immoral person than such a man would be; yet the State cannot punish him. It does not attempt to punish him. This is simply because that with such things — with morality or immorality — the State can have nothing to do.

But let us carry this further. Only let a man's hatred lead him even by a sign, to attempt an injury to his neighbor, and the State will punish him; only let his covetousness lead him to lay hands on what is not his own, in an attempt to steal, and the State will punish him; only let his impure thought lead him to attempt violence to any woman, and the State will punish him. Yet let it be borne in mind that even then the State does not punish him for his immorality, but for his incivility. The immorality lies in the heart, and can be measured by God only. The incivility is in the outward action, and may be measured by men. It is not with questions of moral right or wrong, but with civil rights and wrongs that the State has to do.

The correctness of this distinction is further shown in the term by which government by men — State or national government — is designated. It is called civil government, and the term "civil" is thus defined: "Pertaining to a city or State, or to a citizen in his relations to his fellow-citizens, or to the State." Thus it is plain that governments of men have to do only with men's relations to their fellow-citizens, and not at all with their relations to God, which is again but to affirm that governments of men never can of right have anything to do with religion.

There is another distinction worthy of notice, which shows the same thing, that is the distinction between sin and crime. Sin is defined by Webster as, "Any violation of God's will;" and by the Scriptures, "Sin is the transgression of the law." That the law here referred to is the moral law — the ten commandments — is shown by ~~ROM~~ Romans 7:7. "I had not known sin, but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou

shalt not covet.” Thus sin is a transgression of the law which says, “Thou shalt not covet,” and that is the moral law.

But crime is an offense against the laws of the State. It is thus defined: “Crime is strictly a violation of law, either human or divine; but in present usage, the term is commonly applied to actions contrary to the laws of the State.” Thus civil statutes define crime, and deal with crime, but not with sin; while the divine statutes define sin, and deal with sin, but not with crime. “A crime, or breach of justice, is a deed of the individual, which the State, by its judicial acts, returns on the individual. The State furnishes a measure for crime, and punishes criminals according to their deserts. The judicial mind is a measuring mind, a retributive mind, because trained in the forms of justice, which sees to it that every man’s deeds shall be returned to him, to bless him or to curse him with pain. Now, a sin is a breach of the law of holiness, a lapse out of the likeness to the divine form, and as such it utterly refuses to be measured. It is infinite death to lapse out of the form of the divine. A sin cannot be atoned for by any finite punishment, but only (as revelation teaches) by a divine act of sacrifice....

“It would destroy the State to attempt to treat crimes as sins, and to forgive them in case of repentance. It would impose on the judiciary the business of going behind the overt act to the disposition or frame of mind within the depth of personality. But so long as the deed is not uttered in the act, it does not belong to society, but only to the individual and to God. No human institution can go behind the overt act, and attempt to deal absolutely with the substance of man’s spiritual freedom.... Sin and crime must not be confounded, nor must the same deed be counted as crime and sin by the same authority. Look at it as crime, and it is capable of measured retribution. The law does not pursue the murderer beyond the gallows. He has expiated his crime with his life. But the slightest sin, even if it is no crime at all, as for example the anger of a man against his brother, an anger which does not utter itself in the form of violent deeds, but is pent up in the heart, — such noncriminal sin will banish the soul forever from heaven, unless it is made naught by sincere repentance.”^{F854}

This position is yet further strengthened by the fact that morality and religion are inseparable. Indeed, this is seen by a mere glance at the definitions already given. The moral law is defined to be, “The will of God,

as supreme moral ruler, concerning the character and conduct of all responsible beings; the rule of action as obligatory on the conscience, or moral nature.” This is, in very substance, identical with the definitions of religion as being man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God, and the recognition of him as an object of worship, love, and obedience. Again; the moral law is correctly stated to be summarily contained in the decalogue: and the scripture declares that of fear God and keep these commandments is the whole duty of man, which shows that this embraces all of man’s relationship to God.

The statement of these principles without any further argument, is sufficient to demonstrate that governments of men are civil governments, not moral. Governors of men are civil governors, not moral. The laws of States and nations are civil laws, not moral. To the authorities of civil government, pertains the punishment of incivility, that is, the violation of civil rights, or civil law. It is not theirs to punish immorality. That pertains solely to the Author of the moral law and of the moral sense, who is the sole judge of man’s moral relations. All this must be manifest to every one who will think candidly upon the subject. ^{F855}

As God is the only moral governor, as his law is the only moral law, and as it pertains to him alone to punish immorality, so likewise the promotion of morality pertains to him alone. Morality is conformity to the law of God; it is obedience to God. But obedience to God must spring from the heart in sincerity and truth. This it must do, or it is not obedience; because the law of God takes cognizance of the thoughts and intents of the heart. But “all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” By transgression, all men have made themselves immoral, and by the moral law are found “guilty before God.” “Therefore by the deeds of the law [by obedience] there shall no flesh be justified [accounted righteous, or made moral] in his sight.” ~~AND~~ Romans 3:20. None can ever become moral by the law, because it is that very law that declares all men immoral. The demands of the moral law must be satisfied before any man can ever be accepted as moral by either the law or its author. But these demands never can be satisfied by man himself, because by his transgressions he has made himself immoral.

It is certain, therefore, that if ever men become moral, it must be by some other means than even the moral law, and much less could this result ever be brought about by civil law or any other human process. Yet such means has been supplied, not by man, but by the Author and Source of morality.

For, “Now the righteousness [the morality] of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness [the morality] of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned [made themselves immoral], and come short of the glory of God.” ~~ROM~~ Romans 3:21-23. It is by the morality of Christ alone that men can be made moral. And this morality of Christ is the morality of God, which is imputed to us for Christ’s sake; and we receive it by faith in him who is both the author and finisher of faith. Then by the Spirit of God the moral law is written anew in the heart and in the mind, sanctifying the soul unto obedience — unto morality. Thus, and thus alone, can men ever attain to morality; and that morality is morality of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ; and there is no other in this world. Therefore, as morality springs from God, and is planted in the heart by the Spirit of God, through faith in the Son of God, it is demonstrated by proofs of Holy Writ itself, that to God alone pertains the promotion of morality.

It is by the gospel and not by the law that men are made moral, and that morality is promoted in the world. And this work is committed by Jesus Christ, not to the State, nor to the Church by means of the State, but to the Church alone by the power of God. To the Church, and not to the State, he said, “Go and teach all nations whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you.” Upon the Church, not upon the State, he poured the Spirit of God, by which is manifested the power of God that enables men to act in conformity with the divine will. By his Spirit it is that God worketh in men, both to will and to do of his good pleasure. It is by the church, through the preaching of Jesus Christ, that the gospel is “made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.” There is no obedience but the obedience of faith; there is no morality but the morality of faith. Therefore it is proved that to the Church, and not to the State, is committed the conservation of morality in the world. This at once settles the question as to whether the State shall teach morality or religion. The State cannot teach morality or religion. It has not the credentials for it. The Spirit of God and the gospel of Christ are both essential to the teaching of morality and neither of these is committed to the State, but both to the Church. The State cannot do this work at all; and if the Church cannot do it without the help of the State, much less can she do it with the help of the State; consequently the work of the Church and that of the State lie in different fields, and must always be separate.

Now as there is absolutely nothing that a man can do, or say, or think, that does not involve a moral question; and as the National Reformers propose to bring about in this government a condition of things by which the “leaders and teachers in there churches” shall have “much to do” with “all moral question,” and “with interpretations of Scripture on moral points,” it plainly follows that they propose to have “much to do” with what every person does, and says, and thinks: and let it be borne in mind that their decision, it is plainly declared, will be “final.” There can be no appeal; for there is none higher than they. There can be no appeal to God; for is not the Lord King in Zion? and don’t they represent Zion? and isn’t the law to go forth of Zion? Thus they would make themselves the vicegerents of the Lord, and the fountain of all law.

Yet, like those who made the papacy in the first place, they theorize learnedly about the two distinct “spheres” of the State and the Church.⁷ According to the theory, the State is in itself a moral person distinct from the people, having an individuality and a responsibility to God, of its own. And in its sphere it must be religious and serve God, and cause all the people to do likewise in its own way, and apply the moral law to itself and everybody else. On the other hand, the Church in her sphere must be religious and serve God, and cause all the people to do likewise in her own way, and interpret the Scripture for herself and the State, and everybody else. “The evangelist is a minister of God to preach, and the magistrate is a minister of God to rule;” yet both are ministers in the same field — the field of morals — with this important difference, however, the State is to “apply” the standard of morals — the Scriptures — as interpreted by the Church. As defined by themselves, it is expressed in the following passage from a speech by D. McAllister D. D., in the Washington, D. C., National Reform convention, April 1-3, 1890. He said: —

“Now what does the National Reform Association say? It says, ‘Let the church do its duty in her own line. Let the line of demarcation be drawn here; let the functions of the State go with the State — with civil government, God’s own ordinance. Let the church hold the moral principles of God’s Law, — the law of Jesus Christ, the only perfect law, — and let the State apply those moral principles that pertain to its own sphere of justice and right, in her schools and everywhere else, and do her own work as she shall answer to God himself, as she is the creature of his ordaining.’” [Applause.]

It is yet more fully expressed in a speech by "Rev." T. H. Tatlow in a convention at Sedalia, Mo., May 23, 24, 1889, as follows: —

"To these crafty and carnal assumptions, the spiritual man, firm in Christian principle and the integrity of his convictions, replies: God's jurisdiction over man is before and above all others: and is wisely adapted to man's entire existence in all its diversified relationships, both as spiritual and secular. That this jurisdiction is not only universal but also special, including all the agencies as parts of the greater; just as all its parts are included in the whole. That God has given to man in the present world, a two-fold life, one part spiritual, and the other part secular; and has so blended them together that the secular life, embracing man's civil, social, and earthly good, is subordinate to his spiritual life and spiritual good. Therefore, since God's law, and his administration of it, apply to man's spiritual life, it must also necessarily apply to man's civil, social, and business life, as subordinate parts of his higher spiritual life. This spiritual life, therefore, is the fundamental, or constitutional, life of man; and God's law, as expressive of his will regarding this dual life of man, and as found in the ten commandments, is the constitutional law of God's jurisdiction over man, and is therefore irreparable.

"In administering this one constitutional law to the good of this two-fold life of man, God has ordained two administrative agencies, one of them the Church, as the spiritual agency in the realm of man's spiritual life, and the other the State as his Secular agency in the realm of man's secular life. And although these agents are two and not one, and are diverse in their nature, and occupy separate and diverse realms of authority, yet they are both of them subject to the same law, and are ordained for the purpose of ministering to man's good through this one and same law. And therefore it is, that civil government, of whatever abstract form it be, as "an ordinance of God," and the civil ruler as "a minister of God," are both alike subject to the ten commandments. And not only are they subject, but are ministers of God to man for good. They are also his agents for applying these commandments to man's good within the realm of man's secular life, as far as the commandments have secular application. This is admitted to be so as far as these commandments apply to murder, adultery, theft, and

slander; and they also in like manner apply to the worship of God, and the worship of the Sabbath as far as these come within the province of the civil power. These things being so, neither the civil power “as God’s ordinance,” nor the civil ruler, “as God’s minister,” within their special province, have any authority as such to make void any of the ten commandments, whether by neglect in enforcing them, or by indifference to their authority and claims.

“At this point, the party of civil policy protests and cries out that this is uniting Church and State. The Christian replies: It is indeed a union, but only so far as two separate jurisdictions, the one spiritual and primary, and the other secular and secondary, exercise each one its own appropriate authority within its own individual province, to secure a two-fold good to the two-fold life of man. This union, therefore, is like the union of the spiritual in man, acting conjointly with the body in man; the body being brought under and kept in subjection to the spiritual. It is like the union of the spiritual life in man acting conjointly with man’s domestic life; all the members of the family being loved less than Christ; and all made subject to his claims.”

Let us analyze this:

- (a)** Man is composed of two parts, spiritual and secular;
- (b)** The ten commandments, as expressive of the whole duty of man to God, are likewise composed of two parts — the spiritual and the secular;
- (c)** There are two agencies employed for applying the two-fold nature of this law to the two-fold nature of man; these two agencies are the Church and the State;
- (d)** Throughout, the secular is subordinate, and must be held in subjection to the spiritual;
- (e)** Therefore, The State as the secular and subordinate agency must be “brought under,” held “in subjection” to, the Church, just as the body, the secular part of man, must be brought under and kept in subjection to the mind, the spiritual part of man.

In perfect accord, therefore, with this logical deduction from the two preceding extracts, one of the oldest district secretaries of the National Reform Association, “Rev.” J. M. Foster, in the *Christian Cynosure*, of October 17, 1889, said: —

“According to Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of, and to serve the interests of, the Church.” “The true State will have a wise reference to the Church’s interests in all its legislative, executive, and judicial proceedings.... The expenses of the church, in carrying on her public, aggressive work, it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury. Thus the Church is protected and exalted by the State.

From these declarations it is clear that the National Reform view of the relationship between the Church and the State, is identical with the old Cartwright an Calvinistic one — the original papal view — that the State exists only as subordinate to the church, to serve the interests of the church, and, if need be, to lick the dust off the feet of the church.

Again: after the manner of the clergy of the fourth century, the purpose in this is to turn the government of the United States into a kingdom of God. This is evident from their proposed preamble to the Constitution, and the other quotations given, but they say it so plainly in words that the statements are worth quoting. Like the original scheme, this also proceeds upon the theory of a theocracy. In the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, January 31 to February 1, 1872, “Rev.” Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D. said: —

“Every government, by equitable laws, is a government of God; a republic thus governed is of him, through the people, and is as truly and really a theocracy as the commonwealth of Israel. The refusal to acknowledge this fact is as much a piece of foolish impiety as that of the man who persists in refusing to acknowledge that God is the author of his existence.”

The qualifying phrase, “by equitable laws,” confines this statement to National Reform governments, because all others, as the United States for instance, are not governments by equitable laws, but are “atheistic” governments. The argument, therefore, is flatly that the National Reform idea of earthly government is as truly and really falsely theocratically as it that of the papacy itself. ^{F856}

In the National Reform convention of 1873, held in New York City, February 26, 27, one of the speakers, "Rev." J. Hogg, said: —

"The nation that takes hold upon God and the Lord Jesus Christ, shall never die.... Let us acknowledge God as our Father and sovereign, and source of all good, and his blessing will be upon us. Crime and corruption will come to an end, and the benign reign of Jesus, our rightful Lord, will be established." [Applause.]

In the same convention, another speaker, "Rev." J. P. Lytle, likening the National Reform movement to a train of cars going up a steep grade, said:

"When we reach the summit,... the train will move out into the mild yet glorious light of millennial days, and the cry will be raised, 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.'" [Applause.]

In the same convention, another, "Rev." A. M. Milligan, D. D., said: —

"Like Pontius Pilate, we have a person on our hands, and like him we may ask, 'What shall I do with Jesus who is called Christ?' We must either crucify or crown him; and like the Jewish nation, our decision will seal our future destiny. Either like them we will reject him and perish, or, becoming a kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, we shall fill the earth, and endure forever."

In the annual convention of the Association for 1887, "Rev." W. T. McConnel, of Youngstown, Ohio, proposed the formation of —

"A praying league, to be composed of all who are interested in this movement, to covenant together to offer a prayer at the noon hour, wherever they may be, every day till our prayer is answered in the abolition of the liquor traffic, and till this nation is made God's kingdom."

The proposition was heartily and unanimously indorsed by the convention, and Mr. Mc Connel was given charge of the concern.

And that no element might be lacking to the perfect likeness of the original papal theory, the Christian Nation, which is second only to the Christian Statesman in National Reform propensities, in an editorial, June 15, 1887, put the finishing touch to the picture, in the following words: —

“When the State becomes positively Christian in Constitution, and Christian men are elected to make law, something like this will be done: A street-car company’s charter will be granted, conditioned upon the running of cars free on Sabbath for the accommodation of Christian people on errands of worship, of necessity, and of mercy, even as bridge toll is at present remitted on the Sabbath in some places. To this it will be objected that others than Christians will ride for other than Christian purposes, which is very true; but the sin will be upon their own souls. The company will suffer no hardships, the men employed will be God’s messengers for good, and ‘in that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses, holiness unto the Lord,’”

The likeness being so close in theory, between this and the papacy, it were only to be expected that the likeness would be just as close in practice if the National Reformers should only secure the power to put the theory into practice. This also is abundantly shown in the published words and speeches of the chiefest representatives of the Association. The National Reform Sunday-school lessons for 1884, published in the *Christian Statesman*, were written by David Gregg, D. D., then of New York City, later pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, and now (1891), successor to Dr. T. L. Cuyler in his pastorate in Brooklyn. In the lesson printed in the *Statesman* of June 5, Dr. Gregg positively declared and supported the declaration by argument, that the civil power “has the right to command the consciences of men.” And in full accord with this strictly papal principle, the *Christian Statesman* itself, October 2, 1884, says: —

“Give all men to understand that this is a Christian nation, and that, believing that without Christianity we perish, we must maintain by all means our Christian character. Inscribe this character on our Constitution.... Enforce upon all who come among us the laws of Christian morality.”

To enforce upon men the laws of Christian morality is to compel men who are not Christians to act as though they were. It is nothing else than an attempt to compel them to be Christians, and does in fact compel them to be hypocrites. Yet when it is said that this is to invade the rights of conscience, the National Reformers, in the words of “Rev.” W. J. Coleman, in the *Christian Statesman* of November 1, 1883, coolly reply: —

“If there by any Christian who objects to the proposed amendment on the ground that it might touch the conscience of the infidel, it seems to me it would be in order to inquire whether he himself should not have some conscience in this matter.”

And thus according to the National Reform type of “Christianity,” it is the perfection of conscientiousness to outrage the consciences of others; and the reverse of the Golden Rule — all things whatsoever ye would not that men should do to you, this do ye even unto them — is made by them and to them the law and the prophets.

Accordingly, in strict adherence to these bad principles, the testimony proceeds. In the *Christian Statesman* of January 13, 1887, “Rev.” M. A. Gault, a District Secretary and a leading worker of the Association, declared: —

“Our remedy for all these malefic influences, is to have the government simply set up the moral law and recognize God’s authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it.”

And “Rev.” E. B. Graham, a vice-president of the Association, in an address delivered at York, Neb., and reported in the *Christian Statesman* of May 21, 1885, said: —

“We might add in all justice, If the opponents of the Bible do not like our government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas; and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die.”

Yet more than this: In the National Reform convention for 1873, held in New York City, Jonathan Edwards, D. D., a vice-president and a leading spirit of the Association, made a speech in which he said: —

“We want State and religion, and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require religion, it shall be revealed religion — the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land ‘an undeniable legal basis.’ We use the word ‘religion’ in its proper sense, as meaning a man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God.”

Then according to their own definition, the National Reform Association intends that the State shall obtrude itself into every man's personal relation of faith and obedience to God. Mr. Edwards proceeds: —

“Now, we are warned that to engraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists who would be sufferers under it.”

He then defines the terms “atheist,” “deist,” “Jew,” and “Seventh-day Baptist,” and counts them all atheists as follows: —

“The atheist is a man who denies the being of God and a future life. To him, mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and end-all of consciousness and of character.

“The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.

“The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.

“The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.

“These all are, for the occasion, and as far as our Amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and the outcry — the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him: they must be treated as, for this question, one party.”

What, then, are the rights of these “atheists” according to the National Reform view? Mr. Edwards asks the question, and answers it thus: —

“What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic; for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. The atheist is a dangerous man.”

Now a lunatic may be harmless, and be suffered to go about as he chooses; yet he is kept under constant surveillance, because there is no knowing at what moment the demon in him may carry him beyond himself, and he become dangerous. Thus the National Reformers propose to treat those who disagree with them. So long as dissenters allow themselves to be cowed down like a set of curs, and submit to be domineered over by those self-exalted despots, all may go well; but if a person has the principle of a man, and asserts his convictions as a man ought to, then he is “raving,” then he becomes “dangerous,” and must be treated as a raving, dangerous lunatic.

Next, dissenters are to be tolerated as conspirators are. A political conspirator is one who seeks to destroy the government itself; he virtually plots against the life of every one in the government; and in that, he has forfeited all claims to the protection of the government or the regard of the people. And this is the way in which these would-be guardians of the Lord propose to treat dissenters, should they possess the power, even though the dissent might be caused merely by “the accident of differing from the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week” should be observed as holy.

Mr. Edwards proceeds: —

“Yes, to this extent I will tolerate the atheist; but no more. Why should I? The atheist does not tolerate me. He does not smile either in pity or in scorn upon my faith. He hates my faith, and he hates me for my faith.”

Let it be borne in mind that these are the men who propose to make this a Christian nation. These are the ones who propose to put themselves in the place of supreme interpreters of the Scriptures, and supreme expositors of the moral law, for the nation. But where is the harmony between this and the sermon on the mount? Did the Saviour say, Hate them that hate you; despise them that will not tolerate you; and persecute them that do not smile upon your faith? Is that the doctrine of Christ? Nay, nay, everybody

knows it is the opposite. Jesus said, "Love your enemies bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven;" while the National Reform style of religion would have it: "Hate your enemies; oppress them that hate you; and persecute them who will not smile, either in pity or in scorn, upon your faith," And this is the way in which they propose to convert men to the Christian religion. This is the way in which they propose to exemplify the sublime Christian principle of brotherly love and the means which they will employ that brotherly love may continue! This is the way in which they are going to bring about the reign of universal peace, even, as they say, the millennium itself. By a like scheme of the Christian endeavor of the "Society of Jesus," there was peace once in the fair Waldensian Valleys. By like exertions, Innocent III succeeded in creating peace amidst "the graceful scenery, the rich fields, and the splendid cities of Languedoc and Provence."

As the delicious prospect enlarges upon his vision, the zealous Doctor warms to his work, and worthily rises to the hight of his subject as follows:

"I can tolerate difference and discussion; I can tolerate heresy and false religion; I can debate the use of the Bible in our common schools, the taxation of church property, the propriety of chaplaincies and the like, but there are some questions past debate. Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon! The atheist may live, as I have said; but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the evil institutions of all this fairland! Let us repeat: atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. They cannot dwell together on the same continent!"

In order perfectly to complete the very image of the papacy in its fullness, there remains to be taken the step whereby they would place themselves above God, and propose to re-enact his laws. This is a further step to be taken, and it is taken. It is done in this same speech, as follows: —

"Now if there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out, — there cannot be many of

them, — and we are prepared to accept them AND HAVE THEM RE-ENACTED.”

To any one who has any respect for God or his word, it would seem that anything which God had once ordained and had not abrogated, would be of sufficient authority as it stands. But to the proposed National Reform hierarchy, such statutes are counted of no force until it shall have set to them its seal of orthodoxy by having them re-enacted. So that the Lord himself must needs take a secondary place in the presence of the arrogance of these would-be legislators.^{f857}

There is but one more step that could possibly be taken to complete the infamy of the thing, and that would be to form an alliance with the papacy itself. And even this step has been taken so far as it can be taken without the consent of the papacy; that is, as far as the National Reformers alone can go. The Christian Statesmen of December 11, 1884, said: —

“Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.”

Further: at a National Reform conference — not convention — of ministers of a number of different denominations, held at Saratoga, New York, August 15-17, 1887, “Rev.” T. P. Stevenson, editor of the Christian Statesman, and corresponding secretary of the National Reform Association, opened the discussion of the subject of religion in the public schools, under the title of “secularism in Education.” The Christian Statesman of September 1, in reporting the proceedings, says: —

“The speaker argued against the secular program: 1. That it does not satisfy the Roman Catholics or conciliate them to our school system. The special outcry is against the atheistic tendencies of public education, and the exclusion of religious worship and instruction from the schools only gives color to the charge.”

In the course of the discussion, “Rev.” S. V. Leech, D. D., of Saratoga, who had been for seven years chaplain of the New York Senate, asked the corresponding secretary to state how National Reformers would answer this argument: —

“If we put the Protestant Bible in the schools where Protestants are in the majority, how could we object to the Douay Version [the

Catholic Bible] in schools where Roman Catholics are in the majority?"

The corresponding secretary answered: —

“WE WOULDN’T OBJECT.... This is not a question of versions, but of the right of the word of God to a place at all in the public schools. Prof. Tayler Lewis once wrote two valuable articles on the theme, ‘The One Bible,’ in which he maintained that no body of Catholic scholars, in the face of the scholarly world, would deny that King James’ Version is a real version of the Holy Scriptures, while Protestant scholarship cheerfully admits the same of the Douay Bible. There are not a half a dozen passages in it which even seem to inculcate any distinctively Roman doctrine. It is a Latinized version rather than Anglo-Saxon, far less plain than ours, but it is a version.”

Exactly what Mr. Stevenson means by the phrase “distinctively Roman doctrine.” we cannot say, because the popular Protestantism of the day is making so many compromises with Romanism that it is difficult to tell just what is distinctively Roman doctrine. But we here quote one verse from the Douay Version, and ask the non-Catholic people of this country whether this is not enough distinctively Roman in doctrine to distinctively condemn the National Reformers in their proposal to give the Catholics power to teach such stuff in the public schools of this nation. We quote ~~scribble~~ Hebrews 11:21, which in the Douay Version reads thus: “By faith Jacob dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and adored the top of his rod.”

To adore, is “to worship with profound reverence; to pay divine honors to; to honor as a god.” — Webster. Therefore the Douay Version distinctly inculcates the doctrine that Jacob worshiped with profound reverence the top of his rod; that he paid divine honors to, that he honored as a god, the top of his rod. And this is the version of the Bible which the National Reformers “wouldn’t object” to having a majority of Catholics by law put into the hands of the children of a minority of non-Catholics. This is the doctrine which the National Reformers propose, by constitutional amendment, to empower a majority of Roman Catholics in any school district of the United States, to teach to the children of non-Catholics. Therefore, if National Reform succeeds, what is to hinder the Roman Catholic majority from teaching your children and mine to adore the top of

the priest's rod, in the public schools? For what is the Bible to be taught for in the public schools if it is not to be obeyed in the public schools? And if the Catholic Bible is to be taught in the public schools where the Catholics are a majority, then is not the Catholic Bible to be obeyed in such schools? As the National Reformers propose to have "religious worship" as well as religious instruction in the public school; as they propose to have Catholic worship and instruction in the Catholic Bible in the schools where Catholics are in the majority; and as the Catholic Bible says that Jacob "adored the top of his rod," "as a figure of Christ's scepter and kingdom, as an instance and argument of his faith," then why should not the children in those schools adore the top of the priest's rod, "as a figure of Christ's scepter and kingdom," whose vicegerent on earth the pope is, and also "as an instance and argument of their faith"?

Whether, according to Mr. Stevenson's idea, this passage is one of the less than half a dozen passages which inculcate any distinctively Roman doctrine, we know not, but we do know that it inculcates distinctively idolatrous doctrine. But even then that is not the primary question involved here. Whether there be in the Douay Version a half dozen such passages, or one such passage, or none at all, the principle is the same. And it is the principle upon which we stand. That principle is that the Catholic majority has just as much right to force the Catholic Bible, and the Catholic instruction, and the Catholic worship, upon the non-Catholic minority in the public schools, as the Protestant majority has to force the Protestant Bible, and the Protestant instruction, and the Protestant worship, upon the non-Protestant minority in the public schools. And that is but to say that there is no right at all on either side of the question, nor in the question anywhere. And this only illustrates the principle that neither the Bible, nor religious instruction, nor religious worship, can of right have any place in the public schools of the United States government, or of any other civil government on earth. We have cited the above passage from the Douay Version, and made the argument upon it, only to make more clearly apparent the justice of the principle, and not because we think that the Catholics have any less right in the matter than Protestants have.

The official report of the proceedings of the Saratoga conference further records the following: —

Rev. Dr. Price of Tennessee. — "I wish to ask the secretary, has any attempt ever been made by the National Reform Association to

ascertain whether a consensus, or agreement, could be reached with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, whereby we may unite in support of the schools, as they do in Massachusetts?”

The secretary. — “I regret to say there has not.... But I recognize it as a wise and dutiful course on the part of all who are engaged in or who discuss the work of education, to make the effort to secure such an agreement.”

Dr. Price. — “I wish to move that the National Reform Association be requested by this Conference to bring this matter to the attention of American educators and of Roman Catholic authorities, with a view tot securing such a basis of agreement, if possible”^{f858}

The motion was seconded and adopted.

Thus the National Reform Association, which exists for the sole purpose of turning this government into a “kingdom of God,” for the purpose of making the ecclesiastical independent of and superior to the civil power in this government, for the purpose of establishing a new theocracy here, not only officially declares itself ready gladly to join hands with the papacy to accomplish that bad purpose, but officially bears a commission to secure a basis of agreement with the papacy “if possible,” by which the Association may have the co-operation of the papacy in effecting its declared purpose to subvert the Constitution of the United States as it respects religion and religious legislation.

Nor is it at all unlikely that this aim may prove successful; for in his Encyclical of 1885, Pope Leo XIII addressed to Catholics everywhere the following words: —

“We exhort all Catholics who would devote careful attention to public matters, to take an active part in all municipal affairs and elections, and to further the principles of the church in all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live. They must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert their utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usages of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God’s law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the Constitutions of States, and legislation, to

be modeled in the principles of the true church. All Catholic writers and journalists should never lose for an instant from view, the above prescriptions. All Catholics should redouble their submission to authority, and unite their whole heart, soul, and body, and mind, in the defense of the church.”

And very opportunely with the Saratoga National Reform Conference, there was held at Baltimore a conference of Catholic prelates to discuss the plans of the new Catholic University at Washington, D. C., to whom the pope addressed a letter, in which he said: —

“The unlimited license of thought and writing, to which erroneous notions concerning both divine and human things have given rise, not only in Europe but also in your country, has been the root and source of unbridled opinions, while, on the other hand, with religion banished to a great extent from the schools, wicked men strive by craft and fallacious wisdom to extinguish the light of faith in the minds of the young, and to enkindle there the flames of irreligion. Wherefore it is necessary that youth be nourished more carefully with sound doctrine, and that these young men especially, who are being educated for the church, should be fully armed to fit them for the task of defending the Catholic truth. We therefore most gladly welcome and heartily approve your project for the erection of a university, moved as you are by a desire to promote the welfare of all, and the interests of your illustrious republic.”

The theories and the aims of the papacy and of the National Reform Association, are identical. The National Reform Association is doing precisely what the pope has commanded all Catholics to do. And why should they not join hands?

The National Reform Association is strong not only in the influence which in itself it possess, and in the fair prospect of its longed-for alliance with papacy; but it is still stronger in the alliances which it has already been enabled to effect. The first of these was formed with —

THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

In the published reports of the National Reform Association for the years 1886-87, appears the following suggestion, made in 1885, on the

relationship between the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association: —

“Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, suggested the creation of a special department of its already manifold work, for the promotion of Sabbath observance, co-operating with the National Reform Association. The suggestion was adopted at the national convention in St. Louis, and the department was placed in the charge of Mrs. J. C. Bateham, of Ohio, as national superintendent. Mrs. Bateham has since, with her own cordial assent, been made one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association.”

Again; of the year 1886, the same report says: —

“It was your secretary's privilege this year again to attend the national convention. A place was kindly given for an address in behalf of the National Reform Association, and thanks were returned by a vote of the convention. A resolution was adopted expressing gratitude to the National Reform Association, ‘for its advocacy of a suitable acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ in the fundamental law of this professedly Christian nation.’”

And again: —

“In the series of monthly readings for the use of local unions as a responsive exercise, prepared or edited by Miss Willard, the reading for last July [1886] was on ‘God in Government;’ that for August was ‘Sabbath Observance’ (prepared by Mrs. Bateham), and that for September, ‘Our National Sins.’ Touching the first and last named readings, your secretary had correspondence with their editor before they appeared. A letter has been prepared to Woman's Christian Temperance Union workers and speakers, asking them in their public addresses to refer to and plead for the Christian principles of civil government. The president of the National Union allows us to say that this letter is sent with her sanction, and by her desire.”

In that same National Reform Convention, which was held in Pittsburg, PA., May 11, 12, 1887, in the discussion of a resolution complimentary to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, one speaker declared: —

“This movement is bound to succeed through the influence of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.”

Another expressed the National Reform hopes thus: —

“When we get woman and Christ in politics, — and they will both go in together, — we shall have every reform, and Christ will be proclaimed King of kings and Lord of lords.”

And the chairman closed the debate on this resolution by saying: —

“When woman undertakes anything good, she will do it. And if she attempts anything bad, she will accomplish that. What Ahab would not do. Jezebel did. And what Herod would not do to John the Baptist otherwise, his wife caused him to do.”

No one attempted to explain just exactly where, in this observation, there lay the compliment to the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. It seemed to the author of this book who was present, that the compliment was rather back-handed. And yet he could not help wondering whether in the end the observation might not prove true and the examples appropriate, even though the statement be not preeminently complimentary as it stands.

Miss Frances E. Willard, president of the National Union; Mrs. J. C. Bateham and Mrs. Woodbridge, of the National Union; Miss Mary A. West, editor of the Union Signal; Mrs. Hoffman, president of the Missouri State Union; Mrs. Sibley, president of the Georgia Union; Mrs. Lathrap, president of the Michigan Union; Mrs. Burt, president of the New York Union; Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, president of the Iowa Union; all these are vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, according to the latest printed list (that of 1890-91), and have been such for the last three or four years. And District Secretary M. A. Gault, reporting his work in the Christian Statesman of November 15, 1888, said: —

“The four weeks I spent recently in the eight Wisconsin district,, lecturing under the auspices of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, were among the most pleasant weeks since I went into the lecture field. The weather was unusually fine, and there were but very few meetings in which everything was not in apple-pie order. Ladied wearing the significant white ribbon met me at the train, and took me often to the most elegant home in the town... The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union affords the best facilities for

openings for such workers more than any other organization. It is in sympathy with the movement to enthrone Christ in our government.”

In the monthly reading for September 1886, before referred to, regarding which the secretary of the National Reform Association had correspondence with Miss Willard before it appeared, one of the responses is as follows: —

“A true theocracy is yet to come,... and humanity’s weal depends upon the enthronement of Christ in law and law makers: hence I pray devoutly, as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women and rejoice that the National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause.”

Nor is it simply as an ally as such, of the National Reform Association, that the Union works for these bad principles. In its own separate and organized capacity, the Union advocates the whole National Reform scheme, At the annual convention of the National Union for 1887, held in Nashville, the president, Miss Frances E. Willard, in her annual address, officially reported in the Union Signal of December 1, declared the purpose of the Union, as follows: —

“The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, local, State national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world’s king of its courts, its camps, its commerce, — king of its colleges and cloisters, — king of its customs and its Constitutions... The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics.... We pray Heaven to give them [the old parties] no rest... until they shall... swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army up to the polls to worship God.

“I firmly believe that the patient, steadfast work of Christian women will so react upon politics within the next generation, that the party of God will be at the fore; ministers will preach for it from their pulpits, and Christian men will be as much ashamed to say that they never go to the caucus as they would be now to use profane language or defame character; for there is just one question that every Christian ought to ask: ‘What is the relation of this party, this

platform, this candidate. to the setting up of Christ's kingdom on the earth? How does my vote relate to the Lord's Prayer?"

"The answer to this question is sacred, not secular, worthy to be given from the pulpit on the Sabbath day. In the Revolutionary War the question at issue being religious liberty, our forefathers felt that they could preach and pray about it on the Sabbath. In the Civil War, both sides believing their cause to be holy, could do the same; and now, when it is a question of preserving the Sabbath itself and guarding the homes which are the sanctuaries of Christ's gospel, we women believe that no day is too good, no place too consecrated, for the declaration of principles and the determining of notes. The ascetic in the olden time shut himself away from the world and counted everything secular except specific acts of devotion. The Christian soldier of to-day reverses this process, and makes everything he does a devotional act, an expression of his loyalty to Christ — so finding his balance in God, that no sin can overcome, and no sorrow surprise him. Prayer is the pulse of his life; there is no secular, no sacred; all is in God; and as the followers of Bruce inclosed that hero's heart in a silver shrine and flung it into the ranks of the enemy that they might fly to win it back, shouting, 'Heart of Bruce. I follow thee,' so Christian men to-day take their ideal of Christ in government, hurl it into the ranks of his foes, and hasten on to regain it, by rallying for the overthrow of saloon politics and the triumphs of the Christian at the polls.

"Our prayers are prophets, and predict this day of glad deliverance as being at the door. The man who, in presence of such possibilities, says, 'I don't want throw away my vote.' is quite likely to throw away something even more valuable — and that is the voter himself. For, as Miss West has said, 'To-day Christ sits over against the ballot-box, as of old he sat over against the treasury, and judges men by what they cast therein.'"

The official report cordially announces that by an "almost unanimous vote" of the whole delegation assembled, this address "was accepted as expressing the principles of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union," and "the audience manifested its appreciation of this grand address by universal hand-clapping and waving of handkerchiefs."

Although Christ himself has plainly declared that his kingdom is not of this world, these “devout and honorable women” (~~4130~~ Acts 13:50), like those people of old, seem determined to take him by force and make him king. No one should be surprised, therefore, that he should do now as he did then — he “departed” from them. It is well to remember also that although “the ascetic in the olden time shut himself away from the world,” he was always ready, upon any question of orthodoxy, to return to the world, and pour out upon it all the pent-up passions of years. Many a time did these also march in great armies up to the polls, not to worship God, but to “blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle and them which dwell in heaven,” and to outrage every principle not only of Christianity, but of humanity.

In a convention of the eighth district of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union of Wisconsin, held at Augusta, October 2-4, 1888, and representing fifteen counties, there was passed “without a dissenting voice” the following preamble and resolution: —

“Whereas, God would have all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father ; and, —

“Whereas, The civil law which Christ gave from Sinai as the only perfect law, and the only law that will secure the rights of all classes; therefore, —

“Resolved, That civil government should recognize Christ as the moral Governor, and his law as the standard of legislation.”

And the national convention of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union for the same year, held in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, the nineteenth to the twenty-third of the same month, confirmed this action and the principle of it, by passing the following resolution, the first in the series of resolutions there adopted, as officially reported in the Union Signal of November 8: —

“Resolved, That and his gospel, as universal king and code, should be sovereign in our government and political affairs.”

At the Chautauqua (N. Y.) Assembly of 1886, Mrs. Woodbridge of the Union made a speech (July 23), in which she said: —

“An amendment to the national constitution requires the indorsement of two thirds of the States to become law. Although

the action must be taken by State legislative bodies, let such an amendment be submitted, and it would become the paramount issue at the election of legislators, and thus God would be in the thought, and his name upon the lip, of every man. May not this be the way opened to us? How to bring the gospel of Christ to the masses has been, and is, the vexing problem of the church. Would not the problem be solved? Yea, Christ would then be lifted up, even as the serpent in the wilderness, and would we not have right to claim the fulfillment of the promise, that 'He will draw all men unto himself'?...

"In considering the submission of such an amendment, we may use the very argument used by Moses, in his song containing these words of Jehovah, 'For it is not a vain thing for you; because it is your life: and through this thing ye shall prolong your days in the land.' How prayerfulness would be stimulated! Conscience would press the words, 'If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him!' Then would there be searchings of heart, as David's, of which we learn in the fifty-first Psalm. Prayer would bring faith and the power of the Spirit; and when such power shall rest upon the children of God, there will be added to the church daily such as shall be saved.,

"The National Reform Association makes this plea in the name of the Lord and his suffering ones. It asks the prayerful consideration of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, by which, if adopted, we, the people, will crown Christ the Lord, as our rightful Sovereign.

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, pursuing its work 'For God, and home, and native land,' in thirty-nine departments of reform, can but see that were a nation to be thus aroused, were it to make such an acknowledgment at the ballot-box, the laws of our land would ere long be truly 'founded on the old Mosaic ritual.' Then we could [*Italics hers*] have no other God. Unto the Lord Jehovah would we bow. Should we take his name in vain, or fail to keep the Sabbath holy, we would be criminals."

Is there any one so dull as to be unable to see that in this scheme there lies the whole theory and practice of the papacy? In this way precisely the

“gospel” “was brought to the masses” in the fourth century. In this way precisely, then, God and his name were put into the thought and upon the lip, clubs and stones into the hands, and murder in the heart, of every man; and so there was, then, added to the church daily such as should be _____. And, by the way, the women were among the leaders and were the main help in bringing about that grand triumph of the “gospel” among the masses. And “history repeats itself,” even to the part the women would play in the political project of bringing “the gospel to the masses.”

To propose a political campaign managed by ambitious clerics, political hypocrisies, ward politicians, and city bosses, and call that the bringing of the gospel of Christ to the masses, and the means of adding to the church daily such as shall be saved, is certainly a conception of the gospel that is degraded enough in all conscience. But when, to cap such conception, it is avowed that such would be the lifting up of Christ even as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, and the fulfillment of the promise that he will draw all men unto him, the whole idea becomes one that is vastly nearer to open blasphemy than it is to any proper conception of what the gospel of Christ is. Yet such, and of such, is the gospel of the National Reform Woman’s Christian Temperance Union combination. Instead of lifting up Christ, it tramples him under foot. Instead of treasuring the gospel as the pearl of great price, it casts it to swine to be trampled under their feet. Instead of honoring Christ, it puts him to an open shame. Instead of the gospel being held forth as the mystery of godliness, it is supplanted by the mystery of iniquity. For the testimony of history is unanimous in confirmation of the truth that “men will fight to the death, and persecute without pity, for a creed whose doctrines they do not understand and whose precepts they habitually disobey.”

Before leaving this division of the subject, it is but justice to all concerned to say that there are none who have more respect or more good wishes for the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, in the line of its legitimate work, than have the author of this book and the Christian people with whom he has the honor to be connected. We thoroughly believe in Christian temperance. Not only do we believe in it, but we practice it. We practice Christian temperance more strictly than the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union even preaches it. But believing in it as thoroughly as we do, and endeavoring to practice it as strictly as we believe in it, we would never lift a hand nor open our lips in any effort compel men to practice the Christian temperance in which we believe and which we practice.

Christianity persuades men, instead of trying to compel them. By the purity and love of Christ, Christianity draws men instead of trying to drive them. It is not by the power of civil government, but by the power of the Holy Spirit, that Christianity secures the obedience of men and the practice of Christian temperance, as well as every other Christian virtue.

We sincerely wish that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union would stick to its text, and work for Christian temperance by Christian means; and not for Christian temperance by political means, nor for political temperance by theoretical means. We know there are Christian women in the organization, who look at this precisely as we do. We know many such who have left the organization solely upon account of the political and theocratically course of its leadership. And every other woman would do well to leave it, unless its leadership and the course to which that leadership has already committed, it can be changed. The leadership of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union has led it in wicked ways, has established it upon evil principles, and has committed it to the very worst alliance that could possibly be made; and those who disapprove of all this cannot remain much longer in it without becoming a part of it.

The next ally that the National Reform Association was enabled to gain was and is —

THE THIRD-PARTY PROHIBITION PARTY.

In the Pittsburg National Reform convention of 1887, the corresponding secretary in his annual report, upon this point said: — "The national platform of the Prohibition party, adopted in Pittsburg, in 1884, contained an explicit acknowledgment of Almighty God, and of the paramount authority of his law as the supreme standard of all human legislation, The 'Rev.' Dr. A. A. Miner, D. D., of Boston, an eloquent and devoted fine and done of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, was a member of the committee which framed the declaration.

"After that presidential campaign was over, and before the State conventions of 1885, Prof. Wallace. of Wooster University, wrote to your secretary, suggesting that all diligence be used to secure similar acknowledgments and kindred declarations on related points, in the Prohibition platforms of the several States. Under this most judicious and timely suggestion, a large correspondence has been held with the leaders of the party, and its chief workers in

many States. Efficient service has been rendered by Secretary Weir, in parts of Pennsylvania and Ohio. The friends of the cause have everywhere remarked with gratitude that the county conventions for Washington, Lancaster, and Chester counties, PA., and Belmont county, Ohio, incorporated in their platforms distinct acknowledgments of the Lordship of Jesus Christ; the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Maryland, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Colorado, and Texas, made devout acknowledgment of God; the States of Connecticut Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, and others, declared in favor of the maintenance of our Sabbath laws, while the States of Ohio and Connecticut declared for the reformation of our marriage and divorce laws in accordance with the law of God. Other similar declarations in other States may have escaped notice.”

The California State Prohibition convention held in April, 1888, proposed as the preamble of its platform, these words: —

“The prohibition party of the State of California, in convention assembled, reverently recognize Almighty God as the Supreme Ruler, to whose laws all human should conform.”

And when objection was made by one of the delegates that this was entering upon dangerous ground, and tended to a union of Church and State, he was met with such a storm of “yells and hisses” that he could proceed no further, and the preamble was adopted with but two or three dissenting votes.

The National Prohibition convention, held the same year at Indianapolis, likewise said: —

“The Prohibition party in national convention assembled, acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all power in government, do hereby declare,;” etc.

“Sam” Small was secretary of this convention, and his views in this connection were declared in a “revival sermon” delivered in Kansas City, in the January preceding, and repeated by him in a letter to the Voice of August 8, 1889, as follows: —

“I want to see the day come in the history of our country when the voice of the church of Christ will be heard and respected upon all

vital moral issues. I shall ever hope for and patiently expect the day when legislation, State, national, and municipal, will be projected in harmony with the eternal principle of justice and righteousness, revealed by Christ and proclaimed by his church. Happy will be the day... when the harmonious judgment of the people of God in America upon the issues of temperance, purity, and uprightness, shall be received with respect and enacted into laws.”

What more was the papacy ever than this? What more did it ever claim to be? All that the papacy ever wanted was that legislation, State, national, and municipal, should be projected in harmony with the principles of justice and righteousness as proclaimed by the church; and that “the harmonious judgment of the people of God” (and to find out what this “harmonious judgment” was, is what all the councils were for), should be respected “and enacted into laws.” That is all she ever wanted, and that is all she wants now, as is seen by the words of Pope Leo XIII, on page 732 of this book. And as though to make perfectly clear the attitude of the National Prohibition party, Mr. Small in the same letter continues as follows: —

“I hold that the above expressions are in perfect harmony with the principles of the National Prohibition party, as expressed in its preamble and platform.”

Mr. Geo. W. Bain, the prominent Prohibition party workers, is a vice-president of the National Reform Association. The Christian Statesman, in August, 1888, under the heading, “The National Reform Movement,” printed an extract from a sermon by “Sam” Jones, preached in Windsor, Canada, to an audience composed mostly of Americans who had gone over the line to hear him, and in the extract were the following words: —

“Four years from now the Prohibition element will break the solid South. The issue then will be, God or no God, drunkenness or sobriety, Sabbath or no Sabbath, heaven or hell. That will be the issue. Then we will wipe up the ground with the Democratic party, and let God rule America from that time on.”

This is reproduced here not for any value that it has as a prophecy, but as showing, with the other extracts even, the views, held by the leading and most influential Third-party Prohibitionists.

The “Rev.” John A. Brooks, of Kansas City, was the candidate for Vice-President on the Prohibition ticket of 1888, and in a joint Convention of the National Reform Association, the State Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, and the American Sabbath Union, held at Sedalia, Mo., May 23, 24, 1889, he made a speech, in which he said: —

“If you will give me a united church that will recognize that the Lord Jesus Christ is king, and he only is king; and that will think and talk and preach and pray and vote in his name; then victory shall come, and the Kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of God and his Christ. And then when this is done, the millennium will come.

These evidence are sufficient to show that with the leadership of the Third-party Prohibition party, the principle of prohibition is entirely subordinate to the scheme for securing religious legislation, and to the setting up of the ecclesiastical power above the civil; and that the alliance with the National Reform Association is not an accident. There is a civil basis for prohibition, and upon that basis we favor it; but prohibition on the religious basis, as advocated by the Thirdparty Prohibition party, if successful, would be far worse than ever was or ever could be the evil against which they profess to be working. The world has been without prohibition for more than forty-three hundred years, but in no instance has this lack ever wrought anything like so much evil as did the religious despotism of the fourth century and onwards, of which this movement is so exact an image.

A third ally of the National Reform Association is —

THE AMERICAN SABBATH UNION

which was organized in New York City, November 13, 1888. The way in which it was brought about is this: The year 1888 was the time for the regular meeting of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Early in the year, before the conference met, “Rev.” W. F. Crafts circulated among the officers of Sunday-law associations in all parts of the country, the following petition: —

“To the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“DEAR FATHERS AND BRETHEREN: The undersigned earnestly petition you as representatives of the largest denomination of American Christians, to take the initiative in forming a National Sabbath Committee, by appointing several persons to serve in your behalf on such a committee, with instructions to ask other religious bodies, in your name, to appoint representatives to serve on the same committee, in order that the invasion of our day of rest and worship by the united forces of the liquor traffic and its allies, may be successfully resisted by the united forces of American Christianity, in the interests alike of the church and of the nation, of morality and of liberty.”

When the said General Conference met, the petition was presented by “Rev.” J. H. Knowles, editor of the *Pearl of Days*. The petition was referred to the “Committee on the State of the Church.” May 15 this committee made the your committee recommend the following for adoption by the General Conference: —

“Resolved, **1.** That the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in response to a petition signed by the officers of Sabbath association of this country, and by more than six hundred other petitioners of different evangelical denominations, take the initiative in forming a National Sabbath Committee.

“2. That this General Conference invite all other evangelical denominations to appoint representatives to serve on this Committee.

“3. That the basis of representation on the Committee for each denomination be one representative for each one hundred thousand or major fraction thereof.

“4. That the following persons be designated to serve on this Committee during the coming quaderennium, with power to complete the full quota for the Methodist Episcopal Church, and to fill vacancies — the first-named to communicate the action of this body to the official representatives of other denominations, and to be the convener of the Committee for its first meeting.”

This prompt and hearty action of the Methodist Episcopal General Conference, was made the basis of a plea for similar action on the part of other church organizations which met the same year. Upon the strength of

this action, the originator of the petition visited, and secured the indorsement of, the Presbyterian General Assemblies both North and South; the Baptist Home Missionary convention; the Synod of Reformed Church; and the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church. Then, November 13, there was held in the parlors of Col. Elliott F. Shepard, New York City, a meeting of eight preachers, one Ph.D., and Mr. Shepard, and the organization was effected, with a Constitution as to name, basis, and object as follows: —

“I. — NAME.

“The American Sabbath Union.

“II. — BASIS.

“The basis of the Union is the divine authority and universal and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath, as manifested in the order and constitution of nature, declared in the revealed will of God, formulated in the fourth commandment of the moral law, interpreted and applied by our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. transferred to the Christian Sabbath, or Lord’s day, by Christ and his apostles, and approved by its beneficial influence upon national life.

“III. — OBJECT.

“The object of this Union is to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.

Col. Shepard was made president; “Rev.” J. H. Knowles was made general secretary and editor of Publications, and of the Pearl of Days which was made the official organ of the Association; the whole United States was divided into ten “Districts,” and “Rev.” W. F. Crafts was made Field Secretary, for organizing the work in the said districts, and for carrying on the work at large. When this organization was just one month old, there was held at Washington, D. C., a convention composed of themselves, National Reformers, and Woman’s Christian Temperance Union managers, for the purpose of urging upon Congress, by every means they could employ, religious legislation, which if secured, would commit the nation to the whole National Reforms scheme.

In April, 1889, the Field Secretary of the Sabbath Union was an important part of the annual National Reform Convention; shortly afterward one of the district secretaries of the National Reform Association, "Rev." James P. Mills, was made secretary of the Ohio branch of American Sabbath Union, and another, "Rev." M. A. Gault, was made district secretary of the Sabbath Union for the Omaha District; and in the West, especially in the Omaha District, the conventions of the Sabbath Union were simply joint conventions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and National Reform workers, directed by the Secretary. The convention at Sedalia, Mo., for instance, was a convention of all the allies of the National Reform Association.

We have seen that the first definite step toward the organization of the American Sabbath Union, was in presenting to the Methodist Episcopal General Conference a numerously signed petition from Sunday-law associations already existing. The chief of these was the Illinois Association, which dates its active existence as an organization from a convention held in the city of Elgin, November 8, 1887.^{F859} Statements and arguments made by representative men in this convention, therefore, will justly show the intent of the Union, which not only in a great measure grew out of it, but of which it afterward became an important part. "Rev." C. E. Mandeville, D. D., of Chicago, made one of the main speeches of the convention. He afterward became president of the State Association, and vice-president of the American Sabbath Union, the latter of which he is still. In his Elgin speech, Dr. Mandeville spoke on the subject of "Some Dangers Respecting Sabbath Observance," in the course of which he said:

"The subject has two sides. We must not look alone at the religious side. The interests of the Church and State are united." They must stand or fall together.

And yet they all make a great show of injured innocence when any person opposes the movement on the ground that it would create a union of Church and State. In the same speech, Dr. Mandaville further said: —

"The merchants of Tyre insisted upon selling goods near the temple on the Sabbath, and Nehemiah compelled the officers of the law to do their duty, and stop it. So we can compel the officers of the law to do their duty.... When the church of God awakes and does its

duty on one side, and the State on the other, we shall have no further trouble in this matter.”

Yes; we all know how it was before. The gentle Albigenses in the South of France greatly disturbed the church — they refused to obey her commands. But the church was wide awake, for Innocent II was pope; and with the command, “Up! most Christian king; up! and aid us in our work of vengeance,” he saw to it that the State was awake on the other side. Then with the Church awake to its “duty” on one side, and the State on the other, the Albigenses were blotted from the earth, and there was no further trouble in that matter.

It is worth while further to notice this statement upon the merit of its argument, because it was not only used there by Dr. Mandeville, but it is used everywhere by the whole National Reform alliance. It is their stock argument and example.

Nehemiah was ruling there in a true theocracy, a government of God; the law of God was the law of the land, and God’s will was made known by the written word, and by prophets. Therefore if Dr. Mandeville’s argument is of any force at all, it is so only upon the claim that the government here should be a theocracy. With this idea the view of Mr. Crafts agrees precisely, and he is not only field secretary, but the originator of the National Sunday-law Union. He claims, as expressed in his own words, in the *Christian Statesman* of July 5, 1888, that “the preachers are the successors of the prophets.”

Now put these things together. The government of Israel was a theocracy; the will of God was made known to the ruler by prophets; the ruler compelled the officers of the law to prevent the ungodly from selling goods on the Sabbath. By this religious combination, the government of the United States is to be made a theocracy; the preachers are the successors of the prophets; and they are to compel the officers of the law to prevent all selling of goods and all manner of work on Sunday. This shows conclusively that these preachers intend to take the supremacy into their hands, officially declare the will of God, and compel all men to conform to it. And this deduction is made certain by the words of Prof. Blanchard, in the Elgin convention: —

“In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath, we are the representatives of God.”

The example of Nehemiah never can be cited as a precedent on any subject under any form of government but a theocracy, and when it is cited as an example in any instance in the United States, it can be so only upon the theory that the government of the cities or States of the Union and the Union itself, should be a theocracy. A theocracy is essentially a religious government. Sabbath laws belong only with a theocracy. Sunday laws being advocated upon the theory that Sunday is substituted for the Sabbath, likewise are inseparable from a theocratical theory of government. In such a theory Sunday laws originated, with such a theory they belong, and every argument in behalf of Sunday laws is, in the nature of the case, compelled to presuppose a theocratical form of government.

Nor is it alone among the National Reform organs and allies as such, that these evil principles are found. They are found advocated by leading religious papers of the country. The Christian Union, for instance, which opposed the movement at first, now advocates it as strongly as formerly it opposed it. In its issue of September 8, 1887 this paper said: —

“The political aim of Christianity is to bring forth a time in which Christianity shall control the caucus, religion shall control politics, the politicians shall be saints, and the polls shall be holy ground.

Such is the situation to-day with regard to the National Reform Association, as it stands before the country with its several active and more or less powerful allies, making itself still more active and more powerful. And from all this it is evident that the whole scheme and organization as it stands to-day, forms only a colossal religious combination to effect political purposes, the chief purpose being to change the form of the United States government, to turn it into a new “kingdom of God,” a new theocracy, in which the civil power shall be but the tool of the religious, in which the government shall no longer derive just powers from the consent of the governed, but shall be absorbed in the unjust and oppressive power of a despotic hierarchy, acting as “the representative of God,” asserting and executing its arbitrary and irresponsible will as the expression of the law and will of God.

Nor do they shrink from distinctly asserting even this. In the Sedalia joint convention before mentioned the “Rev.” W. D. Gray, who was secretary of the convention and was elected corresponding secretary of the American Sabbath Union for the Omaha District, made a speech as follows: —

“I, for one, have made this question very much a of a study, especially this topic of it. To appeal to divine authority in our legislation would be to fundamentally change the law of our land, or the principle adopted by our fathers when they said that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. I for one do not believe that, as a political maxim. I do not believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. And I believe as Brother Gault on this, I think. And so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law. Jefferson was under the influence of French ideas when the Constitution was framed, and that had something to do with leaving God out of the Constitution.^{F860} And I think that the provincial history of this country will compel us to come back to that, and recognize God in our constitution. And I see in this reform a Providence teaching us the necessity of recognizing something else besides the will of the people as the basis of government.”

And at the Chautauqua (N. Y.) Assembly in August following, Col. Elliot F. Shepard, speaking as president of the American Sabbath Union, said: —

“Governments do not derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. God is the only law-giver. His laws are made clear and plain in his word, so that all nations may know what are the laws which God ordained to be kept.”

Nothing more need be said to demonstrate that the religio-political movement represented in the National Reform Association, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, the Third-party Prohibition Party, and the American Sabbath Union, is a gigantic conspiracy to turn the United States government into a new theocracy in the living image of that of the papacy.

In 1829-30 the United States Senate was called upon to consider a certain phase of this question, and in the report that was made, the Senate truthfully and warningly observed that —

“The Jewish government was a theocracy, which enforced religious observances; and though the committee would hope that no portion of the citizens of our country would willingly introduce a system of religious coercion in our civil institutions, the example of other nations should admonish us to watch carefully against its earliest

indication,... Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. To prevent a similar train of evils in this country, the Constitution has wisely withheld from our government the power of defining the divine law. It is a right reserved to each citizen; and while he respects the rights of others, he cannot be held amenable to any human tribunal for his conclusions.

“Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object, are, in the opinion of the committee, always dangerous. This first effort of the kind calls for the establishment of a principle, which, in the opinion of the committee, would lay the foundation for dangerous innovations upon the spirit of the Constitution, and upon the religious rights of the citizens. If admitted, it may be justly apprehended that the future measures of the government will be strongly marked, if not eventually controlled, by the same influence. All religious despotism commences by combination and influence, and when that influence begins to operate upon the political institutions of a country, the civil power soon bends under it; and the catastrophe of other nations furnishes an awful warning of the consequence.”

Extensive religious combinations for political purposes are indeed always dangerous. The movement under consideration in this chapter is not only an extensive religious combination to effect a political object, but with only a single element lacking — the active co-operation of the Catholic Church — it is the most extensive religious combination that could be formed in the country, and even that element is fast falling into line. Therefore, as it is an undeniable truth that extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are always dangerous, and as there stands before the government of the United States to-day, the most extensive religious combination that was ever formed to effect a political object, the proposition stands demonstrated that the situation to-day, in the presence of this great conspiracy, IS MOST DANGEROUS.

CHAPTER 26.

THE BOND OF UNION.

WE have seen the organization and growth of the National Reform, or religious legislation, movement, until it has become, with but one element lacking, the most extensive religious combination that there could possibly be in this nation; and the one element that is lacking is the active co-operation of the Catholic Church. We have also seen that the National Reform Association has not only declared itself ready gladly to join hands with the papacy whenever she is ready, but has actually accepted a commission to find “if possible” a basis of agreement upon which the harmonious action of the two bodies can be secured. It must be evident even to the dullest comprehension, that if such a basis of co-operation should be secured, and if the point of agreement should become a political issue, there could be but one result — the religious combination would overwhelmingly carry their point. Even now the Catholic Church is of no small consideration as a political factor.

Now as a matter of fact such a basis of agreement and co-operation has been found. And it is the demand for the national recognition of the Christian religion in the enactment and enforcement of a NATIONAL SUNDAY LAW. As early as 1881, “Rev.” Sylvester F. Scoville, then and now a leading National Reformer, published in the *Christian Statesman*, of August 31, an article on the Sunday-law question, in which he said: —

“This common interest [‘of all religious people in the Sabbath’ — Sunday] ought both to strengthen our determinations to work, and our readiness to co-operate in every way with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches — as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation.”

In 1881, however, the National Reform movement did not possess sufficient influence to make it much of an item in the estimation of the papacy, and no definite response was made to this proffer to accept rebuffs

at her hands, especially as it was openly announced that they were prepared to make repeated advances, and submit to repeated rebuffs. Rome therefore bided her time. She knows as well as they that “it is one of the necessities of the situation.” She knows full well that without her consent they never can secure the religious legislation which they want, and she is determined, here as ever, to have all the tokens of surrender come from them. The author of this book personally knows a gentleman who, riding on a railroad in California in 1886, fell into conversation with a Catholic priest, and finally said to him, “What is your church going to do with the religious amendment movement? are you going to help if forward? are you going to vote for it?” “Oh,” said the priest, “we have nothing to do with that. We leave that to the Protestants; we let them do all that. They are coming to us, and we only have to wait.”

Rome therefore waited; and as she waited, the National Reform movement rapidly grew in influence, especially by its alliances. And when in 1888, by the organization of the American Sabbath Union the movement for religious legislation had become about as strong as it could be expected to grow on the so-called Protestant side; and when the Field Secretary and chief originator of that organization personally addressed to the head of the papacy in this country — Cardinal Gibbons — a letter asking him to join hands with them in petitioning Congress to pass the bill for the enactment of a national law to “promote” the observance of Sunday “as a day religious worship;” the Cardinal promptly announced himself as “most happy” to do so, in the following letter: —

***“CARDINAL’S RESIDENCE,
408 N. CHARLES STREET,***

“Baltimore December 4, 1888.

“REV. DEAR SIR: I have to acknowledge your esteemed favor of the 1st instant in reference to the proposed passage of a law by Congress ‘against Sunday work in the government’s mail and military service,’ etc.

“I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by legitimate legislation. As the late Plenary Council of Baltimore has declared, the due observance

of the Lord's day contributes immeasurably to the restriction of vice and immorality, and to the promotion of peace, religion, and social order, and cannot fail to draw upon the nation the blessing and protection of an overruling Providence. If benevolence to the beasts of burden directed one day's rest in every week under the old law, surely humanity to man ought to dictate the same measure of rest under the new law.

"Your obedient servant in Christ,

"JAMES CARDINAL, GIBBONS.

Archbishop of Baltimore." ^{f861}

And although in this particular instance the Cardinal spoke only for himself, the anxious zeal of these professed Protestants to secure an alliance with the papacy, hurried them into counting every Catholic man, woman, and child in the United States, under the census of 1880, as having actually signed the petition. This was done at the convention of the National Reform allies, held in Washington, D. C., under the auspices of the American Sabbath Union, December 11-13, 1888. In the announcements of the convention it had been stated that the church in which the convention was to meet would be festooned with the names of six million petitioners; but at the very beginning of the first meeting, it was stated that there were fourteen million of them. A question was sent up asking how the number could have grown so much larger so suddenly. Mrs. Bateham was recalled to the platform to answer the question, and when she answered it, the cause of such a sudden and enormous growth was explained by the fact that Cardinal Gibbons had written the above letter saying he was most happy to add his name to the others, and solely upon the strength of his name, seven million two hundred thousand Catholics were counted as petitioners.

Thus matters stood for about one year, until November 12, 1889, when the "Congress of Catholic Laymen of the United States" was held in Baltimore, "to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the American hierarchy. In that Congress there was a paper read by Mr. Manly B. Tello, editor of the Catholic Universe, of Cleveland, Ohio, in which it was said: —

“What we should seek is an en rapport with the Protestant Christians who desire to keep Sunday holy.... We can bring the Protestant masses over to the reverent moderation of the Catholic Sunday.”

And the platform which was adopted as the result of the discussions in the congress, declared upon this point as follows: —


“There are many Christian issues to which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics, and shape civil legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. Without going over to the Judaic Sabbath, we can bring the masses over to the moderation of the Christian Sunday.”

This was one of the “planks” of the platform which was “received with the greatest demonstrations;” and the whole platform was adopted “without discussion” and “without a dissenting voice.” As all the papers that were read in the congress, as well as the platform, had to pass the inspection of the hierarchy before they were presented in public, these statements are simply the expression of the papacy in official response to the overtures which the so called Protestant theocrats had been so long making to the papacy. As was only to be expected, it was received by them with much satisfaction. The American Sabbath Union joyously exclaimed: —

“The National Lay Congress of Roman Catholics, after correspondence and conference with the American Sabbath Union, passed its famous resolution in favor of co-operation with Protestants in Sabbath reform.... This does not mean that the millennium is to be built in a day. This is only a proposal of courtship; and the parties thus far have approached each other shyly.”

And in a temperance speech in a temperance convention in New York City, reported in the National Temperance Advocate, for May, 1891, Archbishop Ireland thanked God that “Protestants and Catholics” “stand together in demanding the faithful observance of Sunday.”

When a union so long desired as this has been, has reached the stage of courtship, actual marriage cannot be very far off. Yes, that marriage is

certainly coming; and like every other great feature of the papacy, it is contrary to nature — one woman (church) marrying another in order that both may more readily form an adulterous connection with the State. And the fruit of the confused relationship will be just that which is pictured in the Scripture — a hideous nondescript monster, breathing out persecution and death.  Revelation 13:11-17.

Thus are the leaders of professed Protestantism in the United States joining heart and hand with the papacy, with the sole purpose of creating in this government an order of things identical with that which created the papacy at the first. It is most appropriate, therefore, that the bond of union which unites them in the evil work, should be the very thing — the day of the sun — by means of which the papacy secured control of the civil power to compel those who did not belong to the church to submit to the dictates of the church, and to act as though they did belong to it. It was by means of Sunday laws that the church secured control of the civil power for the furtherance of her ends when the papacy was made. It is appropriate that the same identical means should employed by an apostate Protestantism to secure control of the civil power for the furtherance of her ends, and to compel those who do not belong to the church to submit to the dictates of the church, and to act as those do who do belong to the church. And as that evil intrigue back there made the papacy, so will this same thing here make the living image of the papacy. Two things that are so alike in the making will as surely be as much alike when they are made.

What Rome means by the transaction is shown by a letter from Cardinal Gibbons upon the subject of the authority for Sunday observance, written but a little while before the “Congress of Catholic Laymen” was held. The letter was written to Mr. E. E. Franke, then of Pittsburg, now of Williamsport, PA., and is as follows: —

***“CARDINAL’S RESIDENCE,
“408 NORTH CHARLES ST., BALTIMORE, MD.,
“October 3, 1889.***

“DEAR MR.FRANKE: At the request of His Eminence, the Cardinal, I write to assure you that you are correct in your assertion that Protestants in observing the Sunday are following not the Bible, which they take as their only rule of action, but the tradition of the church. I defy them to point out to me the word ‘Sunday’ in the

Bible; if it is not to be found there, and it cannot be, then it is not the Bible which they follow in this particular instance, but tradition, and in this they flatly contradict themselves.

“The Catholic Church changed the day of rest from the last to the first day of the week, because the most memorable of Christ’s works was accomplished on Sunday. It is needless for me to enter into any elaborate proof of the matter. They cannot prove their point from scripture; therefore, if sincere, they must acknowledge that they draw their observance of the Sunday from tradition, and are therefore weekly contradicting themselves. Yours very sincerely,

“M. A. REARDON.”

This shows that it is as a Roman Catholic, securing honor to an institution of the papacy, and thus to the papacy itself, that Cardinal Gibbons has indorsed the national Sunday law movement; and that it is as Roman Catholics doing the same thing, that the laity and the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States have accepted the proffer of the professed Protestant combination for political purposes, and have joined hands with this combination in its aims upon the institutions of the country.

The Cardinal understands what he is doing a great deal better than the associations for religious legislation understand what they are doing. And further, the Cardinal understands what they are doing a great deal better than they themselves do. His letter also shows that those who sign the petition for a Sunday law, as the Cardinal did, are honoring the papacy, as the Cardinal does.

What Rome means may be seen not only by this letter, but by the history of the original movement as given in Chapter XIII of this book. The Cardinal and the rest of the hierarchy know just how the original movement worked and accomplished what it did. All these facts are familiar to them, and they are glad to see this perfect pattern of the original so strongly supported and so persistently urged. They are indeed glad to join hands with it, and to be married to it, for it is in spirit and in truth only a part of that of which they themselves are a part.

This is what Rome means by it; and what those professed Protestants mean by it will be clearly seen by the evidences which will now be presented. We

have seen that the American Sabbath Union originated in a petition to the Methodist Episcopal General Conference, from Sunday-law organizations already existing in the States, and that one of the strongest of these was the Illinois Association, which originated in the Elgin Convention of 1887. In that convention "Rev." W. W. Everts, D. D., then of Chicago, since deceased, made a speech in which he said: —

"This day is set apart for divine worship and preparation for another life. It is the test of all religion."

This clearly shows that the object of those who are working for Sunday laws is wholly religious; that the legislation which they seek is religious legislation; and that they are thus endeavoring to secure the power of the State to further their own aims. The Sabbath is indeed set apart for divine worship and preparation for another life; but the observances of divine worship, and the preparation of men for another life, are committed by Jesus Christ to the church. The State cannot of right have anything to do with religious observances, and it is impossible for the civil power to prepare men for another life. Therefore, as this work belongs wholly to the church, and as the church wants to use the civil power for this purpose, it follows that these church leaders of our day, like those of the fourth century, are determined to make use of the power of the State to further their own aims.

"It is the test of all religion," says Dr. Everts. Then what can ever the enforcement of it be but the enforcement of a religious test? That is precisely what it is. Again the same speaker said: —

"The people who do not keep the Sabbath have no religion."

Let this be admitted, then the antithesis of it must also be admitted: the people who do keep the Sabbath have religion. Therefore this demand for laws to compel men to keep the Sabbath, is only a demand for laws to compel people to have religion.

Again Dr. Everts said: —

"He who does not keep the Sabbath, does not worship God; and he who does not worship God, is lost."

Admitted. Therefore this demand for laws to compel men to keep the Sabbath, is only a demand for laws to compel them to worship.

Nor is Mr. Everts alone in this. Joseph Cook, in the Boston Monday lectureship of 1887, said: —

“The experience of centuries shows that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, unless you preserve it as a day of worship.”

And when the American Sabbath Union was asked the question, “Could not this weekly rest-day be secured without reference to religion?” the answer of the Union many times repeated and published, was as follows: —

“A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out. Greed is so strong that nothing but God and conscience can keep him from capturing all the days for toil.”

As it is only on the basis of religious obligation that the weekly rest can be secured, when laws are demanded enforcing a day of weekly rest, it is plain that such laws must rest upon a religious basis only, enforcing a religious obligation, and so cannot be anything else than religious laws.

Again: as taking the religion out of the day takes the rest out, it follows that religion is essential to the rest; that if religion is not in it, there is no rest in it. Therefore, when laws compel men to take the rest, in so doing they compel men to take religion. When laws compel men to recognize and use the day as one of rest, such laws do compel the recognition and use of the day as one of religion.

And again: as nothing but God and conscience can preserve the day from greed, it follows that such laws are expected to perform the part of God and the conscience. And as the State is to enact and enforce the laws, it follows that the State is required to put itself in the place of God, and deal with the consciences of men. The demand for such laws does demand that the State shall invade the realm of conscience, and rule there in the place of God.

This is yet further shown by other official declarations. In the Washington, D. C., convention, December 11-13, 1888, the president of the American Sabbath Union said: —

“You have to say yes or no, whether you will stand by the decalogue, whether you will stand by the Lord God Almighty, or whether you will turn your back upon him. The work, therefore, of this society is only just begun. We would not put this work upon mere human reasoning, for all that can be overthrown by human reason: we rest it wholly on the divine commandment.”

In the Sedalia, Mo., convention, May 23, 24, 1889, “Rev.” John A. Brooks, in the speech before referred to, said: —

“If there is one thing that I want above another, it is a quiet Lord’s day. If there is one thing that I prize above another, it is the day consecrated to the worship of God, and the rest of his people upon this earth. If there is one thing I prize above another, it is that. And I enter my solemn protest against this desecration of this day. You and I as private citizens, answer, It is the business of the officers to lift up their hands to God, and swear that they will enforce the laws of this country and the Constitution of the United States and the State of Missouri as an officer of this great State. Why do n’t they do it? Why do n’t they do it? There are several reasons why, in my judgment, they do not do it. In the first place, the Christian people of this country do not raise such a protest as to compel them to do it, because you are silent upon these political questions; because the church of God has nothing to do with the political questions of this country. Yes, shame! shame! eternal shame that such a thought should fall from the lips of such a man who calls himself a servant of the most high God. If the preachers would speak out on this question, I believe these officials would be more faithful than they are. And if we have not officers in power who will enforce the law, let us elect men who will enforce the law; and to do that let us kick out of the traces, and vote for men who are for truth and God and right, and let parties go to perdition, where they ought to go.”

And in the same convention, “Rev.” M. A. Gault, speaking for the whole National Reform combination, said: —

“Now we take the ground that governments should appeal to divine authority on this question; governments should say to the people, You must keep the Sabbath, and have the Sabbath’s rest secured to all classes, not merely because it is good for you, but because God

says so; because there is a divine appointment behind this question. The point may be illustrated by the story of a man who had a melon patch, and who put up at one end of the patch the sign which reads as follows: 'Boys, don't steal these melons: for they are green, and God sees you.' That is, that farmer appealed to divine authority. He gave the boys to understand that they must not steal melons, not merely because it would injure them, but because God saw them. And in that way he reached their consciences. Well, that simple idea of the farmer expresses the philosophy that underlies this whole question. I believe that government can reach the conscience of the people. A man without a God is a man without a conscience; and a government without a God is a government without a conscience. A government has no right to enforce a law upon the conscience of man without recognizing the idea of a supreme being, the Almighty God, as revealed in Jesus Christ."

These plain and positive declarations of the chief leaders and the strongest representatives of the combination are sufficient to show that the movement is not and cannot be anything else than religious. Now, to the church and to her alone, God has committed the power by which alone religion can be promoted, religious obligations fulfilled, and religious observances secured: that is, by the persuasive power of the gentle influences of the Holy Spirit speaking to an abiding faith in Jesus Christ. This power belongs to the church of Christ. So long as any church has this power, she needs no other, and she will never ask for any other. But having lost the power to persuade men, she will invariably grasp for the power to compel them. It has ever been so, and it will ever be so. Therefore by this so widely prevalent movement on the part of the churches to secure the power of the State by which to promote religion and religious observances, it is proved that the professed Protestant church of the United States has lost the power of promoting religious observances by persuasion, and is grasping for the power to do it by compulsion. Having lost the power to do it by Christian means, she grasps for the power to do it by anti-Christian means. And this Sunday-law movement of the nineteenth century, as that in the fourth century, is only an effort on the part of the church to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of her aims.

If direct and positive proof is asked for upon this point, it is at hand in no less abundance than on any of the others which have been touched upon.

The Elgin convention 1887, passed a series of resolutions, one of which runs as follows: —

“Resolved, That we look with shame and sorrow on the non-observance of the Sabbath by many Christian people, in that the custom prevails with them of purchasing Sabbath newspapers, engaging in and patronizing Sabbath business and travel, and in many instances giving themselves to pleasure and self-indulgence, setting aside by neglect and indifference the great duties and privileges which God’s day brings them.”

As this was unanimously adopted by a large convention of the leading ministers and religious workers of the State of Illinois, we are compelled to believe it to be the truth. But what do they propose to do to rectify the practice and wipe away the “shame”? Do they resolve to preach the gospel earnestly, to be more faithful themselves in instructing and impressing the consciences of the people, by showing them their duty in regard to these things? — Oh, no. They resolve to do this: —

“Resolved, That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath.”

Indeed! They are ashamed and sorry that professed Christians will not act morally and religiously as Christians ought to; therefore they will turn politicians, and trade off their votes and support for pledges of candidates and political officers to enact statutes compelling the professed Christians to act religiously by enforcing upon them a civil Sabbath! That is, those professed Christians will not obey what they believe to be a duty to God without being compelled to do so by the civil law. Then when they are compelled to do so by the civil power, they will call that obeying God! This is only to put the civil law in the place of the law of God, and the civil government in the place of God. Such is only the inevitable result of such attempts as this. It makes utter confusion of all civil and religious relations, only adds hypocrisy to guilt, and increases unto more ungodliness.

The Illinois Association is not the only that testifies to this. The Kings county (N. Y.) Sabbath Association, in its annual report for 1889, said: —

“The delivery of ice-cream after ten o’clock Sunday morning, has proven a source of annoyance to many sections of the city, and has disturbed public worship in many of our churches.”

The report also states that the ice-cream dealers had been remonstrated with both by the Association and the police, but in vain. And the reason of this was given as follows: —

“We regret to state that many church people absolutely ignore their duty in these premises by requiring ice-cream to be delivered to them for their Sunday dinner. It is safe to say that many professedly Christian people require ice-cream dealers to keep their places of business open and scores of employees to do work on Sunday, contrary to law, besides requiring the services of horses and wagons, merely to gratify a selfish appetite, and serve mere personal gratification.”

And the American Sabbath Union, by its Field Secretary, reported in the *Christian Statesman Supplement*, December 4, 1890, as follows: —

“I believe the chief difficulty is that in the Christian descendants the Puritans on both sides of the sea, conscience is no longer regnant, but indulgence reigns in its stead. Christians break the Sabbath chiefly because it seems pleasanter or more profitable to do so than to do right. Even church committees receive men into church membership who are doing needless work on the Sabbath, and intend to continue so doing, sanctioning the excuse that otherwise a salary will have to be sacrificed. That is, a man ought to do right except when it will cost him something. With such a fountain the subsequent Christian life cannot be expected to rise above the idea that the Sabbath is to be kept only when it is perfectly convenient to do so. [The preachers ought not to blame the people for that, for it is the preachers who have taught the people so. — A. T. J.] Thus convenience has displaced conscience in thousands of Christians.

“‘What shall we do with our Presbyterian elders?’ said a pastor to me recently. ‘One of my elders owns the motor line, and another the electric cars that carry the people to Sunday picnics and base ball. Half the railroads of the country, I believe, after abundant opportunity to inquire, are owned by men who are devoutly singing, ‘O day of rest and gladness,’ in the churches, while their

employees are toiling and cursing on their Sunday trains. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church is itself a stockholder in a liquor-selling, Sabbath-breaking railroad. Some commissioner should raise the question whether it ought not to follow the example of its illustrious adherent, Hon. Wm. E. Dodge, and refuse to share the 'wages of unrighteousness.' Sunday camp-meetings, which the New England Conference calls 'the scandal of Methodism,' are not yet wholly abolished, nor that other scandal, the use of Sunday trains by some presiding elders.

"In one of our great cities, a leading officer of a Congregationalist Church devoutly worships every Sabbath morning, while his employees indevoutly work, driving all over the city to furnish the people that necessity of life, ice-cream. One Easter Sabbath I looked into a post-office and saw those who had been learning of the spiritual resurrection in flowers and songs and sermons, with prayer-books and hymn books in hand, and one in a Quaker bonnet, getting their letters and bills and newspapers, so as to bury the risen Lord again.

"Taking a swift run from city to city, let us see who are the owners or controllers of the Sunday papers. In this first city a Baptist trustee, in this next a Methodist steward, in this next a Presbyterian elder, in this next the editors of both Sunday papers are Methodists, and so following.

"Who owns that little store that sells candies and cigarettes and firecrackers to little embezzlers on their way to Sabbath-school? — A Covenanter, who is very particular that no one should call the Sabbath Sunday, but allows it to be heathenized in her own buildings rather than risk the rent.

"'Judgment must indeed begin at the house of God,' which means discipline. Candidates for the ministry and for membership should be examined as to their Sabbath observance, that they may start right, and then be admonished at the first open violation of their vows in this line. 'I commanded the Levites,' said Nehemiah, 'that they should purify themselves, and that they should come and keep the gates to sanctify the Sabbath day.'"

From these evidences it appears that the churches are filled with people who have little respect for the rules or discipline of the churches to which they belong, and less respect for Sunday. These evidence likewise demonstrate that the main object of Sunday-laws is the enforcement of church discipline not only upon the church members, but upon the people who do not belong to the church at all. That is the secret of all the Sunday laws that ever have been. It was the object of the first Sunday law that ever was made. This lengthy extract from the chief worker for Sunday laws, shows that the logic of Sunday laws is that there are hosts of people in the church who profess to be what they are not, and therefore these laws are demanded in order that they may compel everybody else to be just what these are.

Of course, no one can justly blame anybody for not observing Sunday; indeed, it is far better not to observe it than to observe it. Yet every person has a perfect right to observe Sunday if he chooses, as also a person has a right not to observe it at all if he does not wish to. But when men professing to believe that the day ought to be observed, and professing to be observers of the day, attach themselves to a church whose rules require its observance, then it is not too much to insist that they ought to be honest enough to stand by their professions. And if they are not honest enough to be indeed what they profess to be, then when laws are obtained and enforced, compelling other people to act as they do, the only possible fruit of the enforcement of such laws can be but multiply hypocrites.

From the first sentence of the foregoing extract it appears that Mr. Crafts's object is, by means of Sunday laws, to create in the church members sufficient conscience to lead them to do what their church obligations already require that they shall do.² Because, he says, "in the Christian descendants of the Puritans, conscience is no longer regnant, but indulgence reigns instead." This, in fact, is the tone of the article all the way through. He complains against the Sunday newspaper because that by it "families are solicited all the week to violate conscience by announcements that the best articles are being held back for Sunday readers." But whether or not he expects Sunday laws to cultivate conscience where there is little, and create it where there is none, this much is certain: this statement shows as plainly as words can, that the intent of Sunday laws is that they shall have to do with the conscience of men.

This need of State laws to cultivate conscience where there is little, and create it where there is none, on the subject of Sunday observance, is caused by the absence of any command of God for its observance. The word of God alone speaks to the conscience, and where there is no command of God, there can be no appeal to the conscience. And these organizations that are so determined to have Sunday laws, know as well as Cardinal Gibbons does that there is no authority in the Scripture for Sunday observance. They know as well as he does that there is no other basis for it than tradition, and no other authority for it than the authority of "the church." The American Sabbath Union has issued a series of "Pearl of Days Leaflets," No. 3 of which is written by "Rev." George S. Mott, a vice-president of the Union, and is entitled "Saturday or Sunday — Which?" In this leaflet, page 7, are the following words: —

"Our opponents declare, 'We are not satisfied with these inferences and suppositions; show us where the first day is spoken of as holy, or as being observed instead of the seventh; we must have a direct and positive command of God.' We admit there is no such command."

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union likewise occupies the same position. Leaflet No. 3, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, department of Sabbath observance, is a concert exercise on the fourth commandment for Sunday schools and "Bands of Hope." From this leaflet we copy following: —

"Question 5. — Why do not still keep the seventh day for our Sabbath, instead of the first, or Sunday?

"Answer. — ' We still keep one day of rest after six of work, thus imitating God's example at creation, and at the same time we honor and keep in memory the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who on the first day of the week rose from the dead, and thus completed our redemption.

"Question 6. If Jesus wished the day changed, why did he not command it?

"Answer. — A command to celebrate the resurrection could not wisely be made before the resurrection occurred. He probably gave his

own disciples such directions afterwards when ‘speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.’ “

In 1885 the American Sunday-school Union issued a one-thousand-dollar prize essay on the Sunday question, written by “Rev.” A. E. Waffle, who is now an ardent worker for Sunday laws. In this essay he plainly says: —

“Up to the time of Christ’s death no change had been made in the day.” And “So far as the record shows, they [the apostles] did not, however, give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week.”

The American Sabbath Union leaflet above referred to, corresponds to this precisely, in that it says that the observance of the first day of the week “grew up spontaneously in the apostolic age, and out of the heart of believers, and so became the Sabbath of the Christian era.” And this, with a number of other things, is said by the same document to “furnish a reliable presumption that, during those years following the resurrection, the first day of the week was observed in a religious way.”

And Dr. Herrick Johnson, speaking for the whole religio-political combination, before the United States Senate Committee, December 13, 1888, confirmed these statements in the following words: —

Mr. Johnson. — “I think that no one who accepts the Bible doubts that there is one day in seven to be observed as a day of rest.”

The Chairman. — “Will you just state the authority?”

Mr. Johnson. — “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy... Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work.”

Mr. Chairman. — “Is there any other?”

Mr. Johnson. — “There are references to this law all through the Bible.”

The Chairman. — “Now you come and change that Sabbath day to which the Lord refers.”

Mr. Johnson. — “That we hold was changed by the Lord himself.”

The Chairman. — “When did he do that, and by what language?”

Mr. Johnson. — “There was a meeting for worship on the first day of the week, the day the Lord arose, and seven days after ^{f862} there was another meeting for the same purpose, and then it is referred to as the Lord’s day.”

The Chairman. — “After the change?”

Mr. Johnson. — “Yes, sir; after the change.”

The Chairman. — “It is base then upon two or three days’ being observed as days of religious worship after the resurrection.”

Mr. Johnson. — “Yes, sir.”

Such, according to the official declarations of these organizations, is the origin and basis of Sunday observance. And as to the authority for it, they are equally explicit. “Rev.” George Elliott, pastor of the Foundry Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., is a representative of the movement. He has appeared twice before congressional committees as such representative. In 1884, he wrote an essay on the Sunday question, which took a prize of five hundred dollars. The essay, entitled “The Abiding Sabbath,” is issued by the American Tract Society, and is recommended everywhere by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. In this book, is the following statement: —

“It is not difficult to account for the complete silence of the New Testament so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath or definite rules for its observance are concerned.... The conditions under which the early Christian church existed were not favorable for heir announcement. The early church, a struggling minority composed of the poorest people, could not have instituted the Christian Sabbath in its full force of meaning. The ruling influences of government and society were against them.”

And how the ruling influences of government and society were turned in favor of the Sunday, so that it could be and was instituted in its full force of meaning, the following extracts from pages 213 and 228 of the same book plainly show: —

“For the perfect establishment of the Christian Sabbath, as has already been observed,. there was needed a social revolution in the Roman empire. The infant church, in its struggle through

persecution and martyrdom, had not the power even to keep the Lord's day perfectly itself, much less could the sanctity of the day be guarded from desecration by unbelievers. We should expect, therefore, to find the institution making a deepening groove on society and in history, and becoming a well-defined ordinance the very moment that Christianity became a dominant power. That such was the case, the facts fully confirm. From the records of the early church and the works of the Christian Fathers, we can clearly see the growth of the institution culminating in the famous edict of Constantine, when Christianity became the established religion of the empire.

"The emperor Constantine was converted, and Christianity became, practically, the religion of the empire. It was now possible to enforce the Christian Sabbath, and make its observance universal. In the year 321, consequently, was issued the famous edict of Constantine, commanding abstinence from servile labor on Sunday."

As to the origin and growth of Sunday observance, and its culmination in the famous Edict of Constantine, these statements are strictly in accord with the historical facts. And that famous edict in which the Sunday observance movement culminated then, was issued solely at the request of the church managers in return for services rendered, and on their part was but the culmination of their grand scheme to secure control of the civil power to compel all to submit to the discipline and the dictates of the church. Therefore, by their own official and representative statements, we know that they know that Cardinal Gibbons states the exact truth when he tells them that it is the Catholic Church that has changed the day of rest from the seventh day of the week to the first, and that the original and only authority for Sunday observance is the authority of the papacy. This they know, and therefore they realize that their efforts are impotent to persuade the consciences of men in the matter of Sunday observance. Mr. Elliott himself has borne conclusive testimony to this in the same book above referred to (p. 263), as follows: —

"To make the Lord's day only an ecclesiastical contrivance, is to give no assurance to the moral reason, and to lay no obligation upon a free conscience. The church cannot maintain this institution by its own edict. Council, assembly, convocation, and synod can

impose a law on the conscience only when they are able to back their decree with ‘Thus saith the Lord.’

To make Sunday observance only an ecclesiastical contrivance is all that he or anybody else has ever been able to do. That is just what these official statements of those organizations show that they know it to be. The only edicts they are able to show for it, are the edicts of Constantine and his successors, who in every instance did only the bidding of the church. These are confessedly the only authority by which they would lay the observance of Sunday as a law upon the consciences of men. They cite no “Thus saith the Lord” for the institution, nor for its observance. On the contrary, they confess that “there is no such command;” they confess that there is no command “enjoining the abandonment of the seventh day Sabbath and its observance on the first day of the week;” they confess “complete silence of the New Testament” so far as concerns any command to observe Sunday, or rules as to how it should be observed; they confess that they have only “presumption,” and “probability,” and a “spontaneous growth out of the hearts of believers,” for its origin and basis, and the church as “a dominant power” issuing “the famous Edict of Constantine” for its authority. Therefore, by their own showing and upon their own confession, the observance of Sunday is of “no obligation upon a free conscience.” Yet council, assembly, convocation, and synod have decreed that Sunday shall be observed by all; and as they are not able to back their decree with a “Thus saith the Lord,” they are determined now, as those others were at the first, to back it with the Thus saith the State, and lay it as an obligation upon — not free, but enslaved consciences, compelling men to do homage to the authority of the papacy.

All this is confirmed by positive testimony. It is church discipline that they propose to enforce by law. An important part of church discipline is church attendance and the forms of worship. This is, fact, the point of chief importance in all the Sunday-law discussions. They demand that the Sunday paper shall be abolished, because, as stated by Dr. Everts in the Elgin convention, —

“The laboring class are apt to rise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday papers, and allow the hour of worship to go by unheeded.”

And Dr. Herrick Johnson, in the Illinois Sunday convention, in Farwell Hall, Chicago, November 20, 21 1888, said of the Sunday newspaper: —

“The saloon cannot come into our homes ; the house of ill-fame cannot come into our parlors ; but the Sunday paper is everywhere. It creeps into our homes on Sunday. It can so easily be put into the pocket, and taken into the parlor and read.”

Then he named the matter with which he said the Sunday papers are filled, — “crime, scandal, gossip, news, and politics,” — and said: —

“What a melange! what a dish to set down before a man before breakfast and after breakfast, to prepare him for hearing the word of God ! It makes it twice as hard to reach those who go to the sanctuary, and it keeps many away from the house of worship altogether. They read the paper; the time comes to go to church; but it is said, ‘Here is something interesting; I will read it, and not go to church to-day.’”

The Sunday railway train must also be stopped, and for the same reason. In the speech above referred to, Dr. Johnson, speaking of the Inter Ocean Sunday news train, described how the people would flock to the station to see the train, and said: —

“In the Sabbath lull from politics, business, etc., the people would go to church were it not for the attraction of the Inter Ocean special train.”

In the Elgin convention, Dr. Everts said: —

“The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations. The Sunday railroad trains are hurrying their passengers fast on to perdition. What an outrage that the railroad, that great civilizer, should destroy the Christian Sabbath !”

And “Rev.” M. A. Gault, in the Christian Statesman, September 25, 1884, said: —

“This railroad [the Chicago and Rock Island] has been running excursion trains from Des Moines to Colfax Springs on the Sabbath for some time, and the ministers complain that their members go on these excursions.”

And as expressing the sum and substance of the wishes of the managers of the whole national Sunday-law movement, “Rev.” Dr. Briggs, in a Sunday-

law mass-meeting held in Hamilton Hall, Oakland, Cal., in January, 1887, said to the State: —

“You relegate moral instruction to the church, and then let all go as they please on Sunday, so that we cannot get at them.”

Therefore they want universal Sunday laws enacted, by which the State shall corral all the people on Sunday, so that the preachers may get at them. That is what they wanted in the fourth century. They got it at last.

It is not necessary to add any more statements; they are all in the same line. They all plainly show that the secret and real object of the whole Sunday-law movement is for the churches to obtain control of the civil power in order that they may enforce church discipline upon all the people. The Sunday train must be stopped, because church members ride on it instead of going to the church. The Sunday paper must be abolished, because the people read it instead of going to church, and because those who read it and go to church too, are not so well prepared to receive the preaching. The distribution of ice-cream on Sunday must be prohibited to protect from “disturbance” the worship of those churches whose members persist in “requiring ice-cream to be delivered to them for their Sunday dinner.”

Thus was it precisely in the fourth century, and in the making of the papacy. The people, even the church members, would go to the circus or the theater instead of to church ; and even if any went to both, it must be confessed that the Roman circus or theater was not a very excellent dish — “What a melange !” — to set down before a man to prepare him for hearing the word of God. The Sunday circus and theater could not afford to keep open unless they could get a great many spectators, and so break up a great many congregations. And as they hurried the spectators fast on to perdition, they had to be shut on Sunday, so as to keep “a great many congregations” out of perdition. It is exceedingly difficult to see how a Sunday circus in the fourth century could hurry to perdition any one who did not attend it ; or how a Sunday train in the nineteenth century can hurry to perdition any one who does not ride on it. And if any are hurried to perdition by this means, who is to blame: the Sunday train, or the ones who ride on it? Doctor Johnson’s complaint that the Sunday paper is worse than the saloon or the house of ill-fame, because these cannot get into the home, while the paper can be put into the pocket and taken into the home, is of the same flimsy piece. The saloon can be taken into the home, if a person

will but put it into his pocket, and the house of ill-fame can be taken into the parlor, if a man will put it under his cloak ; and if the Sunday paper gets there by being put into the pocket, where lies the blame: upon the paper, or upon the one who puts it into his pocket? Right here lies the secret of the whole evil now, as it did in the fourth century: they blame everybody and everything else, even to inanimate things, for the irreligion, the infidelity, and the sin that lie in their own hearts.

Yet in the face of all this testimony and ever so much more to the same effect, and in the face of the whole history of the Sunday institution, they have the effrontery to present the plea that it is only a “civil” Sunday observance that they want to enforce! They therefore pass resolutions such as that by the Elgin convention, and adopt planks such as the following from the National Prohibition platform of 1887: —

“10. For the preservation and defense of the Sabbath as a civil institution, without oppressing any who religiously observe the same or any other day than the first day of the week.”

None of those Prohibitionists, however, have attempted to explain just why, in their efforts to preserve and defend the Sabbath as a civil institution, they should refrain from oppressing only those who “religiously observe” Sunday or some other day. This betrays a lurking consciousness of the fact that such legislation is oppressive. It likewise reveals the utter impossibility of either defining or defending such a thing as a civil Sabbath. There is no such thing as a civil Sabbath, and these organizations mean no such thing as a civil Sunday. The whole subject is religious from beginning to end. There never was a law enacted, nor a single step taken, in favor of Sunday that had not a religious purpose and intent; and there can never be any such thing without such purpose; for the institution is religious in itself.

In this connection it will not be amiss to remember that it was altogether for “civil” reasons that Roger Williams was banished, that the Baptists and the Quakers were dealt with as they were by the New England theocracy; and that it was for the good of the State and to preserve the State, — that is, for “civil” reasons, — that the emperor Justin compelled all to be Catholics, and that the alliance was first formed with the church and such legislation enacted. ^{F863}

Like the original Sunday-law workers, these now do not propose to be content with a little — except at first. In a ministers’ meeting in behalf of

Sunday legislation, held in San Diego, Cal., in September, 1888, it was stated that "too much must not be asked for at first. Ask just what public sentiment will bear, and when you get that, ask for more." And at the national capital, before the Senate Committee, April 6, 1888, and repeated in the same place, December 13 of the same year in behalf of a bill to enact a national Sunday law, Mr. Crafts, of the American Sabbath Union, said: —

"We will take a quarter of loaf, half a loaf, or a whole loaf. If the government should do nothing more than forbid the opening of the post-offices at church hours, it would be a national tribute to the value of religion, and would lead to something more satisfactory."

Then in telling what would be more satisfactory, he said: —

"The law allows the local postmaster, if he chooses (and some of them do choose), to open the mails at the very hour of church, and so make the post-office the competitor of the churches."

This same trouble was experienced in the fourth century also, between the circus or the theater, and the church. The church could not stand competition; she would be content with nothing less than a monopoly, and she got it, precisely as these church managers are trying to get it. More than this, they want now, as they did then, the government to secure them in the enjoyment of a perpetual monopoly. For said Mr. Crafts in the same speech: —

"It should not be possible for any postmaster in this country to run the United States post-office as a rival and competition and antagonist of the churches."

At another point in the same speech, Mr. Crafts referred to the proposed law as one for "protecting the church services from post-office competition." And in explaining how this could be done, he said: —

"A law forbidding the opening between ten and twelve, would accomplish this, and would be better than nothing; but we want more."

And, —

"A law forbidding any handling of Sunday mail at such hours as would interfere with church attendance on the part of the

employees, would be better than nothing; but we want more than this.

He continues: —

“Local option in deciding whether a local post-office shall be opened at all on Sunday, we should welcome as better than nothing;... but we desire more than this.”

How much more? Still he continues: —

“A law forbidding all carrier delivery of mail on Sunday, would be better than nothing; but we want more than that.”

And when will they ever get enough? It is precisely as it was when, at the request of the church managers, the emperor Constantine ordered “a suppression of business at the courts and other civil offices” on Sunday. That was an imperial tribute to the “value of religion,” and led to “something more satisfactory” — to the church managers.

And when they shall have secured the help of the government in carrying their monopolizing ambition thus far, will they be content? — Not at all. Nothing short of a complete and perpetual monopoly will satisfy them. This is proved by Dr. McAllister’s words in National Reform Woman’s Christian Temperance Union convention at Lakeside, Ohio, July, 1887, as follows: —

“Let a man be he may, — Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denomination, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath, — let the law apply to every one, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest for the nation. They may hold any other day of the week as sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the nation at large, let that not be publicly desecrated by any one, by officer in the government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor.”

It is not without cause they have written on their banners, “Always encouraged, NEVER SATISFIED;” for this has been the very spirit of the movement from the day that Paul saw the mystery of iniquity working, until now. There is much being said of the grasping, grinding greed of monopolies of many kinds; but of all monopolies on earth, the most

grinding, the most greedy, the most oppressive, the most conscienceless, is a religious monopoly.

The Christian Statesman from its earliest days has ever insisted that —

“The observance of the Sabbath [Sunday] is an acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God over us.”

Then when they secure the law, it will be in their estimation, a national acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God; and for any one to refuse to keep Sunday, will be treason. This, too, is plainly stated by them. In a great Sunday-law mass-meeting held in Chicago, March 3, 1889, in which Protestant preachers and Catholic priests united in demanding a National Sunday law, “Rev.” J. Boring Gold said: —

“It should be understood first and last that this is America, not Europe, and the laws say expressly that no work, save that of necessity and charity, shall be performed on the Sabbath. The man who does not subscribe to the doctrine of Sabbath observance, is a traitor to his country, and should be treated as such.”

As stated by a regular National Reformer, it is carried farther even than this. “Rev.” W. M. Grier, of Due West, South Carolina, said in the Philadelphia National Reform convention, 1888: —

“Every sin, secret or public, against God, is a sin against our country, and is high treason against the State.”

Every sin, whether “secret or public,” being “high treason” against the State, the State must punish it, even secret sin. But how shall the State discover secret sins, except by an inquisition? This again confirms the logic of Sunday laws, and of the theoretical theory of earthly government — that the Inquisition is the inevitable consequence. These evidences are sufficient to demonstrate to the satisfaction of every reader that in its theory, its principles, and its propositions, this movement a success, are in perfect likeness of that which made the papacy. There remains in this connection only the inquiry, What will be the practice of the thing should it succeed?

As the whole combination singly and together is wedded to the idea of a man-made theocracy, the practical effects of the movement, if successful, would seem to be sufficiently discernible from the examples that have been given in the papal, the Calvinistic, and the Puritan theocracies. This

probability is greatly strengthened by the fact not only that it is such a perfect likeness of the papal theocracy, but that great pride is taken in appealing to the principles and practices of the Puritan theocracy. It was declared in the Washington, D. C., convention, December 11-13, 1888, that the object of the movement is to make Sunday "the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans." A favorite invocation of "Rev." M. A. Gault is that it might "rain Puritanism," all the way from six weeks to three months. Dr. Herrick Johnson, in his noted philippic against the Sunday newspaper, exclaims: "Oh, for a breath of the old Puritan !" And Mr. Crafts adopts as his own the words of another upon this point, to the following effect: —

"In the words of Dr. Lyman Abbott: 'We run up the Puritan flag, and emblazon on it the motto of a modern and modified Puritanism; a State Christian, but not ecclesiastical; with faith, but no creed; reverence, but no ritual; a recognized religion, but no established church.'"

And to show how fully he means this, and to cap the whole longing for the Puritan ideal, he has invented and published the placard on the opposite page, which, after the manner of the ancient and unmodified Puritanism, is "to be hung on the breasts" of those not on conforming to the dictates of the preachers. Please observe that the impression which is plainly conveyed is, not that it should be, nor that it ought to be, but that it is "to be, hung on the breast of every person who buys postage stamps, provisions, cigars, clothing, or what not," on Sunday. At this rate, how long will it be before they will be proposing to paint hobgoblins and devils upon the hats and garments, and to brand with the letter S the foreheads, of those who do not keep Sunday? Neither the spirit nor the principle of this proposal is removed a single degree from that which did paint such devices upon the garments, and did brand the foreheads, of people in times past. And the libelous thing is for sale by the hundred ! And why for sale, unless it is expected that they will be used? And how can it be expected that they will be used, unless it is first presumed that the American people are of so loathsome a disposition as willingly to engage in such an infamous undertaking? Such a presumption is an open insult to the civilization, and an outrage upon the Christian sentiment, of the American people. But it shows the disposition of the leadership of the national Sunday-law movement.

Having so explicitly declared their intentions in merely working for their much-desired laws, it were almost superfluous to inquire whether there will not be persecution, were it not for the singular apathy, and the overweening confidence, of the people generally with regard to the scheme. To ask the question, however, is only to ask whether they may be expected to use the power for which they are grasping, should they succeed in their designs. And to this it would seem to be a sufficient answer, merely again to ask, If they do not intend to use the power, then why are they making such strenuous efforts to get it? For an answer we might cite the reader to pages 722-726 of this book. But in addition to that, this question has been asked to themselves, and they have answered it. At the Lakeside, Ohio, convention, there was asked the following question: —

“Will not the National Reform movement result in persecution against those who on some points believe differently from the majority, even as the recognition of the Christian religion by the Roman power resulted in grievous persecution against true Christians?”

The answer given by Dr. Mc Allister is as follows: —

“Now notice the fallacy here. The recognition of Roman Catholic religion by the State, made that State a persecuting power. Why? — Because the Roman Catholic religion is a persecuting religion. If true Christianity is a persecuting religion, then the acknowledgment of our principles by the State will make the State a persecutor. But if the true Christian religion is a religion of liberty, a religion that regards the rights of all, then the acknowledgment of those principles by the State will make the State the guardian of all men, and the State will be no persecutor. True religion never persecutes.”

There is indeed a fallacy here, but it is not in the question; it is in the answer. That which made the Roman State a persecuting power, says the Doctor, was its recognition of the Catholic religion, “which is a persecuting religion.” But the Roman Catholic religion is not the only persecuting religion that has been in the world. Presbyterianism persecuted while John Calvin ruled in Geneva; it persecuted while the Covenanters ruled in Scotland ;it persecuted while it held the power in England. Congregationalism persecuted while it had the power in New England.

Episcopalianism persecuted in England and in Virginia. Every religion that has been allied with the civil power, or that has controlled the civil power, has been a persecuting religion; and such will always be the case. Dr. McAllister's implied statement is true, that "true Christianity never persecutes;" but it is true only because true Christianity never will allow itself to be allied in any way with the civil power, or to receive any support from it. The National Reform Association does propose to "enforce upon all, the laws of Christian morality;" it proposes to have the government adopt the National Reform religion, and then "lay its hand upon any religion that does not conform to it;" and it asserts that the civil power has the right "to command the consciences of men." The whole Sunday-law movement does propose to enforce the observance of the Christian Sabbath, or the Lord's day. Now any such thing carried into effect, as is here plainly proposed by the Associations, can never be anything else than persecution.

But Dr. Mc Allister affirms that the National Reform movement, if successful, would not lead to persecution, "because true religion never persecutes." The Doctor's argument amounts only to this: The National Reform religion is the true religion. True religion never persecutes. Therefore to compel men to conform to the true religion, — that is, the religion that controls the civil power, — is not persecution.

In A.D. 556, Pope Pelagius called upon Narses to compel certain parties to obey the pope's command. Narses refused, on the ground that it would be persecution. The pope answered Narses's objection with this argument: —

"Be not alarmed at the idle talk of some, crying out against persecution, and reproaching the church, as if she delighted in cruelty, when she punishes evil with wholesome severities, or procures the salvation of souls. He alone persecutes who forces to evil. But to restrain men from doing evil, or to punish those who have done it, is not persecution, or cruelty, but love of mankind." ^{F864}

Compare this with Dr. Mc Allister's answer, and find any difference in principle, between them who can. There is no difference. The arguments are identical. It is the essential spirit of the papacy which is displayed in both, and in that of Pope Pelagius no more than in that of Dr. McAllister; and he spoke for the whole National Reform combination when he said it.

Another question, in the form of a statement, at the same time and place was this: —

“There is a law in the State of Arkansas enforcing Sunday observance upon the people, and the result has been that many good persons have not only been imprisoned, but have lost their property, and even their lives.”

To which Dr. Mc Allister coolly replied: —

“It is better that a few should suffer, than that the whole nation should lose its Sabbath.”

This argument is identical with that by which the Pharisees in Christ’s day justified themselves in killing him. It was said: “It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.” ~~John~~ John 11:50. And then says the record: “Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death.” Verse 53.

The argument used in support of the claim of right to use this power, is identical with that used by the papacy in inaugurating her persecutions; the argument in justification of the use of the power, is identical with that by which the murderers of Jesus Christ justified themselves in accomplishing that wicked deed; and if anybody thinks that these men in our day, proceeding upon the identical theory, in the identical way, and justifying their proceedings by arguments identical with those of the papacy and the murderous Pharisees, — if anybody thinks that these men will stop short of persecution, he has vastly more confidence than the author of this book has, in apostate preachers in possession of civil power.

December 14, 1887, “Rev.” W. T. Mc Connell, of Youngstown, Ohio (the same who originated and was made the head of the National Reform league for praying, “Thy kingdom come”) published in the Christian Nation an open letter to the editor of the American Sentinel, in which he said: —

“You look for trouble in this land in the future, if these principles are applied. I think it will come to you, if you maintain your present position. The fool-hardy fellow who persists in standing on a railroad track, may well anticipate trouble when he hears the rumble of coming train. If he shall read the signs of the times in the screaming whistle and flaming head-light, he may change his position and avoid the danger; but if he won’t be influenced by

these, his most gloomy forebodings of trouble will be realized when the express strikes him. So you, neighbor, if, through prejudice or the enmity of unregenerate hearts, you have determined to oppose the progress of this nation in fulfilling its vocation as an instrument in the divine work of regenerating human society, may rightly expect trouble. It will be sure to come to you.”

Certainly it will. That is the spirit of the wicked scheme from the first effort ever made to secure a Sunday law unto this last. The editor of the American Sentinel, however, knew this full well before Mr. Mc Connell wrote that letter, because he was acquainted with facts by which the thing was actually demonstrated. Some of these facts will now be given.

It may be known to the reader that there is a considerable and constantly growing number of people in the United States known as Seventh-day Adventists, besides the denomination known as Seventh-day Baptists, who exercise the right to think for themselves religiously as well as otherwise, and to believe and decide for themselves as to what the Bible requires with respect to their duty toward God. They observe the seventh day as the Sabbath according to the plain reading of the fourth commandment, and quietly carry on their business on Sunday as on other days. These people are found in all the States and Territories of the Union, in numbers ranging from a few to several thousands in different places.

Until 1885 Arkansas had a Sunday law reading as follows: —

“Section 1883. Every person who shall on the Sabbath, or Sunday, be found laboring, or shall compel his apprentice or servant to labor or perform service other than customary household duties of daily necessity, comfort, or charity, on conviction thereof shall be fined one dollar for each separate offense.

“Section 1884. Every apprentice or servant compelled to labor on Sunday shall be deemed a separate offense of the master.

“Section 1885. The provision of this act shall not apply to steamboats and other vessels navigating the waters of the State, nor such manufacturing establishments as require to be kept in continual operation.

“Section 1886. Persons who are members of any religious society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian

Sabbath, or Sunday, shall not be subject to the penalties of this act (the Sunday law), so that they observe one day in seven, agreeable to the faith and practice of their church or society.”

In the session of the Arkansas Legislature of 1885, Section 1886 was repealed, by act of March 3. The object of those who secured the repeal of that section, was, as they said, to close the saloons. It was claimed that under cover of that section, certain Jews who kept saloons in Little Rock, had successfully defied the law against Sunday saloons, and that there was no way to secure the proper enforcement of the law without the repeal of that section. The legislature believed the statements made, and repealed the section as stated. But when the act was secured, and was framed into a law, not a saloon was closed, nor was there an attempt made, any more than before, to close them. Not one of the saloon-keepers was prosecuted. And in Little Rock itself, during the session of the legislature of 1887, when the law was in full force, up to the time of the restoration of the repealed section, the saloons kept their doors wide open, and conducted their business with no effort at concealment, the same as they had before the act was passed. But, so far as we have been able to learn by diligent investigation, from the day of its passage, the law was used for no other purpose than to punish peaceable citizens of the State who observed the seventh day as the Sabbath, and exercised their God given right to work on Sunday.

With but two exceptions, all the arrests and prosecutions were of people who observed the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath. And in these two exceptions, those who were held for trial were held without bail, — simply on their own recognizance, — and the cases were both dismissed ; while in every case of a Seventh-day Adventist, the least bail that was accepted was \$110; the most of them were held under bonds for \$250, and some for as high as \$500. There was not a single case dismissed, and in all the cases there never was a complaint made of that which was done having disturbed the worship or the rest of any one. But the indictments were all for the crime of “Sabbath-breaking” by the performance of labor on Sunday.

If there had been arrests of other people for working on Sunday, in anything like the numbers that there were of seventh-day observers, had the law been enforced upon all alike, then the iniquity would not have been so apparent; or if those who were not seventh-day observers, and who

were arrested, had been convicted, even then the case would not have been so clearly one of persecution. But when in all the record of the whole two years' existence of the law in this form, there was not a solitary saloon-keeper arrested, there was not a person arrested who did not observe the seventh day, with the two exceptions named, then there could be no clearer demonstration that the law was used only as a means to vent religious spite against a class of citizens guiltless of any crime, but only of professing a religion different from that of the majority. Nothing could be more clearly demonstrated than is this: that the only effect of the repeal of that exemption clause was to give power to a set of bigots to oppress those whose religion they hated.

If anything was needed to make the demonstration more clear, it is found in the method of the prosecutions: Mr. Swearingen and his son were convicted upon the testimony of a witness who swore that the work for which he was convicted was done on a day which proved to be seventeen days before the law was enacted, thus by its enforcement making the law *ex post facto*. The Constitution of the United States forbids the making of *ex post facto* laws. But when a law not being *ex post facto* in itself, is made so by its enforcement, it would seem that something ought to be done to enlighten those courts upon that subject; yet even this would certainly be vain, because religious bigotry knows no such thing as enlightenment. On the other hand, several cases were tried and the men convicted and fined after the law was repealed, but for work done before.

In almost every case the informer or the prosecuting witness, or perhaps both in one, was a man who was doing work or business on the same day, and often with the very persons accused; yet the man who kept the seventh day was convicted in every instance, while the man who did not keep the seventh day, but did work or business with him who was prosecuted, was left entirely unmolested, and his evidence was accepted in court to convict the other man.

For instance: Millard Courtney, who was the prosecuting witness against both J. A. Armstrong and F. N. Elmore, took a man with him to where these men were working, and there made a contract for roofing a school-house; and yet this man's evidence convicted these two men of Sabbath-breaking at the very time at which he was doing business with them.

J. L. Shockey was convicted of Sabbath-breaking in the first instance upon the testimony of D. B. Sims, who was hunting stock when he saw Mr. Shockey plowing and in the second instance upon the testimony of P. Hammond, who went where Shockey was at work, and bought of him a Plymouth Rock rooster.

J. L. James, who worked in the rain for nothing, that a poor widow, a member of another church, might be sheltered, was convicted of Sabbath-breaking upon the evidence of a man who carried wood and chopped it up within seven rods of the man who was convicted by his testimony.

Wm. La Fever and his wife went to Allen Meeks' house on Sunday to visit. They found Meeks planting potatoes. Meeks stopped planting potatoes, and spent the rest of the day visiting with them; and yet Meeks was convicted and fined upon the evidence of La Fever. And in the second case of this same Mr. Meeks, Riley Warren went to his house on Sunday, to see him about hiring a teacher for the public school. In the social, neighborly conversation that passed between them, Meeks incidentally mentioned that he had mended his wagon-brake that morning; and yet he was convicted of Sabbath-breaking by the evidence of that same Riley Warren.

Mr. Reeves's boys were hauling wood on Sunday. In the timber where they got the wood, they met another boy, John A. Meeks, hunting squirrels. They joined him in the hunt, scaring the squirrels around the trees so he could shoot them. Then the squirrels having been divided between the Meeks boy and the Reeves boys, the Meeks boy was indicted, prosecuted, and convicted of Sabbath-breaking, upon the evidence of the father of those boys who were hauling wood, and who helped to kill the squirrels.

John Neusch, for picking peaches, was convicted of Sabbath-breaking on the evidence of one Hudspeth, who had gone to where he was picking the peaches, to plead for a Sunday peach thief, and who offered pay for the stolen peaches to shelter the thief. James M. Pool, for hoeing in his garden on Sunday, was convicted of Sabbath-breaking, on the evidence of a "sanctified" church-member who had gone to Pool's house on Sunday to buy tobacco.

Thus throughout this whole list of cases, people who were performing honest labor on their own premises in a way in which it was impossible to do harm to any soul on earth, were indicted, prosecuted, and convicted upon the evidence of men, who, if there were any wrong involved in the

case at all, were more guilty than they. It religious persecution could possibly be more clearly demonstrated than it is in this thing, we know not how anybody could ever ask to see an illustration of it.

Yet further note the methods of prosecution. In the case of Scoles, J. A. Armstrong was called before the Grand Jury. After repeated answers to questions in regard to Sunday work by different parties in several different lines of business and traffic, he was asked the direct question whether he knew of any Seventh-day-Adventists who worked on Sunday; and when in the nature of the case he answered in the affirmative, every one of the Seventh-day Adventists whom he named was indicted, and not one of any other class or trade. And in the second case of James A. Armstrong: although, when asked for the affidavit upon which Armstrong was arrested, the mayor said that A. J. Vaughn had called his attention to Armstrong's working, and had said, "Now see that you do your duty," Vaughn testified under oath that he did not see Armstrong at all on the day referred to. Armstrong was arrested at the instance of the mayor and tried before the mayor, who acted as justice of the peace. This made the mayor, virtually, both prosecuting witness and judge; and the questions which he asked show that that was precisely his position and his own view of the case. The question which he asked to each of the first two witnesses was, "What do you know about Mr. Armstrong's working on Sunday, June 27?" This question assumes all that was expected to be proved on the trial. And then when the only witness whose word seemed to confirm the judge's view of the case, was cross-questioned, the judge came to the rescue with the excellent piece of legal wisdom, to the effect that if the prisoner was innocent, he could prove it. ^{F865}

The whole procedure is well described in the following extract from the speech of Senator Crockett in favor of the bill restoring the repealed clause. We cannot see how any lover of justice can fail to assent to the Senator's opinion as expressed in the closing sentence.

"Let me, sir, illustrate the operation of the present law by one or two examples. A Mr. Swearingen came from a Northern State and settled on a farm in ____ county. His farm was four miles from town, and far any from baby house of religious worship. He was a member of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and after having sacredly observed the Sabbath of his people (Saturday) by abstaining from all secular work, he and his son, a lad of seventeen,

on the first day of the week went quietly about their usual avocations. They disturbed no one — interfered with the rights of no one. But they were observed, and reported to the Grand Jury, indicted, arrested, tried, convicted, fined, and having no money to pay the fine, these moral, Christian citizens of Arkansas were dragged to the county jail and imprisoned like felons for twenty-five days — and for what? — For what? — For daring, in this so-called land of liberty, in the year of our Lord 1887, to worship God.

“Was this the end of the story? — Alas, no sir ! They were turned out; and the old man’s only horse, his sole reliance to make bread for his children, was levied on to pay the fine and costs, amounting to thirty eight dollars. The horse sold at auction for twenty-seven dollars. A few days afterward the sheriff came again, and demanded thirty-six dollars, eleven dollars balance due on fine and costs, and twenty-five dollars for board for himself and son while in jail. And when the poor old man — a Christian, mind you — told him with tears that he had no money, he promptly levied on his only cow, but was persuaded to accept bond, and the amount was paid by contributions from his friends of the same faith. Sir, my heart swells to bursting with indignation as I repeat to you the infamous story.”

Nor did the unjust proceeding stop here. The Supreme Court confirmed the judgments which sanctioned these iniquitous proceedings, and it confirmed them under a Constitution which declares: —

“All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent. No human authority can, in any case or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given by the law to any religious establishment, denomination, or mode of worship, above any other.”

The concluding portion of the decision reads as follows: —

“The appellant’s argument, then, is reduced to this: That because he conscientiously believes he is permitted by the law of God to labor on Sunday, he may violate with impunity the statute declaring it illegal to do so; but a man’s religious belief cannot be accepted as

a justification for his committing an overt act made criminal by the law of the land. If the law operates harshly, as laws sometimes do, the remedy is in the hands of the legislature. It is not the province of the judiciary to pass upon the wisdom of policy of legislation. That is for the members of the legislative department; and the only appeal from their determination is to the constituency.”

This decision of the Supreme Court is of the same piece with the prosecutions and judicial processes throughout. It gives to the legislature all the omnipotence of the British Parliament, and in that does away with all necessary for a Constitution. The decision on this principle alone is un American. No legislative power in this country is framed upon the model of the British Parliament in respect to power. In this country, the powers of every legislature are defined and limited by Constitutions. It is the prerogative of Supreme Courts to define the meaning of the Constitution, and to decide whether an act of the legislature is constitutional or not. If the act is constitutional, then it must stand, whatever the results may be. And the Supreme Court is the body by which the constitutionality or the unconstitutionality of any statute is to be discovered. But if, as this decision declares, the legislature is omnipotent, and that which it does must stand as law, then there is no use for a Constitution. “One of the objects for which the judiciary department is established, is the protection of the constitutional rights of the citizens.”

So long as there is a Constitution above the legislature, which defines and limits its powers, and protects and guards the rights of the citizens, so long it is the province of the Supreme Court to pronounce upon the acts of the legislature. The Supreme Court of Arkansas, therefore, in this case, clearly abdicated one of the very functions for which it was created, or else subverted the Constitution of Arkansas; and in either case, bestowed upon the legislature the omnipotence of the British Parliament, which is contrary to every principle of American institutions. Nor is the State of Arkansas an exception in this case, for this is the usual procedure of Supreme Court in sustaining Sunday laws. They cannot be sustained upon any American principle; resort has to be made in every instance, and has been with scarcely an exception, either to the church-and-state principles of the British government, or to the British principle of the omnipotence of the legislative power. But American principles are far above and far in advance of the principles of the British government, in that they recognize constitutional limitations upon the legislative power, and countenance no

union of Church and State; consequently, Sunday laws never have been, and never can be, sustained upon American principles.

That this indictment of the Supreme Court of Arkansas is not unjust, we have the clearest proof. The three judges who then composed the Supreme Court, were all members of the Bar Association of the State. In less than three months after this decision was rendered, the Bar Association unanimously made a report to the State on "law and law reform," an official copy of which we have in our possession. In that report, under the heading "Sunday Laws," is the following: —

"Our statute as it stands in Mansfield's Digest, provides that 'persons who are members of any religious society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday, shall not be subject to penalties of this act [the Sunday law], so that they observe one day in seven, agreeably to the faith and practice of their church or society.' — Mans. Dig., sec. 1886.

"This statute had been in force from the time of the organization of the State government; but it was unfortunately repealed by act of March 3, 1885. — Acts 1885, p. 37.

"While the Jews adhere, of course, to the letter of the original command to remember the seventh day of the week, there is also in the State a small but respectable body of Christians who consistently believe that the seventh day is the proper day to be kept sacred; and in the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our Supreme Court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, for worshipping God according to the dictation of his own conscience, supported, as he supposed, by good theological arguments. It is very evident that the system now in force, savoring as it does very much of religious persecution is a relic of the Middle Ages, when it was thought that men could be made orthodox by an act of parliament. Even in Massachusetts, where Sabbatarian laws have always been enforced with unusual vigor, exceptions are made in favor of persons who religiously observe any other day in the place of Sunday. We think that the law as it stood in Mansfield's Digest, should be restored, with such an amendment as would prevent the sale of spirits on Sunday, as that was probably the object of repealing the above section."

Now the Arkansas Constitution says, "All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences." This report of the Bar Association says, "In the case of *Scoles vs. State*, our Supreme Court was compelled to affirm a judgment against a member of one of these churches, for worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

The members of the Supreme Court being members of the Bar Association, in that report it is confessed that they confirmed a judgment against a man for doing that which the Constitution explicitly declares all men have a natural and indefeasible right to do. By this, therefore, it is demonstrated that the men who composed the Supreme Court of Arkansas in 1885, plainly ignored the first principles of constitutional law as well as the express provisions of the constitution which they were sworn to uphold.

One more consideration is worthy of note. The form of indictment in all these cases was the same as that printed in Appendix.

Thus the State of Arkansas declared that for a man to work quietly and peaceably on his own premises on Sunday, digging potatoes, picking peaches, plowing, etc., is against the peace and dignity of that state. This relegates honest occupations to the realm of crime, peaceable employment to the realm of disorder, and puts a premium upon idleness and recklessness. When any State or body of people declares it to be against the dignity of that State or people for a man to follow any honest occupation on his own premises on any day, then the less dignity of that kind possessed, the better it will be for all concerned. And when such things are considered as offenses against the peace of any State or community, that State or community must be composed of most exceedingly irritable people.

The fact of the matter is, — and the whole history of these proceedings proves it, — from beginning to end the prosecutions were only the manifestation of that persecuting, intolerant spirit that will always make itself felt when any class of religionists is can control the civil power. The information upon which the indictments were found, was treacherously given, and in the very spirit of the Inquisition. The indictment itself is a travesty of legal form, and a libel upon justice. The principle was more worthy of the Dark Ages than of any civilized nation or modern time; and the Supreme Court decision that confirmed the convictions, rendered by

judges who stultified themselves within three months, is one which, as we have shown, is contrary to the first principles of constitutional law or constitutional compacts.

In January, 1887, a bill was introduced by Senator R. H. Crockett, restoring the repealed clause. Only two men voted against the bill in the Senate, and both these were preachers. One of them, a member from Pike country, was acquainted with many who observed the seventh day, several of whom were at that time under bonds. In private conversation, he confessed that they were all excellent people and law-abiding citizens. When the vote was taken by roll call, he asked to explain his vote, and the following note of explanation was sent to the clerk:" — .

““Mr. President. — I desire to explain my vote. Believing as I do that the Christian Sabbath should be observed as day of worship, losing sight of this is to impede the progress of Christianity.

“J. P. COPELAND.”

The vote was a verbal and emphatic “No.”

The restoration of the repealed section was strenuously opposed by the religious leaders. The editor of the Arkansas Methodist declared in his paper at the time, “the Sabbath laws” as they were, had”worked well enough,”and were “about as near perfect as we can expect to get them, under the present Constitution.”^{F866}

Arkansas; however, was not the only State in which such things were done, for even while this crusade was being urged there, the same schemes were being enacted in Tennessee, especially in Henry county, and later in other countries, and in Georgia; and in every place the proceedings have been confined exclusively to observers of the seventh-day, and limited only by the number of such persons as might be found at work by devout observers of Sunday, who were at the time doing worse than were those who were prosecuted — provided there was anything wrong or bad about any of the work performed.

It is by no means certain that the strict Sunday observers of these States are any worse than would be those of any other State, in like circumstances. And such a probability is greatly strengthened by the fact, that although accounts of these persecutions were not only a matter of public record in the proceedings of courts and legislatures, but were

published denounced by the secular papers throughout the country, and too by such papers as the *World* and the *Sun* of New York City; the *Inter Ocean*, the *Tribune*, and others of Chicago; the *Globe Democrat* and the *Republic* of St. Louis; and *Boston Magazine*, ;the *Arena*; yet not a religious paper in all the land ever spoke a word against it, except the *New York Independent*, and a small Baptist paper in the South.

True, the *National Reform* papers mentioned it, but only to apologize for it or to justify it. And as a matter of course, the *National Reform* leaders as well as papers have justified it all. The *Christian Statesman* of June 4, 1891, in its leading editorial, stirring up the people of Michigan to sow “the good seed” of Sunday-law enforcement, referred to these persecutions, and soothingly remarked that “these instances have occurred in three States only,” and that then only one person “ever died from such a cause.”

And as for the decision of the Arkansas Supreme Court, it has abundant precedent in the decisions of the Supreme Courts of Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and others of the original thirteen States, ;which have perpetuated the colonial Sunday legislation, which was copied from the British system, which was derived directly from the papal system, and which in turn has been copied in the legislation, and perpetuated by the decisions, of the Supreme Courts of all the younger States of the Union. And now, instead of following the splendid example of California and lifting the legislation of the States up to the level of the national principles, the great effort is to bring down the national principles and procedure to the level of those of the States, and so to turn this nation into the Romish tide, and commit it to papal principles, to the support of papal institutions, and to the enforcement of the chief of all papal observances.

Religious bigotry is ever the same everywhere. And the movement to secure the enactment of National Sunday laws is simply an attempt to spread ;over the whole nation the same wicked persecutions that have appeared in these localities.

The national religious combination has repeatedly stated that their object in securing a national Sunday law is only to make the State Sunday laws more effective. There is now no lack of Sunday laws, both city and State, throughout the whole land, with but two exceptions; but both the principles and the precepts of the national Constitution, as well as the national sentiment, are clearly against it all. Therefore the most strenuous

efforts of the national religious combination, are being put forth to secure legislation or constitutional amendment, or both, which shall commit the national government to the declaration of the sanctity of Sunday, and to the enforcement of its observance. And just as certainly as Congress shall ever enact any of the Sunday measures which this religious combination proposes, and thus lend the national sanction to the sacredness of Sunday, and pledge the national power to its support, just so certainly will the history of Arkansas from 1885 to 1887 be repeated throughout the length and breadth of the nation. Are the people ready to have it done?

NOTE. — Since this chapter was electrotyped. United States District Judge E. S. Hammond, Memphis, Tenn., in *Ex parte King*, has confirmed the legality of these persecutions, though admitting that King was wrongfully convicted. He established the rightfulness of persecutions in these words: “If the human impulse to rest on as many days as one can have for rest from toil is not adequate, as it usually is, to secure abstention from daily vocations on Sunday, one may, and many thousands do, work on that day, without complaint from any source; but if one ostentatiously labors for the purpose of emphasizing his distaste for, or his disbelief in, the custom, he may be made to suffer for his defiance by persecutions, if you call them so on the part of the great majority, who will compel him to rest when they rest.” This decision and the practice which called it out, the *New York Independent* August 6, 1891, fitly described as “bad law, bad morals, and bad religion.” This decision does in fact justify all persecution from that of Jesus Christ, to this case at bar.

CHAPTER 27.

WILL IT SUCCEED?

EVIDENCE has been given showing the strength of the religious combination for the political object of making the civil power subordinate to the ecclesiastical in this government. This evidence also shows that just as soon as their design can be made a political issue dependent upon votes, the question will be decided in their favor, because the combination can easily cast enough votes to carry any election in their favor. It is important next to inquire, What, if any, encouragement has this movement already received from the national government? It is too bad that it should be so, but it must be confessed that there is abundance of evidence to show that the encouragement which the movement has received is so extensive and of such a material character as to render the situation at the present moment actually alarming to every person who has respect for Christianity, or the principles of the United States Constitution, or the rights of his fellow-men.

As a matter of fact, it is certain unconstitutional practices of the national government that have established a precedent which has been made a coign of vantage to the religious movement from the date of its organization. Contrary to the Constitution and to the intent of its makers, the United States government almost, if not quite, from the beginning has employed chaplains in the army, the navy, and in Congress; and has thus retained that relic of the union of Church and State, and perpetuated the imposture begun by Constantine and the political ecclesiastics. That it is contrary to the intent of the founders of the national government, is made clear by the following words of Madison, written in a letter to Edward Livingston , July 10, 1822: —

“I observe with particular pleasure the view you have taken of the immunity of religion from civil jurisdiction, in every case where it does not trespass on private rights or the public peace. This has always been a favorite principle with me ; and it was not with my approbation that the deviation from it took place in Congress, when they appointed chaplains, to be paid from the national treasury. It would have been a much better proof to their constituents, of their

pious feelings if the members had contributed for the purpose a pittance from their own pockets.”^{F867}

He observed likewise that the precedent was “not likely to be rescinded, “which has not only proven true, but the precedent has been made the basis of this loud demand for a religious government altogether.

That it is contrary both to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, is made clear by the qualifications that are required as essential to an appointment to a chaplaincy.

The following is an official statement received from the War Department, concerning the rank and pay of chaplains, and the qualifications required to become a chaplain: —

“The attention of applicants is directed to the following laws from the Revised Statutes of the United States: —

“**Section 1121.** The President may, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint a chaplain for each regiment of colored troops, and thirty post chaplains...

“**Section 1122.** Chaplains shall have the rank of captain of infantry, without command, and shall be on the same footing with other officers of the army, as to tenure of office, retirement, and pensions.

“**Section 1123.** No person shall be appointed as regimental or post chaplain until he shall furnish proof that he is a regularly ordained minister of some religious denomination, in good standing at the time of his appointment, together with a recommendation for such appointment from some authorized ecclesiastical body, or from not less than five accredited ministers of said denomination.

“**Section 1261.** The officers of the army shall be entitled to the pay herein stated after their respective designations.

“**Chaplain:** Fifteen hundred dollars a year.

“**Section 1262.** There shall be allowed and paid to each commissioned officer below the rank of brigadier-general, including chaplains and others having assimilated rank or pay, ten per centum of their current yearly pay for each term of five years of service.”

Here is a distinctly religious qualification required. The applicant shall prove that he is a regularly ordained minister of some religious denomination and must be recommended by some authorized ecclesiastical body. It is true that he is not required directly by this law, to declare that he believes in the Trinity, or the communion of saints, or the resurrection of the dead. It is true he is not required to pass such a direct test as that. But he is required to be religious and to belong to a religious denomination. If he is not this, he cannot be appointed. This is nothing else than a religious test as a qualification for office under the United States, and is clearly a violation of that clause of the Constitution which declares that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification of any office of public trust under the United States."

More than this: although, as stated above, no direct test as to a belief in the Trinity, etc., is required, the same thing is done indirectly. For in order to be an ordained minister in good standing in some religious denomination, he must necessarily pass a close and searching test upon many religious points. Therefore this requirement does indirectly what it does not do directly, and is just as certainly a violation of the Constitution, as though it were done directly.

That it is contrary to the principles of Christianity, is evident from the actual situation as it exists. This point is discussed from actual knowledge gained by experience, as the author of this book spent five full years in the regular army of the United States. Army chaplains are supposed to be for the spiritual benefit of the soldiers; but they are no benefit at all, either spiritually or otherwise. I have been in different garrisons where chaplains were stationed and never in the whole five years did a chaplain visit the quarters where I was, or any of the men in the company to which I belonged; unless, perhaps, in company with the officers at Sunday morning inspection. Never was there a visit made by a chaplain to the company in which I served — Company I of the 21st Infantry, from November 2, 1870, to same date 1875, — for any spiritual purpose, or for any purpose in the due exercise of the duties which he is appointed to perform.

The fact of the matter is, chaplains cannot work for the spiritual interests of the soldiers in the regular army. They rank as commissioned officers, and are to be considered by the enlisted men with the same deference and military respect that is due to the officers. The chaplain wears an officer's uniform, and an officer's insignia of rank. And whenever he appears, the

soldier must strike an attitude of “attention” and salute, as he would any other commissioned officer. Thus, the very position which he holds, ranking as an officer, places an insurmountable barrier between him and the soldier. He cannot maintain the dignity of his rank and meet the common soldier upon the level where he is, and approach him upon that common level as every minister of the gospel must do with those whom he is to help spiritually. He cannot enter into the feelings, the wants, the trials, the temptations, the besetments, of the common soldier, as one must do to be able to help spiritually, and as the minister of the gospel must do in the exercise of his office anywhere, with any person in the wide world.

Jesus Christ set no such example. He did not appear in the glory, the dignity, the rank, and the insignia of office, which he bore as the King of eternity. He laid this aside; he came amongst men, meeting humanity upon humanity’s level. He though divine, came in human form ; and made himself subject to all the temptations which humanity meets. This he did in order that he might be able to help those who are tempted. The great apostle to the Gentiles, following the way of his Master, became all things to all men, that by all means he might save some. To the weak he became as weak, that he might save them that are weak; to the tempted and tried, the same, that he might save them, and bring them to the knowledge of Him who was tempted and tried for their sakes, that he might deliver them from temptation and give them strength to overcome in time of trial. This is the divine method; it is the only right method.

The appointment of chaplaincies in the United States army, with the rank, the dignity, and the insignia of superior office, is contrary to the principle illustrated by Jesus Christ in his life and taught in his word, and frustrates the very purpose for which professedly they are appointed. The money that is spent by the United States government in paying chaplains could scarcely be spent in a way that would do the soldiers less good. In the nature of the case, it is impossible that chaplains can benefit the men. Besides, having it devolved upon them to maintain the “dignity” and “respect” that is due to their rank they do not, in fact, make any very strenuous efforts to help the men. It is difficult to conceive how any man who has the spirit of Christ, and who really has the burden to help the enlisted men of the army, could ever think of accepting such a position; because the acceptance of the position becomes at once the greatest hinderance to his helping the men at all.

This much upon the merit of the question. The principle shows that in the circumstances of their appointment, army chaplains cannot benefit the men; and practice shows not only that they do not benefit them, but that they do not try. Madison's statement that the precedent was not likely to be rescinded, was simply the expression of a consciousness of the power of precedent in government, however pernicious the precedent and the practice under it may be. The statement was prophetic. In the Thirty-third and Thirty-fourth Congresses, 1853 to 1857, there were strong efforts made to abolish government chaplaincies. The efforts failed, though there was not a valid argument offered to sustain the practice, but only "precedent;" and "it does not cost enough to justify complaint," and "there is no danger of union of Church and State," etc. If those who so argued then, were only alive now, and could see what claims are made upon the practice and precedent which they perpetuated, it is altogether likely they would think there was danger in it then. To the Thirty-fourth Congress the Baptists sent up a memorial asking that chaplaincies be abolished, and the argument is good for all time. We can present only a portion of the document as follows: —

"The immense increase of the number of chaplains employed by the government within the past few years, has alarmed us to apprehend that an extension of the system may ultimately subject us all to the serious and oppressive features of an unholy union of Church and State, with which the world has been so grievously burdened in all ages, and from which we had hoped we were forever delivered by the glorious epoch of the American Revolution.

"The number of national clergy which the citizens of our country are annually forced to support, by indirect taxation, is as follows: Thirty in the army; twenty-four in the navy, and two in Congress, besides a large number at the various naval and military schools, stations, and out-posts; and at various missionary stations, ostensibly as teachers of Indian schools. The aggregate amount which we are annually compelled to pay for the support of clergymen, as officers which the Constitution gives Congress no power to create or impose upon us, but on the contrary, positively prohibits, cannot therefore vary far from a quarter of a million of dollars annually! Should the number of national chaplains continue to increase in the ratio of the past few years, it will soon equal that of the national clergy in the despotisms of the Old World, where

the Church and State are allies in corruption and oppression. Indeed, we know of no stopping place or limit that can be set to arrest its progress, when precedent has overthrown the protective barriers of the Constitution.

“We cannot perceive why clergymen should be sustained by government in either house of Congress, at our military and naval stations, on board our vessels of war, in each regiment of our army, any more than in each township, parish, district, or village throughout the land: and to sanction the former could not be regarded otherwise than as an assent to the extension of the same system that would place us upon a level with the priest-ridden despotisms of the Old World. Our members of Congress, military and naval officers, soldiery and seamen, are, or should be, paid a just compensation for their services, and be left, like all other citizens, to support any clergymen, or none, as their consciences may direct them, without legal agency or coercion. Neither Christianity nor the genius of our institutions contemplates any aristocracy predicated upon the clerical profession, and no special provision therefore is necessary by the government to admit clergymen to our army and navy, as they may enlist like other men, and labor like Jesus himself and his apostles among the poor fishermen on the sea-side. If it be objected that few clergymen would serve among the troops and marines upon such terms, we can only say that, if actuated by correct religious motives, no minister would wait for government gold to lead him to his labors of love among them, and that none but hypocrites would be debarred by the want of it. We think the government should not evince more religious zeal than professed ministers of the gospel themselves, by bribing them to perform religious service. If the clergymen in the army and navy look for other compensation then the voluntary contribution of those among whom they labor, the various religious societies of the country might be more appropriately appealed to, as their funds are voluntarily contributed for such purposes; while those of the government are taken for national purposes, by authority of law, equally from all classes of citizens of whatever sects, and whether professors or non-professors or religions.”

Lest these views should be passed by as only the views of opponents, respectable though they be, we present the views of an admirer and defender of the institution, one who from long acquaintance knew it thoroughly: —

“All these chaplaincies are filled in a way which renders it possible that it may be done by the managing of political wire-pullers, with very little, if any, reference to the appropriate qualifications of those who receive the appointment... Let us look at the manner in which the two chaplains to Congress, and also, we might add, the chaplain who is appointed to the Penitentiary at Washington, reach their election. The same course of electioneering which the clerk of the House, the door keeper or sergeant-at -arms has to pursue; namely, to scramble for it. Letters are written before-hand soliciting votes. The successful candidate must be on hand to meet his ‘friends’ as they alight from the cars at the railroad station, who follow him to his hotel, and who will not hesitate to stand in a bar-room, and talk distinctly of his devotion to the party ! But the successful candidate is not usually the man whom his own denomination even, not to say the Christian Community generally, would wish to see at such a post.

“ The confidence and respect of the best men in the country has lessened in the same ratio as this Congressional usage has been subjected to wire-pulling and strife. It is now well understood that modest merit, eminent piety, and that kind of talent which is best adapted to the position, is no longer sought for in a chaplain to Congress. But the successful candidate is he who has a face to enter the ring of competitors; who knows how to lay his hand upon the right wires, and has strength to pull harder than the others who may be contending with him for the prize. The men best adapted to fill the office will not be found managing and scrambling for it. Instead of seeking the office, they are the very men who will be found at their post in their appropriate calling until the office seeks them. They are the men whose conscious merit and becoming modesty will not suffer them to enter the ring against such odds as they might chance to find striving for the place.” ^{F868}

As stated above, these statements were written by a defender of government chaplaincies; but no argument that the most decided opponent

could make could more fully or more justly condemn the whole institution as a living imposition, and a fraud upon the people. ^{F869}

Though this was written so long ago, there has been no change for the better since, as both facts and practical experience show. The Christian Statesman of May 8, 1891. contains the following: —

“The Rev. James C. Kerr, the most recent appointee to the post of army chaplain, is familiarly known as ‘Father Kerr’ and belongs (according to the Army and Navy Register) to a very church branch of the Episcopal denomination.” The same paper states April 26: ‘The newly appointed post chaplain James C. Kerr, gave a banquet to two hundred of his friends at Slaughter Beach, near Milford, Del., April 24. Three ex-governors were present, and one prospective governor. The chaplain (the telegraph tells us) received congratulations in a graceful manner, and everything was free to his guests, bowling alley, billiard room, and bar room included.’ We quote to emphasize the remark of the National Baptist: ‘It seems to us that evangelical Christians cannot reflect with any satisfaction upon this appointment. We humbly submit that a gentleman who celebrates his appointment by throwing open the bar-room to his friends, is not the sort of man who is going to do much good either to officers or men, among whom drunkenness is a wide-spread calamity and curse.’”

True enough, but it requires “influence” to secure a position as chaplain, precisely as it does to any other appointive office, and it is only such characters as that, that can exert the right kind of “influence” to gain such an appointment. No Christian can do it.

Nor is it surprising that drunkenness should be widespread among officers and men, for just before this man was appointed, there was dismissed from the army because of habitual drunkenness a chaplain who, as a drunkard, had held the office seven years, and was an habitual drunkard when he was appointed. The facts as stated by the New York Independent of May 22, 1890, are as follows: —

“A telling example of the evil of intoxicating liquors is that offered by the dismissal of Post-Chaplain John Vaughan Lewis, formerly a popular minister of St. John’s church, the most fashionable church in Washington City, who was appointed to a chaplaincy in the army

in 1883. He was compelled to leave his church by his unfortunate, and we must add, criminal habit of drinking. The habit pursued him after he left the church, and while a chaplain in the army. A year ago he was confined in an insane asylum for treatment, after having been recommended for retirement by a retiring board. It was hoped that the treatment would result in a partial cure, so that he might be restored to duty; but such has not been the case, and an order has been issued directing his retirement with a year's pay."

That is indeed a telling example of more than the evil of intoxicating liquors. It is a telling example of the evil principle of State chaplaincies. There was a man dismissed from the church for drunkenness, and then by some "influence" or other hocus-pocus was made a chaplain in the army. That is to say, he was not fit any longer to minister to a church, therefore it was proper for the State to take him up and give him charge of the spiritual interests and the moral culture of its soldiers. And this, too, under a rule that required that he should be "in good standing" in his denomination. Perhaps he was.

Addicted to habitual drinking when he was appointed in 1883, he kept it up all these seven years "while a chaplain in the army." Meantime he was confined in an asylum for treatment, with the hope of "a partial cure, so that he might be restored to duty." That is to say, an habitual drinker is worthy to be appointed a chaplain in the army, and so long as he is not entirely gone in besotted inebriety, he is capable of performing "duty" as a chaplain. When, however, it is no longer possible to keep him even partially sober, then it is proper to retire him "with a year's pay." Eight years' pay, therefore, — not less than twelve thousand dollars of public money, — has been paid to this chaplain for doing a drunkard's "duty."

Such a misappropriation of public money, however, is a very small item in comparison with the standing insult thus imposed upon every enlisted man in the United States army. For, to assume — as the appointment of such a character as that to the office of chaplain, and as the keeping of him there knowing him to be such, does assume — that the soldiers of the United States army are so low and degraded that a confirmed drunkard is a fit instructor in morals and a proper person to take charge of their spiritual interests, is nothing short of a base insult imposed upon every enlisted man in the service.

And in the Congress which was in session when this man was dismissed, and which conferred the appointment of the other one, there was introduced a bill to increase the number of chaplains from thirty-four to one hundred! Instead of this, there should have been a bill not only introduced but passed, totally abolishing the whole system of chaplaincies under the United States government. Legally, they are unconstitutional loafers. Physically, however, they are strictly constitutional loafers — when they are not constitutional drunkards.

RELIGIOUS PROCLAMATIONS.

Another unconstitutional practice which has been followed, and which has established a precedent that is now urged in support of the grand movement for national religious legislation, is that wherein the President of the United States directs religious exercises by proclaiming national fasts, prayers, and thanksgivings. The Constitution confers upon the President no such powers. The opinion of Jefferson upon this point, written in a letter January 23, 1808, is as follows: —

“I consider the government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises. This results not only from the provision that no law shall be made respecting the establishment or free exercise of religion, but from that, also, which reserves to the States the powers not delegated to the United States. Certainly, no power to prescribe any religious exercise, or to assume authority in religious discipline, has been delegated to the general government. It must, then, rest with the States, as far as it can be in any human authority. But it is only proposed that I should recommend, not prescribe, a day of fasting and prayer. That is, that I should indirectly assume to the United States an authority over religious exercises, which the Constitution has directly precluded them from. It must be meant, too, that this recommendation is to carry some authority, and to be sanctioned by some penalty on those who disregard it; not, indeed, of fine and imprisonment, but of some degree of proscription perhaps in public opinion. And does the change in the nature of the penalty make the recommendation less a law of conduct for those to whom it is directed? I do not believe that it is for the interest of religion to invite the civil magistrate to direct its exercises, its discipline, or its doctrines; nor of the

religious societies, that the general government should be invested with the power of effecting any uniformity of time or matter among them. Fasting and prayer are religious exercises; the enjoining them, an act of discipline. Every religious society has a right to determine for itself the time for these exercises, and the objects proper for them, according to their own particular tenets; and this right can never be safer than in their own hands, where the Constitution has deposited it.” ^{F870}

Madison also held that this practice is a deviation from the strict principle of the separation of religion from civil jurisdiction as demanded by the Constitution. His word as written in the letter before quoted on chaplaincies, is as follows: —

“There has been another deviation from the strict principle [“ of the immunity of religion from civil jurisdiction “] in the executive proclamations of fasts and festivals.” ^{F870}

Yet even Madison allowed himself by some sort of political or other “necessity” to be swerved from this acknowledged principle, and actually issued such proclamations, and apologized for them by the plea that they were “ indiscriminate, and merely recommendatory.” But no such plea will suffice. Jefferson’s position is the only true one on this question. Fasting, prayer, and thanksgiving to God are religious exercises, and for the President or any Governor to enjoin or recommend them, is only to assume jurisdiction of religion and religious exercises. It is to assume for the particular occasion, the office and prerogative for Pontifex Maximus, and is the first step toward the creation in permanency, of that pagan office, only to be merged at last in the papal form.

NATIONAL SUPPORT OF CHURCHES.

Another practice, evil in itself and fraught with additional danger in that it made a precedent and basis for urging the National Reform claims, is the exemption of church property from taxation. To exempt one class of property from its just share in the general expense, is to increase the measure of tax on the rest. Exemption of church property therefore does cause other property to bear just so much of an additional burden, and is noting less than levying of a general tribute in support of the church. In its original purpose, the exemption was especially to favor the church,

and was only one element in the grand scheme of the union of Church and State; such it has ever been ; and such only it is.

When by the exemption of church property from taxation, the national government had lent its sanction to the principle and the practice of State support of the Church, it was only logical that the further step should be taken, and support from the public treasury the religious teaching of the church. This step was taken in 1885, and the practice actually began in 1886. In 1885, the first year of President Cleveland's administration, there was established at the capital of the nation a "Bureau of Catholic Missions," the chief object of which was to "push Catholic schools upon the government as earnestly as possible." In September of the same year, they secured from the Commissioner of Indian affairs the publication of the following statement: —

"The government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in schools established by those denominations. It should throw open the door and say to all denominations "There should be no monopoly in good works. Enter, all of you, and do whatever your hands find of good work to do, and in your efforts the government will give you encouragement out of its liberal purse.' In other words, the government, without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor." ^{F871}

Fifteen denominations of so-called Protestants took the bait, and the next five years these, with the Catholic Church, made the following record of drafts, upon the public treasury: —

"The appropriations in this regard have run from the year 1886, as follows: For Catholic schools in 1886, \$118,343 as against \$109,916 for all other; in 1887, \$194,635 as against \$168,579 for all others ; in 1888, \$221,169 for Catholic schools, and \$155,095 for all others; in 1889, \$347,672 for Catholic schools, as against \$183,000 for all others; in 1889-90. as I have said \$356,967 for Catholic schools, as against, for all other denominations and all other schools, \$204,993." ^{F872}

That is, in five years there was drawn from the public treasury, by churches, more than two millions of dollars with which to pay themselves for teaching their own church principles and doctrines in their own church

schools and to their own converts. In other words, more than two millions of dollars was paid in those five years by the United States government directly to the support of these churches in their own religious work. And another point worthy of particular notice is that during this time the Catholic Church was enabled to increase by \$238,624 the amount which it first received, while all the other denominations together were able to increase theirs by only \$95,077.

When President Harrison entered upon his administration, and found this condition of things, he set about to remedy the evil, to break this union of Church and State, and let the churches support their own schools, and teach their own doctrines, at their own expense. But he soon found that in so short a time the wicked thing had attained such power that it could successfully cope with the administration of the government itself. As stated by Senator Dawes on the floor of the Senate, —

“The present management was in favor of divorcing the government absolutely from them all. but it found in impossible to do that.”

That is to say, on only five years the church power, as represented in these sixteen denominations, had secured such a hold upon the United States government, that it could not be shaken off. In so short a time, and in the face of every principle of the government there was created such a union of Church and State that it was found impossible to divorce them.

Finding this to be the case, the administration thought to do what appeared to be the next best thing, and allow no increase of the appropriations to any church, and did recommend that the government conduct its own schools and teach the Indians itself. The Catholic Bureau of Missions applied for aid in establishing three new schools. There were also applications on the part of the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, and the Methodists; but all such applications were refused. With the refusal, the Protestant denominations contented themselves; but the Catholic Bureau,” says Senator Dawes, “having failed to get a contract for these three schools from the government, in addition, and aggravating in inequality that had already aroused public sentiment, they went to the House of Representatives without any estimate or recommendation from the department, and obtained the insertion into the bill, of these three schools.”

When the bill reached the Senate, an amendment was there added to it, voting an appropriation to yet another school, making four in all that the Catholics had secured. As soon as the other denominations heard of this, they hurried up to Congress with a “protest” against the proposed increase of appropriation to the Catholic Church ; but there was no suggestion of any protest from them against having the appropriation of former years continued both to the Catholics and to themselves. And as the protest came only because the Catholics had succeeded in obtaining additional money , when they themselves could secure nothing additional their “protest” simply amounted to nothing. There was nothing heard of any protest from any of the Protestant churches, so long as they with the Catholic Church, got their proportionate share of the plunder. It was only when they discovered that the Catholic Church was getting a considerable increase when they could get none, that they discovered anything wrong. Then their “protest” was entered. It was read by Senator Jones, of Arkansas, as a statement which had been sent to him by an “eminent man, a minister a resident of New York,” and runs as follows: —

“Last year was given to the Roman Catholics, for Indian education, \$356,000. They demanded from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs \$44,000 more, making total of over \$400,000. The request was denied, and the commissioner announced that he would not extend the contract system, and would make no contracts with new schools. On this the Catholics endeavored to defeat his confirmation, but did not succeed.

“Foiled in this raid upon the public treasury, they then attempted to accomplish their ends through Congress. In the Indian appropriation bill as introduced into the House of Representatives there are two items, one appropriating \$3,330 for a Roman Catholic school at Rensselaer, Indiana, and the other appropriating \$12,500 for a Roman Catholic school to be opened among the Mission Indians in California.

“The special appropriations for the Roman Catholics in the Indian bill for last year were, for St. Ignatius school, in Montana, \$45,000, and for Roman Catholic schools in Minnesota, \$30,000. This made a total last year of \$75,000. The total amount this year is \$95,830. In addition to this large sum they will demand of the commissioner, doubtless, the same amount granted them last year.

“It should be remembered that in 1886 the amount of money secured from the government by the Roman Catholics was \$118,000 and in 1890 it had reached the large sum of \$356,000. Is it not time that this perversion of public money to sectarian uses should cease?”

Now that would be an excellent protest if it were an honest one. It would be a strong one if it were only fair. From this statement alone, nobody would ever get the idea that any church but the Catholic was engaged in this “raid upon the public treasury,” or had been a beneficiary of “this perversion of public money to sectarian uses.” Yet this statement was written and distributed to United States senators by a minister — clearly a Protestant minister. It was written by a minister who knew the facts. He knew that last year the Roman Catholics received \$356,967 and must also have known that the Protestants received \$204,993. He must have known that while the Roman Catholics asked an increase of \$44,000, the Protestants also requested the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to increase the appropriation to them. He must have known, also, that in 1886, although the Roman Catholics received \$118,343, the Protestants at the same time from the same source received \$109,916 ; and that although in 1890 the appropriation to the Roman Catholic Church had “reached the large sum of 356,967,” the amount secured by the Protestants in the same time, and from the same source, had also reached the large sum of \$204,993. Yet in the face of these figures, showing the large amount of money received by Protestant denominations from the public treasury for church uses, he says not a word about it, and lays against the Roman Catholics only, the charge of that “raid upon the public treasury,” as though they were the only guilty parties in the whole transaction.

Now if the Roman Catholics’ securing from the national government \$118,343 was a “raid upon the public treasury,” the securing by Protestants from the same source \$109,916 is just as certainly a raid upon the public treasury; and if the continuation and increase of the appropriation to the Roman Catholics up to the amount of \$356,967 was a continuous raid upon the public treasury, then the continuation and the increase of the appropriation, from the same source, to Protestants up to the amount of \$204,993, was just as certainly a continuous raid upon the public treasury. The only difference is that the raid of the Protestants was not quite so successful as the raid of the Catholics.

Nor is it exactly correct to put it in this way. The raid was not made by the parties in two distinct divisions. They were united in solid phalanx in the raid, each division supporting the other. It was only when the Protestants found that the Catholics were securing the larger share of the plunder, that there was any division at all among the invading host, or that there was among them any idea that their action was a raid upon the public treasury. As soon as this was discovered, however, the invading hosts separated into two divisions, — the “sectarian” and the “non-sectarian,” — and the Protestants, the “non-sectarian” division, suddenly discovered that there was a “raid being made upon the public treasury,” and that there was being carried on a “serious perversion of public money to sectarian uses.”

It is important to inquire, Why is it considered impossible to break this hold which the churches have secured upon the government? Why is it impossible to sever this union of Church and State which is already formed? After stating the amount of appropriations to parochial schools. from the years 1886-1890, as already given, Senator Dawes, who had charge of the bill, said: —

“That was the condition of things last year when the present management of the Indian Bureau came into power. That is maintained to-day in precisely the same condition. When this present management came into power, it encountered a public sentiment in reference to this great discrepancy, which came very near precipitating upon the country a very angry and unprofitable, and in every possible light an unfortunate discussion, of the great question whether the government should be connected with parochial schools at all. The present management was in favor of divorcing the government absolutely from them all, but it found it impossible to do that.”

This is a statement worth examining: —

- 1.** It is shown by the Senator that the United States government is allied with the churches in the United States to such an extent as to be spending more than one-half million dollars each year for the support of the schools of these churches. That is more than one-half million dollars is taken each year from all the people and given outright to certain churches with which to conduct church schools, and to teach the religious dogmas of those churches.

2. It is stated by the Senator that the question whether the government should be connected with parochial schools at all, is a “great question.” That is the truth. It is a great question. It is the great question that caused the Dark Ages. and has been the curse of every government until now. It is this question that our fathers sought to have this government avoid, when they forbade Congress to have anything to do with religion. But, although the whole spirit and intent of the United States Constitution forbids this thing which is now being done by the government for certain churches of the United States, both the government and the churches have deliberately gone ahead in the matter, and are still going ahead, and the people sit still and let them go on without any protest.

This is forcible and practical illustration of the truth that constitutional safeguards are such only so long as the intelligence of the people is kept up to the level of the Constitution. A people may have a perfect Constitution, and yet, if they neglect it so that the public intelligence falls below the level of the Constitution, and the real character of the Constitution is forgotten, then the Constitution is of no more value than so much blank paper. This is the condition of things in the United States now. So far as the subject of religion and government is concerned, the United States Constitution is as nearly perfect as a human production can be made. It declares an absolute separation between the church, or churches, and the State; and prohibits the government from having anything to do with establishing any religion, or with any religion already established. And yet the people of the United States have so far forgotten these principles, and the necessity of maintaining them, that Congress goes on year after year, bestowing national aid upon certain churches, and the people say not a word. Men are elected to Congress who still carry on the same iniquity, and the people suffer the evil still to go on, until the churches get such a hold upon the government that it is officially declared that it is impossible to be broken. And this declaration is made by the very men who are sent to Congress, and who sit there under a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Of what benefit is the Constitution of the United States, in its provision for the separation of Church and State, when the men who take oath to support it thus violate it, and when the people are so careless and indifferent about the whole matter as to suffer it to go on year after year, with not a word of protest? This is indeed a great question.

And yet, as great a question as it is, and great a question as it is acknowledged by Senator Dawes to be he considers any discussion of the question to be “unprofitable and in every possible light an unfortunate discussion.” How is it possible that the discussion of the great fundamental principles of the United States Constitution can be unfortunate and unprofitable? If this statement be true, then it was an unfortunate and unprofitable thing for our fathers to put this principle in the Constitution at all ; because it is certain that every subject embodied in the Constitution is properly a subject of discussion. Therefore, if the statement of Senator Dawes be true, that the discussion of the question as to whether the government should be connected with parochial schools, — in other words, whether there shall be a union of Church and State — if the discussion of that question can ever be unfortunate and unprofitable, then that is only to charge that the action of the fathers, in making such a provision in the Constitution, was only unfortunate and unprofitable. But Mr. Dawes even repeats this proposition. He says: —

“The present management was in favor of divorcing to government absolutely from them all, but it found it impossible to do that. Perhaps it would have been better had the Indian education set out upon this principle, but it had gone so far and got interwoven with the whole system of Indian education, that it was utterly impossible to retrace the step, and to avoid the precipitation upon the country of such a discussion as that, which could do no good anywhere.”

Senator Dawes is from Massachusetts. Does he express the opinion of the people of that State, when he declares the discussion of the question of national support to parochial schools to be unfortunate, unprofitable, and such as can do no good anywhere? Are the people of the United States, as a whole, ready to admit that the discussion of one of the greatest principles embodied in the United States Constitution, can ever be either unfortunate or unprofitable, or such as can do no good anywhere? It is hard to believe that such is the sentiment of the majority of the people of the United States. But as the practice is known, and is still allowed to go on, increasing every year, and that without any such general protest or even discussion as the importance of the subject demands, we are forced to conclude that the people have forgotten the principles of the government of the United States, and have laid aside that eternal vigilance which alone is the price of liberty.

And from the fact, and the way, that this practice is allowed to go on almost wholly without dispute or protest, it is evident that the American people are ready to admit, and to sit quietly down with the admission, that the church power in the United States has already so far encroached upon the national government as to have absolutely strangled the free discussion of one of the greatest principles of the Constitution, and thus virtually to have strangled all Successful efforts at resistance.^{F873}

So much has actually been accomplished, and is now being practiced, in the union of Church and State in this government, which in every principle and every precept of its fundamental and supreme law, stands pledged to the opposite. And in view of the situation as it is, it is impossible to deny that there is every favorable prospect for the speedy success of the gigantic religious combination which exists for the sole purpose of having the government committed wholly to the interests and the propagation of religion. This would be so, were there nothing more in view than the things which we have here named. But the prospect is made far more promising when viewed from the position which the combination has gained by direct and intentional effort.

THE PROPOSED RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT.

May 25, 1888, Henry W. Blair, United States Senator from New Hampshire, introduced in the United States Senate, the following joint resolution: —

“50TH CONGRESS, S. R. 86.

1ST SESSION

Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools.

“Resolved by the senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled(two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is proposed to the States to become valid when rectified by legislatures of three fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution: —

“ARTICLE.

“**Section 1.** No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

“**Section 2.** Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school institution corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonies, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination organization, or society, being, or claiming to be religious in its character ; nor shall such peculiar doctrines tenets, belief ceremonials, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

“**Section 3.** To the end that each State the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guarantee to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

“**Section 4.** That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.”

With this the National Reformers were delighted, and at once were all astir. The Christian Statesman of July 12, 1888, said that the proposed amendment “should receive the strenuous support of all American Christians.” In the issue of July 19, it further said: —

“Senator Blair’s proposed constitutional amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the minds of the people.”

Then after mentioning “Christianity, the religion of the nation,” and “the Bible the text-book of our common Christianity in all the schools,” it continues: —

“These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the Senate of the United States, in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?”

In the next issue of the *Statesman* July 26 “Rev.” J. C. K. Milligan (the same one who speaks on page 708 of this book) said to the editor: —

“Your editorial of July 12, on a Christian constitutional amendment pending in the Senate, is most gratifying news to every Christian patriot. It seems too good to be true. It is too good to prevail without a long pull, as strong pull, and a pull all together on the part of its friends; but it is so good that it surely will have many friends who will put forth the necessary effort. True the pending amendment has its chief value in one phrase, ‘the Christian religion’ but if it shall pass into our fundamental law, that one phrase will have all the potency of Almighty God, of Christ the Lord of the Holy Bible, and of the Christian world, with it. By letters to senators and representatives in Congress; by petitions numerously signed and forwarded to them; by local, State, and national conventions held, and public meetings in every school district; such an influence can quickly be brought to bear as will compel our legislators to adopt the measure, and enforce it by the needed legislation. The Christian pulpits, if they would, could secure its adoption before the dog-days end. The National Reform Association, the *Christian Statesman*, and the secretaries in the field, are charged with this work, and will not be wanting as leaders in the cause.”

And in the same paper, September 6, Mr. John Alexander, the originator of the National Reform Association, published his congratulations to the Association on the introduction of the Blair “Joint Resolution,” saying that “the National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption;” and continued as follows: —

“Let us begin without delay the circulation of petitions (to be furnished in proper form by the Association), and let an opportunity

be given to all parts of the country to make up a roll of petitions so great that it will require a procession of wheelbarrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the nation in the House of Congress... Let a mass convention of the friends of the cause be held in Washington, when the Blair resolution shall be under discussion, to accompany with its influence the presentation of the petitions, and to take such other action as may be deemed best to arouse the nation to a genuine enthusiasm in behalf of our national Christianity.”

The National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, in its annual convention, held in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, October 19-23, 1888 passed a resolution “that the Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by Senator Henry W. Blair,... deserves our earnest and united support.”

A public meeting in support of the resolution was called and held by the National Reform Association in Philadelphia, December 11, 1888. Senator Blair was invited to attend. He could not go in person, but sent a letter strongly approving the work of the Association, among other things saying: —

“I earnestly trust that your movement may become strong, general in fact, all-pervading ; for the time has fully come when action is imperative and further delay is most dangerous.”

Just how the longest imaginable delay could possibly be as dangerous as would be the success of the movement, neither Mr. Blair nor anybody else has ever attempted to explain.

The meeting adopted a memorial to Congress, pleading for the speedy adoption of the resolution. This memorial was presented by the corresponding secretary of the Association, at a hearing before the Senate Committee, February 15, 1889. At this hearing the National Reform Association was accompanied and supported by “Rev.” James M. King, of New York City, as the representative of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance. One week from that date — February 22 — another hearing was held, at which a delegation from the “Committee of One Hundred” of Boston led by the eminent Baptist minister, Philip S. Moxom of that city, urged the adoption of the proposed amendment. ^{F874}

The Fiftieth Congress expired without any further definite action in behalf of the resolution. The Fifty-first Congress was no sooner convened for business than the resolution was re-introduced by Senator Blair with no change whatever, except that the phrase, "The principles of the Christian religion," was made to read, "The fundamental and nonsectarian principles of Christianity."

That the National Reformers made no mistake in supposing that in its intent this resolution proposed exactly what they have been and are working for, is made plain by the following extract from a letter written by Senator Blair to the New York Mail and Express in the winter of 1889-90:

"I yet believe that instead of selecting a final toleration of so-called religions, the American people will by constant and irresistible pressure, gradually expel from our geographical boundaries every religion except the Christian in its varied forms. I do not expect to see the pagan and other forms existing side by side with the former, both peaceably acquiesced in, for any length of time. I do not think that experience will satisfy the American people that the inculcation of any positive religious belief hostile to the Christian faith, or the practice of the forms of any other worship, is conducive to the good order of society and the general welfare. There may not be any exhibition of bigotry in this. I believe that religious toleration will yet come to be considered to be an intelligent discrimination between the true and the false, and the selection of the former by such universal consent as shall exclude by general reprobation the recognition and practice of the latter.... The people are considering these subjects anew. They are questioning whether there be not some mistake in theories of religious liberty, which permit the inculcation of the most destructive errors in the name of toleration, and the spread of pestilences under the name of liberty which despises the quarantine."

And that they made no mistake in the view that practically it means all that they intend, is clear from the briefest examination of its provisions. If this resolution were adopted and the proposed amendment were made a part of the Constitution, then the first of all questions to be decided would be, What are the fundamental and non-sectarian principles of Christianity?

If Christianity, itself alone, is not sectarian, then none of the principles of Christianity can possibly be sectarian. If any of the principles of Christianity be sectarian, then all of them are. Because Christianity as it is, is a definite and positive thing. It is not a namby-pamby mixture of fast and loose principles. But granting the assumption of the resolution that such a distinction exists, the question then is, How shall the United States government discover just what they are? Christianity is represented in the United States by probably a hundred different denominations. Each one of these holds to something different from all the others, which makes it the particular denomination it is. No one of these, therefore, can be taken as representing the non-sectarian principles of Christianity. Consequently, the only course to be pursued by which the United States government could find out what are the non-sectarian principles of Christianity, is by a general consensus of the principles of Christianity as held by all of the denominations in which Christianity is represented in the United States. This could not be secured by an examination of the creeds of the different denominations, because the leading denominations themselves do not agree upon their own creeds. There would be no remedy, therefore, other than to call a general convention of all the denominations of the United States, to discover what principles of the Christian religion are held in common by all, and are therefore non-sectarian in this country. This is the idea of the author of the resolution, as stated in a letter to the secretary of the National Reform Association, and which was read at the Philadelphia meeting mentioned above, December 11, 1888. He said: —

“I believe that a text-book of instruction in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the public schools by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian church, both Protestant and Catholic, and also those who are not actively associated with either.”

Does anybody who has any acquaintance with history need to be shown the perfect parallel between this and the formation of that union of Church and State in the fourth century, which developed the papacy and all the religious despotism and intolerance that has been witnessed in Europe and America from that time to this? It was in this way precisely that the thing was worked in the fourth century. Let the reader turn back and review chapters XII and XIV of this book, and glance again at the succeeding chapters, and bear in mind that the great changes, tests, and contests that there occurred only at the deaths of the successive emperors, would all

occur here at each successive congressional election and at each change of administration — that is to say, every two years. And as surely as the complete establishment of the papacy followed, and grew out of, that imperial recognition of Christianity in the fourth century, just so surely, and much more speedily, would the complete establishment of a religious despotism after the living likeness of the papacy, follow, and grow out of, such a national recognition of Christianity as is proved for the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Blair, and aimed at and longed for by the National Reform religious combination.

A NATIONAL ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

Nor is Senator Blair the only United States senator who is enlisted in the scheme to create and establish a national religion. Senator George F. Edmunds is scarcely second to Mr. Blair. When in 1876 there had passed the House by the almost unanimous vote of 180 to 7, a proposed amendment to the Constitution prohibiting any State from making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and forbidding any appropriations of public money to religious sects or denominations, it went to the Senate, where it was referred to the Judiciary Committee of which Senator Edmunds ends was chairman. The National Reform Association seeing how readily the resolution had passed the House, and fearing it would pass the Senate, hastily called a meeting of its executive committee, and framed a National Reform clause, and appointed a committee to carry it to Washington to the Senate Committee; and the National Reform Manual says that “this very clause was introduced into the amendment.” This and other changes made an entirely new, and in fact a National Reform, resolution of it, and fortunately it failed to pass the Senate, but only by two votes.

Again: May 14, 1890 Senator Edmunds introduced in the United States Senate “a bill to establish the University of the United States,” Section 10 of which reads as follows: —

“Section 10. That no special sectarian belief or doctrine shall be taught or promoted in said university, but this prohibition shall not be deemed to exclude the study and consideration of Christian theology.”

It is evident that this section provides at once for the creation of a national god and the establishment of a national religion; for theology is the science

which teaches about God. But it is only the Christian theology, science of the Christians' God, that can be taught there. It is only the wisdom concerning the Christians' God that could be studied and considered there. Therefore this section does as clearly and distinctly provide for the setting up of somebody's idea of God, and the establishment of the beliefs, doctrines, and views which conform to it, as anything can do. It just as clearly and distinctly provides for the establishment of some form of Christianity as the national religion, as it would be possible to do by an act of Congress. Because it would be at once a national recognition of Christianity as the only form of theology, belief, or doctrine worthy of study and consideration from a national point of view; and the national recognition of Christianity, and the teaching of it at national expense and by national authority, would be but the establishment of that form of Christianity as the national religion.

As with the Blair resolution, it is evident also that this would not be by any means the end of the story. The next thing to be decided would be, What form of "Christian theology" shall it be? Shall it be Roman Catholic "Christian theology," or shall it be Protestant "Christian theology," that shall be studied and considered in the National University at the national expense and by national authority? This would have to be decided; and as the bill provides that the Board of Regents shall be composed of the President and Cabinet, the Chief-Justice of the United States, and twelve citizens of the United States "appointed by a concurrent resolution of the two houses of Congress," as to how the question should be decided would be the issue in the very first presidential election after the passage of the bill, and in every other presidential and congressional election that ever would follow. At every national election "Christian theology" would be the one great question at issue. Mrs. Woodbridge's National Reform Woman's Christian Temperance Union idea of bringing the gospel to the masses, would be literally fulfilled in the perfect image of the original campaigns that made the papacy.

It may be said that even if such a bill as this were passed by Congress, it would at once be declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. That it ought to be declared unconstitutional is very certain, but that it would be, is another question entirely. That such a bill is unconstitutional is clear from one consideration alone, to say nothing of any more. If Christian theology be taught in the University, there will have to be a teacher. Such a teacher would in the nature of the case be a holder of an

“office or public trust” within the meaning of the Constitution. In order to be qualified to teach Christian theology, such a person must necessarily be a Christian. But to require such a teacher to be a Christian would be to require a religious test, and clearly a violation of that clause of the Constitution which declares that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this government.”

Yet this would be hardly more of a violation of this clause, than is the appointment of chaplains under the law as enacted. And there is hardly a doubt that the teaching of “Christian theology” would be carried on under such an act as this, by teachers obliged to submit to such a religious test, just as the appointment and work of chaplains is now carried on. What does the Constitution amount to in the presence of such forces?

But whether it would be declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court, is by no means certain. Senator Edmunds, the author of the bill, is said to be one of best, if not the best, of constitutional lawyers, not only in the United States Senate, but in the whole country. True, it does not follow that this fact would necessarily have any influence with the Supreme Court; yet when a man with such a reputation as a constitutional lawyer, would deliberately frame and offer such a bill, it might be that a sufficient number of the judges on the Supreme Bench would view the constitutionality of the act as Mr. Edmunds does; especially if he should argue in favor of its constitutionality, as he would be certain to do, it being a favorite measure of his.^{F875}

PROPOSED NATIONAL SUNDAY LEGISLATION.

But it is in behalf of the bond of union between the National Reform combination and the papacy, it is in behalf of this great sign manual of the papacy, it is in behalf of Sunday-laws that the strongest effort is being made by this whole religious combination. These other measures are mere feelers, as compared with the universal movement and determination to secure a national Sunday law, or at least some congressional action which shall establish Sunday as the national holy day, the sign and test of the national religion. The direct effort upon this point was begun by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, which in the winter of 1887-88 presented to Congress by Mrs. Bateham a petition for a national Sunday law, which they said represented “a million and a quarter” petitioners. The

petitions were referred, in the Senate, to the Committee on Education and Labor, of which Senator Blair was chairman.

April 6, 1888, a hearing was held by this committee, at which Mrs. Charles St. John, and "Rev." W. F. Crafts by request of Mrs. Bateham, appeared in behalf of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. "Rev." T. A. Fernley, D.D., appeared as the representative of the Philadelphia Sabbath Association, which represents all of the churches of Philadelphia; whom Archbishop Ryan had told "that he is cordially with us in the effort to secure a proper and rigorous enforcement of Sabbath [Sunday] laws;" and bearing a petition indorsed by the National Reform Association. "Rev." G. P. Nice represented the "Maryland Sabbath Association." "Rev." Yates Hickey represented the "International Sabbath Association," which "proposes to bring the divine law to bear" upon Sunday working corporations, such as railroads, etc., and guarantee that the Lord will assure them "dividends." "Rev." George Elliott, pastor of Foundry Church, Washington, D.C., who was introduced to the committee as "the author of a book on the Sabbath," and who very appropriately cited the Sunday legislation of Constantine, and congratulated the committee on the "considerable amount of Puritan blood""an the feeling of the Puritan," which he professed to see "represented in it." Senator Blair closed the hearing with the following words: —

"If any gentlemen interested in this matter will formulate a bill, or if different gentlemen will formulate different bills, and forward them to the committee, it would be of assistance in the way of enabling us to reduce these suggestions to a practical form, so that they can be better considered. The hearing is now closed."

The result was that May 21 following, Mr. Blair introduced in the Senate the following bill: —

"50th CONGRESS, S. 2983.

1ST SESSION.

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship.

“Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, or during any part thereof, in any territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

“Section 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week; Provided, That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Postmaster-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: And provided further, that when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails, it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.

“Section 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such a way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day or rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day or religious worship, is hereby prohibited; and any person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of

any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten, or more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

“Section 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited; nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord’s day.

“Section 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed or for the transportation of persons, or of property, in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

“Section 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH DAY.”

This was at once met with strong opposition throughout the country; and it was so manifestly religious legislation, that its advocates found themselves at a disadvantage everywhere on account of the force of popular sentiment against any measures of religious legislation. The second session of the Fiftieth Congress had therefore no sooner convened than — December 13, 1888 — a hearing was obtained of the Senate Committee having the bill in

charge, strongly urging the passage of the bill, recommending, however, certain changes which would give it less of a religious appearance, while at the same time not only retaining all its religious sense and meaning, but making its provisions more strict. They asked that the title of the bill should be changed so as to read as follows: —

“A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord’s day, commonly known as Sunday, as a day of rest, and to protect its observance as a day of religious worship.”

Although Mrs. Bateham stated to the committee that the bill as it was, had “been specifically indorsed by hundreds of thousands,” not including those who “not having seen the bill, ask in general terms for a Sunday law,” she said: —

Mrs. Bateham, — “One of requests of our National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union was that the word ‘promote’ should be changed to ‘protect,’ in the title of the bill. so that it should have no appearance of what all Americans object to, any union of Church and State. That amendment was proposed and accepted by the American Sabbath Union, the organized body which has just been in session in this city.”

Senator Blair — “Do you not think that the word ‘protect’ implies power to command and compel? An army protects.”

Mrs. Bateham. — “All our laws protect us, do they not?”

Senator Blair. — “You would make this a law?”

Mrs. Bateham. — “I suggest that the bill be made a law. and that it be a law which shall protect the civil Sabbath; not promote religious worship, but protect the day as a day of rest and religious worship.”

Senator Blair. — “It seems to me that the word ‘protect’ is a stronger and more interfering word than ‘promote.’”

Senator Blair is certainly correct in saying, particularly in this connection, that the word “protect” is a stronger and more interfering term than “promote;” because it is particularly to be noticed that with the change the title would not read that the object of the bill was to protect them, not to protect the observers of the day, but the observance of the day as a day of religious worship. That is, the government must exert its authority to

protect the day from everything that would be out of harmony with its character and observance as a day of religious worship. But as the change was only proposed as a contrivance to save appearances, the stronger the bill was made, the better they would be pleased, if only its "appearance of a union of Church and State" could be taken away.

Again: although the term "Lord's day" was retained in the title, in the body of the bill asked that the word "Sunday" be inserted, instead of the term "Lord's day" or "Sabbath;" and this "in order to preserve uniformity in using the less religious term." And then they closed their request for changes with the following words: —

"We covet from Congress a law that shall make itself effective by small exceptions and large penalties."

Dear pious souls! they are very anxious to "abstain from all appearance of evil," but they have no compunctions as to the fact, if only appearances can be saved.

At this hearing, seventeen speeches were made in favor of the bill, by Mr. Crafts for the American Sabbath Union; Mrs. Bateham for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union; T. P. Stevenson for the National Reform Association; Hon. G. P. Lord, of Elgin, Ill., and Herrick Johnson, D. D., of Chicago, for the Illinois Sunday-law Association, and other prominent preachers. The Fiftieth Congress expired, however, without reaching even a report upon the bill. In the interval between the expiration of the Fiftieth Congress and the opening of the Fifty-first, the advocates of the Sunday-law found by experience that even their proposed title had a stronger religious cast than could well be defended in legislation, consequently when the Fifty-first Congress began, the bill was re-introduced by Senator Blair, with the term "first day of the week" instead of either "Lord's day" or "Sabbath" in the body of the bill, and with the following head: —

"A bill to secure to the people the privileges of rest and of religious worship, free from disturbance by others, on the first day of the week."

Now it is a fact, and the advocates of this bill, as well as all others, know it to be so, that there are no people in all this land who have not the privileges of rest and religious worship free from disturbance by anybody, on the first day of the week and all other days and nights of the week. And

that the title does not in any sense describe the real intent of the bill is evident from a glance at the provisions of the body of the bill, even with the substitution of the term “first day of the week” for the religious names of the day.

Section 1 declares that “no person within the jurisdiction of the United States shall perform or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others upon the first day of the week.”

Now secular means “pertaining to this present world, or to things not spiritual or holy; relating to things not immediately or primarily respecting the soul, but the body; worldly.” Therefore this bill proposes to prohibit all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States from performing or authorizing to be performed on Sunday any work, labor, or business pertaining to this present world or to things not spiritual or holy. It proposes to prohibit them from performing any work, labor, or business relating immediately or primarily to the body (works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted); to prohibit them from doing anything worldly, that is, pertaining to this world or to this life. Consequently, the only kind of works that can properly be done on Sunday under that bill are works that pertain to another world, works that pertain to things spiritual or holy, work respecting the soul, and the life to come.

Now we should like some of the Sunday-law advocates to tell how the Congress of the United States is going to find out, so as authoritatively to state, what work, labor, or business it is that properly pertains to another world, on Sunday or at any other time. More than this, we should like them to tell how Congress is to find out whether there is any other world than this, and especially how it is to find this out and make it to be so clearly discerned, that the recognition of it can be enforced by law upon all the people. We should like, also, some of these to tell how Congress is to discover what work it is that properly pertains to the people’s souls on Sunday; or indeed, whether the people have any souls. How is Congress to know whether there is a life to come?

And even if Congress should discover all this to its own satisfaction, then will Congress insure to all the people a happy issue in that life to come, upon condition that they observe the Sunday laws?

These are not captious questions, they are entirely pertinent. For when it is proposed that this nation by legislative acts shall commit itself to the

guardianship of the affairs of the world to come, of men's souls, and of another life; and when the people are asked to consent to it, it is strictly proper for the people to inquire, How shall the State make that thing a success?

The truth is, that the State can never of right have anything to do with the world to come, or with the question as to whether there is one to come at all. The State can never of right have anything to do with men's souls, or with the question as to whether men have any souls. The States can never have anything to do with the life to come, or with the question as to whether there is any life to come. No State will ever reach the world to come, nor will any State ever, in the least degree, be partaker of the life that is to come. The State is of this world wholly; it has to do only with the affairs of this world, and with men as they are in this world. The State has to do only with men's bodies, and to see that the lives which men lead are civil. By this it is clearly seen that the Blair Sunday bill at the very first step, proposes to lead the government of the United States into a field where it is impossible for it to exercise any proper jurisdiction.

Nor do we raise these questions because we doubt that there is another world, or that there is a life to come. We are fully persuaded that there are both another world and a life to come. But the discerning of this a matter of faith, and that on the part of each individual for himself alone. Nobody on this earth can discern or decide this for anybody else. We thoroughly believe that there are both another world and a life to come; and anybody in this world has an equal right not to believe it if he chooses so to do. We have the right to believe this without the sanction of the government; and any other man has a right not to believe it, and that without any interference by the government. We deny the right of any of the senators or representatives in Congress to decide any of these matters for anybody but himself.

Under the first proviso of Section 2, there is a clause that is of considerable moment, especially to those who observe Sunday. That is the clause which refers to "the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest." Who is to decide what is the due observance of the day? Without any such law, this remains for each person to decide according to the dictates of his own conscience. But just as soon as such a law as this should be enacted, this would devolve upon the courts. And the individual could no longer decide this according to the dictates of his own conscience, but must decide

according to the dictate of the State. Are the people who believe in keeping Sunday ready to have the government regulate their observance of that day? Are they ready to have the State assume the prerogative of deciding what is the due observance of that day as a day of worship and rest? This is what they do when they consent to the enactment of such a law as the Blair Sunday bill is. Every man who believes in keeping Sunday, when he consents to this bill, resigns his religious liberty. He resigns his right to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, and yields to the government the right to dictate how he shall observe that day as a day of worship.

The fact is, that in this thing the people who desire to keep Sunday, and who believe that it should be religiously observed, have more at stake than any other people, and it is a mystery that they cannot see it. It is a mystery that the leaders in the movement cannot see that they are deliberately robbing themselves of the dearest rights known to man. The mystery is solved, however, by the fact that the lust for power has blinded them to the consideration, not only of the rights of other people, but of their own rights. It is in behalf of the rights of those who believe in keeping Sunday and of worshipping according to the dictates of their own consciences, no less than in behalf of the rights of all other people, that we carry on this uncompromising opposition to all manner of governmental sanction or interference in the matter of Sabbath observance.

State regulation of the religious observance of the day, and the worship of the people, is the inevitable outcome of the legislation that is proposed; yet it is not intended by the managers of this movement that the State shall do this of itself. They intend that the church shall assume the supremacy, and dictate the action and wield the power of the State. Thus a union of Church and State, the rule of a despotic hierarchy, is to be the logical and certain outcome of such legislation. It cannot be escaped when once the legislation is begun.

Upon Section 3 we simply remark that, by a penalty of a thousand dollars upon the exercise of honest occupations, and such a premium upon idleness, the government ought to be able soon to create enough evil to ruin itself, which it surely will if the thing should be carried into effect in all the States.

As to Section 4: when everything shall have been forbidden the soldiers, sailors, marines, and cadets, as is here proposed, “except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship,” suppose that they do not want to assemble for the observance of religious worship, will they then be assembled for that purpose? And how are they to know what is the “due” observance of religious worship in the meaning of the law, except they shall be instructed? Having gone so far in religion-political chicanery after the manner of Constantine, the government might take the next and requisite step also, according to the example set by him, and teach them the “due” observance of religious worship, as he did, by having them assemble and repeat at a given signal a prayer, also enacted by Congress and adapted to the governmental authority of the United States.

Section 5 is identical, word for word, with the one in the original bill. Whenever anybody receives any pay at any time for work done on Sunday, the first man that will sue for the money shall have it. It makes no difference who he is or where he comes from, if he finds out that anybody has received money for work done on Sunday, all he has to do is to enter suit, and the law says he shall have it.

This section aptly befits the cause to which this bill is committed. The only effect the bill as a whole can have upon those who are not really religious, is to compel them to be idle, and this section simply proposes to put a further premium upon idleness by compelling the man who chooses to work rather than to be idle, to pay the idler for the exercise of his own honest industry. The lazy loafer who will never do anything if he can help it, can spend his time watching the industrious citizen, and if he can detect him in committing the heinous crime of performing any honest work on Sunday, for which he shall receive any pay, the loafer can recover from the industrious man a sufficient amount to support him in his idleness several days. This is a fine thing indeed, an excellent provision of law, for the loafers.

Government is supposed to be founded in justice. Courts are supposed to be courts of justice. But we should like very much indeed for somebody to show upon what principle of justice this section is founded, and by what principle of justice any court could be guided in enforcing the provisions of it. The principle of this section is identical with that by which Tiberius and Domitian encouraged the informers about them.

In Section 6 of the revised bill, there is an important change from the original bill. In the original bill the provisions of the act were to be so construed as to “secure to all the people the religious observance of the Sabbath day.” But as revised, they are to be so construed as neither “to prohibit nor to sanction labor on Sunday by individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship.” Thus the government proposes to allow labor on Sunday by those who observe another day, yet it carefully refrains from adding to the permission any such sanction as would imply that it is right such people to work on Sunday.

Yet nobody can be partaker of even this permission, unless he conscientiously believes in, and observes another day than Sunday as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship. The conscientious belief in and observance of a day, therefore as a day of religious worship, is required by the bill on the part of those who do not want to keep Sunday; and as the other sections of the bill require that Sunday shall be duly observed as a day of religious worship, that nothing shall be done that day except that which pertains to another world, to that which is sacred and holy, to the souls of men, and to the life to come, it is manifest that the sole object of the Blair Sunday-rest bill is the enforcement of THE RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF A DAY.

Consideration of the whole bill makes it plain that the modification of the title is utterly disingenuous. The object of the bill is not to secure to the people of privilege of rest and worship upon the first day of the week. It is to compel them to rest and to religiously worship on the first day of the week, or else on some other day, if they do not choose to do it on Sunday. The clause in the title relating to “disturbance by others,” is as disingenuous as is the other part.

Every State in this Union already does by statute prohibit at all times disturbances of religious worship or religious meetings, or peaceable assemblies of any sort. These are strictly civil statutes, prohibiting incivility. The Sunday-law workers complain of the disturbance of their worship on Sunday. If they are sincere in this, why do they not enforce the laws already on the statute books prohibiting disturbance of worship, California? for instance, prohibits disturbance of worship, under penalty of five hundred dollars fine and six months in jail. But instead of having such legitimate laws enforced, they demand laws to “prohibit the disturbance” of

their worship on Sunday, by compelling everybody to keep Sunday. That is, they would have the State prohibit incivility by compelling everybody to be religious. We say always, If worship is disturbed on Sunday or at any other time, let the State punish the person or persons who create the disturbance. Let the State punish them by such strictly legitimate statutes as the States already have on this subject. But let the State never attempt to prohibit disturbance of worship by trying to compel men to worship; not attempt to prohibit incivility by enforcing religious observances.

But that Sunday work does not really disturb the rest or the worship of those who keep Sunday, is proved by the fact that the people who make this the ground of their demand for Sunday laws, do not recognize for an instant that work on Saturday disturbs the rest or the worship of the people who keep Saturday. If the work of all the people on Saturday does not disturb the rest or the worship of those who keep Saturday, how is it possible for the work of the very few who work on Sunday to disturb the rest or the worship of those who keep Sunday?

But look at this from the standpoint of actual experience. There are, for instance, Seventh-day Adventists in every State and Territory of this nation, in Canada, nearly every country of Europe, the Sandwich Islands, Australia, South America, China, Japan, India, South Africa, and other places. They all rest every Saturday; they all keep it as the Sabbath unto the Lord. But no person has ever yet heard of a Seventh-day Adventist who ever complained that his rest on the Sabbath was disturbed by other men's work. More than this: the Seventh-day Adventists have organized churches in the great majority of the States and Territories of this Union, and in these foreign countries. These churches are found in country places, in villages, in towns, and in cities. They meet for worship every Saturday; and although, as everybody knows, Saturday is the busiest day of the week, in the midst of such busy cities as Brooklyn, Chicago, Denver, San Francisco, Minneapolis, Kansas City, and London, England, these churches of Seventh-day Adventists assemble regularly for worship; and no person has ever yet heard of any Seventh-day Adventist's making a complaint that their worship was disturbed by the work, the business, or the traffic that is carried on by other people on that day. The fact is, their worship is not disturbed by these things.

Now, if all the labor, the business, and the traffic that is done on Saturday, the day which is acknowledged by all to be the busiest day of the week, —

if all this, in such cities as we have named, does not disturb their rest or their worship, how is it that the rest or the worship of those who keep Sunday is disturbed on Sunday, when there is not one one-thousandth part as much labor, or business, or traffic done on that day as is done on Saturday?

This argument rests on the living experience of thousands of people every seventh day, and conclusively shows that the plea for Sunday laws to prevent disturbance of worship, is a fraud. These evidences prove also that the modification of the title of the bill, while the body of the bill remains essentially the same, is only to save appearances, and to disarm suspicion of religious legislation.

Nor is this the only effort that is made to disarm suspicion and check opposition. In some places the organizations that are formed auxiliary to the American Sabbath Union, take the name of "Civil Sunday" associations. And in conventions where they cannot carry resolutions indorsing the Sabbath as a religious institution, they will modify them so as to carry them in favor of Sunday as a civil institution. By such modifications and compromises, they hope at last to succeed. But whatever turn they may take, now or in the future, will not relieve them from the just charge of desiring the enactment of a national law for the enforcement of the religious observance of a day; because their real intention has been clearly revealed in the first steps taken; and whatever modifications they may afterward adopt, will not in the least change the original intention but only the appearance, and that simply for policy's sake.

At the opening of the Fifty-first Congress, they had a Sunday bill introduced in the House of Representatives — not a national bill, however, but for the District of Columbia. Yet, though it was only for the District of Columbia, as it necessarily had to be enacted by Congress, the Principle involved was the same as in a national bill. Their purpose, therefore, was to use this as a stepping stone to a national act by having Congress commit itself to the sacredness of Sunday and the propriety of the legislation. This is manifest from their own statements as well as from all the proceedings in the case. The bill was introduced January 6, 1890, by the Hon. W.C.P. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, and is as follows:

"A BILL TO PREVENT PERSONS FROM BEING FORCED TO LABOR ON SUNDAY.

“Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representative of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation, or employee of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia, to perform any secular labor or business, or to cause the same to be performed by any person in their employment on Sunday, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or services performed or rendered in violation of this act.

“Any person or corporation, or employee of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia, who shall violate the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by fine of not more than one hundred dollars for every offense: Provided, however, That the provisions of this act shall not be constructed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.”

It is seen that this bears the same marks as the revised Blair bill The title says one thing and the body of the bill another The title proposes to prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday, while the body of the bill prohibits all persons from working even voluntarily on Sunday. Besides this, even though it were true that there are persons in the District of Columbia who are being forced to labor on Sunday or at any other time, there is an ample remedy already supplied. Article XIII of Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, declares that “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction,” Now the District of Columbia is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United States; therefore if there is any forced labor or involuntary service anywhere in the District of Columbia, on Sunday or any other day all that is necessary for any to do who are so oppressed is to present their plea, under this article, to the United States Court and the whole power of the United States government will be exerted, if necessary, to release them from their bondage.

No Sunday law, therefore, is needed to prevent persons from being forced to labor on Sunday or at any other time, either in the District of Columbia or anywhere else in the United States, Nor is this the real intent of this bill.

The body of the bill in forbidding any “secular labor or business and in requiring the “conscientious belief in and observance of another day by those who do not keep Sunday does distinctly pledge the legislation to the religious character of the day and to the jurisdiction of the conscientious beliefs and observances of the people. it is evident, therefore that with this bill as with the revised Blair bill, the title that it bears is intentionally misleading and is only for the sake of appearances and policy.

The exemption clause inserted in this bill as also in Section 6 of the revised Blair bill is of the same character — its sole purpose is to ward off the opposition of the observers of the seventh day, until the government shall have been committed to the legislation. This we know, and this they know; and with this item there is a bit of history that is worth relating, not only for the sake of the facts, but of the principles involved.

At the hearing before the Senate Committee on the Sunday bill, Mrs. Bateham mentioned “the Seventh-day Baptists” as “a class not large in numbers,” and requested that “the conscientious scruples of this class be respected” by “the following addition to the bill:”

“Section 7 Any person that has habitually and conscientiously refrained from all labor on Saturday believing that to be the Sabbath, shall; on proof thereof be exempt from the penalties of this law provided he has not on Sunday interfered with e rights of others to a day for rest and worship.”

A. H. Lewis, D. D., who was present as the representative of the Seventh-day Baptists, also asked that a section be added exempting observers of the seventh day. But there was present a representative of the Seventh-day Adventists who objected to the whole matter, exemption and all. From the report of the hearing, we copy the following upon the point:

The Chairman (Senator Blair). — “You object to it?”

Mr. Jones. — “We object to the whole principle of the proposed legislation. We go to the root of the matter and deny the right of Congress to enact it.”

The Chairman. — “Your say that the proposed exemption does not make it any better?”

Mr. Jones. — “Not a bit. because if the legislation be admitted, then we admit that it is the right of a majority to say that such and such a day shall be the Sabbath or the Lord’s day, and that it shall be kept. The majorities change in civil government. The majority may change within a few years, and then the people may say that the day we believe shall be kept must be observed, or they may say that this day shall not be kept. If we admit the propriety of the legislation, we also admit the propriety of legislation to the effect that a certain day shall not be kept, and it makes every man’s observance of Sunday or otherwise simply the foot-ball of majorities.”

The Chairman. — “Do you not think there is a distinction between the majority in a monarchical government and a republican government? In a monarchical government the majority is simply one man who has power.”

Mr. Jones. — “But in a republic, when you throw this legislation into civil affairs it makes a great deal of difference. There is another principle involved. If we admit the exemption clause, it will not help the thing. It will be exceedingly short. Suppose an exemption clause were given There are people who will profess to be Seventh-day Adventists for express purpose of getting chances to open saloons or houses of business on Sunday. Therefore in outright self-defense, majority will have to repeal the exemption clause.”

The Chairman. — Call Mrs. Bateham’s attention to that.”

Mr. Jones. — “Let me repeat it. If you give an exemption clause, — it has been tried, — there are reprehensible men, saloon keepers, who know they will get more traffic on Sunday than they can on Saturday, and they will profess to be Seventh-day Adventists; they will profess to be Sabbath-keepers. You cannot “go behind the returns” — you cannot look into the heart, you cannot investigate the intention — to see whether they are genuine in their profession or not. They will profess to be Sabbath keepers, and then they will open their saloons on Sunday. Then in outright self-defense, to make your position effective, you will have to repeal that exemption clause. It will last but a little while.”

The Chairman, — “I agree with you there.” ^{F876}

Mr. Jones. — “For that reason these people cannot afford to offer an exemption clause, and for e reason that it puts the majority in the power of our conscience, we deny the right to do anything of the kind. I ask the organizations represented here to think of that.”

The Chairman. — “I should like to call everbody’s attention to the point. If you need any legislation of this kind, you had better ask for legislation to carry out your purposes, and be careful that in the effort to get the assistance of the parties against you, you do not throw away the pith and substance of all for which you ask.”

To these same people, with others, Mrs. Bateham had already, in 1887, Addressed a printed “Letter to Seventh day Believers.” proposing, in substance, that if they would help in securing a Sunday law, they should be exempt from its penalties. They replied “We will not help you to put upon others what we would not have put upon ourselves.

During the year 1889, Mr. Crafts made a tour of the whole country from the Atlantic to the Pacific in the interests of Sunday legislation working up “representative indorsements “ of the following petition:

“To the United States senate [Duplicate to the House]

“The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States twenty one years of age or more hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the nation’s mail and military service and in interstate commerce and in the District of Columbia and the Territories all Sunday traffic and work except works of religion and works of real necessity and mercy and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.

Everywhere that Mr. Crafts went, he denounced the Seventh day Adventists as the chief opponents of the Sunday-law movement. Not only did he do this from the platform, but through the press. For instance, in *Our Day*. the Boston magazine edited by Joseph Cook. for July, 1889, he reported as follows: —

“Every where are seen the footprints of the little but lively denomination of Seventh day Adventists, who are outdoing not only the Seventh day Baptists, but even Hebrews infidels, and

liquor dealers in battling against Sunday law as if it were the worst of vices. They put beautiful tract holders into depots filled with their literature, which they also distribute from door to door with a generosity and industry that shame by contrast the meager gifts and efforts of the friends of the American Sabbath.”

Yet these very ones, the very ones who are doing the most against Sunday laws and Sunday observance, are the ones who are to be exempt from the provisions and penalties of the law-enforcing. Sunday observance ! That is the government is asked to set itself by exempting from the requirements of its laws the ones who are most opposed to the laws! For if it should be done in this case, why not in every case? and then what are laws worth and what becomes of government? If a law be just, there can be no just exemption. If the law is right, exemption is wrong. And if exemption is right, then the law is wrong. Therefore their offer and advocacy of exemption, is an open confession that the law is unjust, and that under the law without the exemption, the people would be denied the equal protection of the laws. Yet though this be true, the exemption is neither offered nor advocated upon principle, but solely for policy’s sake. Of this there is the clearest proof.

The Breckinridge bill was referred to the House Committee on District of Columbia. February 18, 1890, this committee held a hearing upon the bill. At that hearing , a representative of the Seventh day Adventists spoke upon this particular feature of the bill; and the argument sets forth this matter so plainly that it is given here in full.

Mr. Jones — ‘MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE: I shall devote most of my remarks to the subject which was made so much of by the gentleman who spoke last on the other side [Mr. Crafts]; namely, the Seventh day Adventists and their opposition to this legislation.... Congress can make no law upon the subject of religion without interfering with the free exercise thereof. There fore the Seventh-day Adventists, while observing Saturday, would most strenuously oppose any legislation proposing to enforce the observance of that day. That would be an interference with the free exercise of our right to keep that day as the Sabbath. For we already have that right’ —

The Chairman. — “Would this law take away your right to observe the Sabbath? “

Mr. Jones. — “Yes sir I was about to prove that it does interfere with the free exercise of our right to observe it; and having done that, I will prove that this bill does dis (contemplate the taking away of the right to observe it.

“First as to its interference with the free exercise of our right to observe the Sabbath. I take it that no one here will deny that now, at least, we, as citizens of the United States, have the constitutional right to observe Saturday as the Sabbath, or not to observe it, as we please. This right we already have as citizens of the United States. As we already have it by the constitution, their proposal to give it to us is only a concealed attempt to deprive us of it altogether. for If we consent to their right or their power to grant it, the power t grant carries with it the power to withhold. In consenting to the one, we consent to the other. And as the granting of it is, as I shall prove, for a purpose, and for a price, the withdrawing of it will surely follow just as soon as the purpose of it is accomplished, and especially if the price of it is not fully and promptly paid.

“Now this bill positively requires that whosoever does not observe Sunday shall “conscientiously believe in and observe’ another day of the week. We do not keep Sunday. The bill does, therefore, distinctly require that we shall conscientiously believe in and observe another day. We maintain that we have the constitutional right to rest on Saturday, or any other day, whether we do it conscientiously or not, or whether we conscientiously believe in it or not. Haven’t we? Congress has no constitutional power or right to require anybody to ‘conscientiously believe in anything or to conscientiously observe’ anything.

“But when it is required, as is proposed in this bill, who is to decide whether we conscientiously believe in it or not? Who is to decide whether the observance is conscientious or not? That has already been declared in those State Sunday laws and decisions which have been referred to here to-day as examples for you to follow. It is that the burden of proof rests upon him who makes the claim of conscience, and the proof must be such as will satisfy the court. Thus this bill does propose to subject to the control of courts and juries our conscientious convictions, our conscientious beliefs, and

our conscientious observances. Under this law, therefore, we would no longer be free to keep the Sabbath according to the dictates of our own consciences, but could keep it only according to the dictates of the courts. Gentlemen, it is not enough to say that would be an interference with the free exercise of our right to keep the Sabbath; it would be an absolute subversion of our right so to do.

“Nor is it for ourselves only that we plead. We are not the only ones who will be affected by this law. It is not our rights of conscience only that will be subverted, but the rights of conscience of everybody, of those who keep Sunday as well as those who keep Saturday, of those who are in favor of the law as well as those of us who oppose the law. When the law requires that those who do not observe Sunday shall conscientiously believe in and observe another day, by that it is conclusively shown that it is the conscientious belief in, and observance of, Sunday itself that is required and enforced by this law. That is, the law requires that everybody shall conscientiously believe in and observe some day. But every man has the constitutional right to conscientiously believe in and observe a day or not as he pleases. He has just as much right not to do it as he has to do it. And the legislature invades the freedom of religious worship when it assumes the power to compel a man conscientiously or religiously to do that which he has the right to omit if he pleases. The principle is the same whether the act compels us to do that which we wish to do, or whether it compels us to do that which we do not wish to do. The compulsory power does not exist in either case. In either case the State control of the rights of conscience; and the freedom of every man to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience is gone, and thenceforth all are required to worship according to the dictates of the State.

“Therefore in opposing this bill, and all similar measures, we are advocating the rights of conscience of all the people. We are not only pleading for our own right to keep the Sabbath according to the dictates of our own consciences, but we are also pleading for their right to keep Sunday according to the dictates of their own consciences. We are not only pleading that we, but that they also, in conscientious beliefs and observances, may be free from the interference and dictation of the State. And in so pleading we are

only asserting doctrine of the national Constitution. In the history of the formation of the Constitution, Mr. Bancroft says that the American constitution 'withheld from the Federal government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul.' Let the American Constitution be respected.

"Now to the point that this bill through its promoters, does distinctly contemplate the taking away of the right to observe the Sabbath. I read from the bill the exemption that is proposed; —

This act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.

"Now why is that clause put in the bill? The intention of the law maker is the law. If, therefore, we can find out why this was inserted, we can know what the object of it is. During the past year Mr. Crafts has advertised all over this country from Boston to San Francisco, and back again, and has repeated it to this committee this morning, that the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh day Baptists are the strongest opponents of Sunday laws that there are in this country, and that they are doing more than all others combined to destroy respect for Sunday observance. All this; and yet these are the very persons whom he proposes to exempt from the provisions of the law, which is expressly to secure the observance of Sunday!

"Why, then does he propose to exempt these? Is it out of respect for them, or a desire to help them in their good work? — Not much. It is hoped by this to check their opposition until Congress is committed to the legislation.

"How do we know this? — We know it by their own words. The lady who spoke here this morning as the representative of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Mrs. Catlin, said in this city; We have given them an exemption clause, and that, we think, will take the wind out of their sails!' Well, if our sails were dependent upon legislative enactments, and must needs be trimmed to political breezes, such a squall as this might take the wind out of them. But so long as they are dependent alone upon the power of

God, wafted by the gentle influences of grace of Jesus Christ, such squalls become only prospering gales to speed us on our way.

“By this, gentlemen, you see just what is the object of that proposed exemption — that it is only to check our opposition until they secure the enactment of the law, and that they may do this the easier. Then when Congress shall have been committed to the legislation, it can repeal the exemption upon demand, and then the advocates of the Sunday law will have exactly what they want. I am not talking at random here. I have the proofs of what I am saying. They expect a return for this exemption. It is not extended as a guaranteed right, but as a favor that we can have if we will only pay them their own stated price for it. As a proof of this, I read again from Mr. Crafts’s book [‘The Sabbath For Man’], page 262: —

“‘The tendency of legislatures and executive officers towards those who claim to keep a Saturday Sabbath, is to over leniency rather than to over strictness.

“And in the convention held in this city only about three weeks ago, January 30, Mr. Crafts said that this exemption is ‘generous to a fault,’ and that ‘if there is any fault in the bill, it is its being too generous’ to the Seventh day Adventists and the Seventh day Baptists. But I read on: —

‘For instance, the laws of Rhode Island allow the Seventh day Baptists, by special exceptions, to carry on public industries on the first day of the week in Hopkinton and Westerly, in each of which places they form about one fourth of the population. This local option method of Sabbath legislation after the fashion of Rhode Island or Louisiana, if generally adopted, would make not only each Stat, but the nation also, a town heap, some places having two half Sabbaths as at Westerly, some having no Sabbath at all, as at new Orleans, to the great confusion and injury of interstate commerce and even of local industry. Infinitely less harm is done by the usual policy, the only constitutional or sensible one, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday) suffer the loss of one day’s was rather than have other

ninety nine suffer by the wreaking of their Sabbath by public business.’

“Why, then, do they offer this ‘special exception’? Why do they voluntarily do that which they themselves pronounce neither constitutional nor sensible? — It is for a purpose.

“Again I read, and here is the point to which I wish especially to call the attention of the committee. It shows what they intend we shall pay for the exemption which they so ‘over generously’ offer.

“Instead of reciprocating the generosity shown toward them buy the makers of Sabbath laws these seventh day Christians expend very large part of their energy in antagonizing such laws, seeking by the free distribution of tracts and papers, to secure their repeal or neglect.”

“Exactly! That is the price which we are expected to pay for this ‘generous’ exemption. We are to stop the distribution of tracts and papers which antagonize Sunday laws. We are to stop spending our energy in opposition to their efforts to promote Sunday observance. We are to stop telling the people that the Bible says “the seventh-day is t he Sabbath,’ and that Sunday is not the Sabbath.

“But have we not the right to teach the people that ‘the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,’ even as the Bible says, and that only the keeping of that day is the keeping of the Sabbath according to the commandment? Have we not the right to do this Have we the not the right to tell the people there is no scriptural authority for keeping Sunday, the first day of the week? Why, some of these gentlemen themselves say that. Mr. Elliott here [Rev. George] confesses ‘the complete silence of the New Testament, so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath , or definite rules for its observance are concerned.’ Many others speak to the same effect. Have we not as much right to tell this to the people as they have? They do not agree among themselves upon the obligations of Sabbath keeping, nor upon the basis of Sunday laws. In every one of their conventions one speaks one way and another in another and contradictory way. Have we not as much right to disagree with them as they have to disagree with one another? Why is it, then,

that they want t stop our speaking these things, — unless it is that we tell the truth?

“More than this: have we not the constitutional right freely to speak all this, and also freely to distribute tracts and papers in opposition to Sunday laws and Sunday sacredness? Does not the Constitution declare that ‘the freedom of speech, or of the press,’ shall not be abridged? then when these men propose that we shall render much a return for that exemption, they do propose an invasion of the constitutional guarantee of the freedom of speech and of the press. Why, gentlemen, this question of Sunday laws is a good deal larger question than half the people ever dreamed of.

“Now to show you that I am not drawing this point too fine, I wish to read another extract from a doctor of divinity in California. With reference to this specific question, he said: —

“‘Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday. and call it the Sabbath if they choose; but there let their privileges end.’

“They do, indeed seem by this to be generous enough to allow those of us who are already keeping Sabbath to continue to do so while we live; but there our privileges are to end. We are not to be allowed to speak or distribute papers or tracts to teach anybody else to keep it. Why, gentlemen of the committee, do you not see that they propose by this law t deprive us of all our rights both of conscience and of the Constitution? Therefore we come to you to plead for protection. We do not ask you to protect us by legislation. We do not ask you to legislate in favor of Saturday — not even to the extent of an exemption clause. We ask you to protect us by refusing to give to these men their coveted power to invade our rights. We appeal to you for protection in our constitutional rights as well as our rights of conscience.

“‘ There let their privileges end.’ If. Even this allowance is only conditional. And the condition is the same precisely as that laid by Mr. Crafts; namely, that we shall stop every phase of opposition to Sunday observance. Here it is in his own words, not spoken in the

heat and hurry of debate, but deliberately written and printed in an editorial in Western Christian Union, March 22, 1889: —

“‘ Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them and then going off quietly and attending to their own business as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances. that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors. None of these bills are aimed at them; but if they fail to appreciate the fact, they may call down upon them selves such a measure of public disfavor as that legislation embarrassing to them may result.’

“ There, gentlemen, you have the story of that proposed exemption. 1. It is inserted to take the wind out of our sails, and stop our opposition to their efforts and to Sunday observance in general. 2. If we do not ‘appreciate’ the benefaction, and ‘reciprocate the generosity’ by stopping all opposition to their work and to Sunday observance, then legislation ‘embarrassing’ to us may be expected to result.

“Gentlemen, do you wonder that we do not appreciate such benevolence, or reciprocate such generosity? Can you blame American Citizens for saying in reply to all that, that however ‘embarrassing’ the result may be, we do not appreciate such benevolence, nor do we intend to reciprocate such generosity as that, in such way as is there proposed?

“There is one more word on this point that I desire to read. It sums up the whole matter is such a way as to be a fitting climax to t his division of my remarks. This is from “Rev.’ M.A. Gault, a district secretary of the American Sabbath Union. Mr. Crafts, who is the American Sabbath Union, personally appointed him secretary of Omaha District. Mr. Gault wrote this to Elder J. S. Washburn, of Hawleyville, Iowa, and Mr. Washburn sent it to me. I read: —

“‘ I see most of your literature in my travels [that is the literature that Mr. Crafts says we do not stop distributing, and which we are not going to stop distributing], and I am convinced that your folks will die hard. But we are helping Brother Crafts all the time to set the stakes, and get the ropes ready to scoop you all in You will kick hard, of course. but we will make sure work.

“Yes, this bill is one of the ‘stakes,’ and the exemption clause is one of the ‘ropes’ by means of which they propose to rope us in. And Mr. Gault is one of the clerical gentlemen who demand that the government shall ‘set up the moral law and recognize God’s authority behind it, and then lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it.’

“This is the intent of those who are working for this bill. You heard Mr. Crafts say a few minutes ago that the Senate Sunday bill introduced by Senator Blair ‘includes this; ‘ and the Senate bill includes everybody within the jurisdiction of Congress. They trump up this District bill with the hope of getting Congress committed to the legislation with less difficulty than by the national bill, because the attention of the people is not so much turned to it. Then having by the District bill got Congress committed to such legislation, they intend to rally every influence to secure the passage of the national bill; and then they propose to go on in their ‘roping in career until they shall have turned this nation into a government of God, with themselves as the repositories of his will.’

Mr. Illeard. — “Is there any reference to that letter in that book from which you have been reading?”

Mr. Jones. — “No, sir. I pasted it on the margin of this book, merely for convenience of reference along with the ‘generous’ proposition of his ‘Brother Crafts.’

“All this shows that the intent of the makers and promoters of this bill is to subvert the constitutional rights of the people. The intent of the law-maker is the law. As, therefore, by their own words, the intent of this exemption clause is to stop all effort to teach o to persuade people to keep the Sabbath instead of Sunday; as the intent of the body of the bill is to compel all to keep Sunday who do not keep the Sabbath; and as the intent of both together is to ‘scoop all in ‘ make sure work,’ it follows inevitably, and my proposition is demonstrated, that the promoters of this legislation do distinctly contemplate the taking away of the right to observe the Sabbath in this nation, and to allow the keeping of Sunday only.”

And this is but the preliminary step to the crushing out of all freedom of religious thought and action. For, by what right, or upon what authority, do they presume to do this? We have seen that by their own plain statements they confess that there is no command of God for Sunday observance. Yet they propose to compel all in the nation to keep Sunday as an obligation to God. By what right, then, does this great combination demand State and national laws compelling people to observe, as an obligation to God, that for which there is no command of God?

Where there is no command of God, there is no obligation towards God. In this demand, therefore, they do in fact put themselves in the place of God, and require that their will shall be accepted as the will of God. They require that their views, without any command from the Lord, shall be enforced upon all men; and that all men shall be required to yield obedience thereto as to an obligation enjoined by the Lord.

Now it is the inalienable right of every man to dissent from any and every church doctrine, and to disregard every church ordinance, institution, or rite. All but papists will admit this. Therefore, whenever the State undertakes to enforce the observance of any church ordinance or institution, and thus makes itself the champion of the Church it simply undertakes to rob men of their inalienable right to think and choose for themselves in matters of religion and church order. Men are therefore, and thereby, compelled either to submit to be robbed of their inalienable right of freedom of thought in religious things, or else to disregard the authority of the State. And the man of sound principle and honest conviction will never hesitate as to which of the two things he will do.

When the State undertakes to enforce the observance of church ordinances or institutions, and thus makes itself the champion and partisan of church, then the inalienable right of men to dissent from church doctrines and to disregard church ordinances or institutions, is extended to the authority of the STATE in so far as it is thus exercised. And that which is true of church doctrines, ordinances, and institutions, is equally true of religious doctrines and exercises of all kinds.

Now Sunday is, and is acknowledged even by themselves to be, but a church institution only. and when the State enforces Sunday observance, it does compel submission to church authority, and conformity to church discipline; and does thereby invade the inalienable right of dissent from

church authority and discipline. if the State can rightfully do this in this one thing, it can do so in all; and therefore in doing this it does in effect destroy all freedom of religious thought and action.

Yet strictly speaking, it is not their own will nor their own views which they propose to have enforced. Protestants did not create the Sunday institution; they did not originate Sunday observance. Protestantism inherited both the Sunday institution and Sunday observance. The Catholic Church originated Sunday observance. The papacy substituted the Sunday institution for the Sabbath of the Lord, enforced its acceptance and observance upon all, and prohibited under a curse the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord She did it, and justified herself in it, precisely as these now do. That is, by tradition and “presumptions” and “spontaneous growths from the hearts of believers,” and by what Christ “probably” taught, or intended to teach, or would have taught if the matter had only been brought to his attention.

There is authority for Sunday observance. It is the authority of the Catholic Church. ^{F887} Therefore, whoever observes Sunday does recognize the authority of the papacy, and does do homage to the Catholic Church. The enactment of Sunday laws does recognize the authority of the Catholic Church; the enforcement of Sunday observance does compel homage and obedience to the papacy. Just what there is in this movement, therefore, is the literal fulfillment of that prophecy in ~~<6631>~~ Revelation 13:11-17. It is the making of the image of the papal beast, and the enforcement of THE WORSHIP OF THE BEAST AND HIS IMAGE.

CHAPTER 28.

CONCLUSION.

THE principles exemplified in the Constitution of the United States as respects religion, were first announced by Jesus Christ, and were preached to the world by his apostles and the early Christians. For two hundred and fifty years they were opposed by the Roman empire. But at last that empire was compelled to confess the justice of the principles, and so to acknowledge the victory of Christianity.

Then ambitious bishops and political ecclesiastics took advantage of a political crisis to secure control of the civil power, and in the name of Christianity to pervert the victory which Christianity had so nobly won. This created the papacy, a religious despotism, and speedily wrought the ruin of the Roman empire, and proved a curse to the ages that followed.

Then came Protestantism, casting off the yoke of the papacy, and re-stating the principles of Christianity respecting religion and the State. Yet, from Martin Luther to Roger Williams, in every place and in every form, wherever it was possible, professed Protestantism, following the example of the papacy, seized upon the civil power, and used it to restrict and repress the freedom of the mind, and to persecute those who chose to think differently from the religious majority.

Thus upon a test of ages, by paganism, Catholicism, and false Protestantism, there was demonstrated to the world that any connection between religion and the State is debasing to both; that if the religious power rises superior to the civil power, it is ruinous to the State; and that religious and civil rights are both secure, and religion and liberty go forward together only when religion and the State are separate. And in all this there was demonstrated by every proof, the perfect wisdom and absolute justice of the divine principle enunciated by Jesus Christ, that religion and the State must be entirely separate — that to Caesar there is to be rendered only that which is Caesar's, while men must be left free to render to God that which is God's, according to the dictates of the individual conscience.

In the formation of the government and in the Constitution of the United States, the triumph of the principles of Christianity respecting earthly government, was complete. In their completeness, and by the directing providence of God, these divine principles were thus set forth for an example to all nations. Yet instead of these principles' having been maintained in their integrity as established by the fathers of the New Republic, there has been allowed or effected by those who came after, a steady encroachment, little by little, of religion upon the State. Each successive encroachment has been made, by the precedent, only a stepping stone to further encroachment, until now the demand is openly, persistently, and even powerfully made, that the government shall formally and officially abandon this fundamental and characteristic principle, and commit itself to the principle of religious legislation — legislation in behalf of the name and institutions of a professed Christianity — which is only to commit itself to the principles of the papacy.

If in the discussions preliminary to the establishment of this principle as part of the supreme law of this nation, Madison could say that, "If with the salutary effects of this system under our own eyes, we begin to contract the bounds of religious freedom, we know no name which will too severely reproach our folly," how much more emphatically can the same thing be said upon the experience of more than a hundred years! If in the face of all history on one hand, and this more than a hundred years of experience on the other, such a thing should be done, we may not only ask, What name would too severely reproach our folly? but, What punishment would be too severe for our wickedness? If such a thing should be done, what wonder should there be if this national apostasy should be the signal of national ruin?

And has not the movement to accomplish this purpose attained sufficient prominence to make the prospect of its success worthy the serious consideration of every soul who has any love for the genuine principles of the religion of Jesus Christ, or any regard for the fundamental principles of the government of the United States, or any respect for the rights of mankind? If that which has already been accomplished in this direction is not sufficient to arouse every such person to the most active and earnest diligence in defense of the divine heritage bestowed upon the world by Jesus Christ and bequeathed to us by our Revolutionary fathers, what more can be required to do it?

We have seen the rise, the rapid growth, and the aim, both immediate and ultimate, of the strongest religious combination that could possibly be formed in the United States. And it is evident that the combination will leave no necessary means unemployed to accomplish its purpose. And, indeed, having already the sanction of such an array of religious precedents on the part of the government, and the favor, from powerful sources, of so many distinct pieces of religious legislation, what is to hinder the complete success of the movement in its one chief aim?

It is evident that even now all that remains is to bring the question to an issue where votes shall decide. If it shall be brought to a vote in Congress first, the probabilities are altogether in favor of its being carried. During the Fifty-first Congress, the New York Independent attempted a sort of census of the Sunday standing of members. There was not a majority of the members who replied, but the great majority of those who did reply expressed themselves in favor of the governmental recognition of Sunday sacredness by closing the coming World's Fair on Sunday.

But even though a vote should fail in a Congress already elected, and the question should be made the issue in a Congressional election, still the probabilities are that the religious combination could secure enough members to carry their scheme in some way to a successful issue. And if the combination can succeed in causing the government to bend to their will in a single point, everything else that they contemplate will follow. If the first step be taken, the last step is then as certainly taken; for the last step is in the first.

Another important consideration that strengthens the probability of the success of the movement, and reveals a most striking and far-reaching result, is the fact that the bond of union, the question of Sunday observance, is not only a national but an international question.

In Europe among the church managers the Sunday question is being made prominent in public affairs, even as it is in the United States. The organized movement began in September, 1876, when there was held at Geneva, Switzerland, the "International Sunday Congress." It consisted of the representative friends of Sunday, from different lands, who met "to report and confer as to the condition of things in their several localities, and to unite in one organization for the promotion of the observance of the Lord's day." At this congress, there were represented "the Swiss Cantons,

Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Italy, Roumania, Scotland, England, and the United States,” “The German emperor delegated his ambassador to Switzerland — Count Roder — to sit as his representative. The king of Wurtemberg and the duke of Baden were also represented. The Vicomte de la Panous, inspector-general of the Orleans Railway; M. L. Charlier, chairman of the Roumanian railways; Messrs. Andre and Arnaud of the Paris and Lyons Railway, represented their several companies. Various societies for home missions sent their directors or prominent members. Members of chambers of commerce, lawyers, bankers, editors, numerous physicians, commercial men, the consuls at Geneva, of Great Britain, the United States, Spain, Brazil, Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands, sat as members of the congress, to the number of four hundred. Many other prominent men of Europe, several of the leading railway companies, and various associations, sent communications expressing interest in the movement, among which was a letter of warm sympathy from the Archbishop of Canterbury.”

A permanent International Federation was organized. A committee was appointed to formulate a basis and plan of action for the Federation. The first paragraph of the “Declaration of Principles” reads as follows: —

“The Federation founded by the congress held at Geneva, at its meeting of the twenty-ninth of September, 1876, proposes, by the help of God, to labor to restore for the good of all, a better observance of the day of rest, known under the old covenant by the name of the Sabbath, and transferred by the primitive church under the name of the Lord’s day, to the first day of the week in remembrance of the resurrection of Christ.”

The Federation called for laws to make Sunday a public holiday, and for its protection as a day of rest; laws for the protection of public worship; laws that will insure a good example of the observance of the day in government offices and in public works; and, “finally, that it shall be provided by law that every concession of special privileges to individuals or companies, shall be accompanied by adequate guarantees in favor of Sunday rest for those employed in their respective enterprises.”

In active harmony with the International Federation are the Catholics of Europe, though they carry on their own part of the work in an organization of their own. This organization is patterned

after that of the Jesuits for the “Propagation of the Faith.” The object as stated is, “To stop the scandal of the profanation of Sunday and the four feasts of obligation.” The duties of the members of the Association are as follows: —

“Not to buy on Sundays and feast days, or send others to buy; not to work and not to make others work, to give the preference to merchants, workmen, and manufacturers who neither sell nor work on Sundays; to propagate the Association with zeal and perseverance; to endeavor to secure the closing of stores, shops, and manufactories on Sunday and feast days; not to be contented with a low-mass on Sundays and feast days, but to be present at high-mass and at the services and instructions of the parish; to avoid travel and parties of pleasure which would occupy the larger part of Sunday or great feast day, and to avoid such great efforts at ordering and cleaning as make a notable increase in the duties of the domestics; and to do each month some good works, such as hearing mass on a week-day, communing, reciting, chaplets, offering one’s labor, etc., in atonement for the profanation of Sunday.

The Association publishes a monthly called the Catholic Sunday. Besides their own publications, the Association uses the Sunday publications of the International Federation. One member of the Association asked the Federal for a thousand of their publications. Another member asked for “several hundreds,” saying, “They are Protestant in their origin, but essentially Catholic in their meaning.” And then the representative of the Federation naively adds, “We are far from denying this, since for us true Protestantism is the Catholicism of the primitive Christians.”^{f892} It was the work of this Catholic Association, which stirred up Mr. Seovel of the National Reform Association to recommend that that organization make repeated advances and suffer rebuffs to gain the co-operation of their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens in this country in behalf of the Catholic Sunday and the enforcement of its observance.

In the San Francisco Bulletin of August 14, 1886, there was given the following notice of the European movement: —

“The agitation in Central and Northern Europe in favor of better observance of the Lord’s day is gaining in breadth and depth. In

Alsace-Lorraine two petitions in favor of the reform have lately been circulated. The first one, originating in Roman Catholic circles, has already 140,845 names, but many on this monster petition are Protestants. The second petition was started by the Protestant Pastoral Conference at Strasburg, and has now 6,367 subscribers. In Paris the 'Society for the Better Observance of Sunday' recently offered prizes for the best popular discussion in pamphlet form of the Sunday question, the condition being that only working men were to send in their essays. No less than forty-one manuscripts were received, five of which took prizes."

This is the report of but a single province, and from it there may be gathered some idea of the "breadth and depth" of the movement when all the nations before named are considered. During the Paris Exposition of 1889, there was again held an international congress to consider the question of the world's Sunday observance.

Another thing which is giving the papacy an opportunity constantly to put itself forward both to magnify itself and to exalt Sunday, is the universal labor troubles. When in March, 1890, the emperor of Germany appointed his "International Labor Conference," he not only appointed the Roman Catholic prince bishop of Breslau, as his personal delegate, but sent a personal letter to the pope, asking him to take an interest in the Conference; to "follow with sympathy the progress of the deliberations;" and to lend his "benevolent support to the work." In reply, the pope took particular pains to remind the emperor of "the teaching of the Catholic Church of which we are the head;" to suggest among other subjects for consideration by the Conference the subject of "rest on the Lord's day;" and to inform his majesty "the successful solution of a matter of this importance will require, besides the wise intervention of the civil authority, the powerful co-operation of religion and the benevolent intervention of the church." Accordingly, the conference made a demand for Sunday observance a part of its platform.

In his Encyclical of May 15, 1891, on "The Condition of Labor," which was evidently written with an eye toward the United States more than any other country, the pope again takes occasion to declare to all the world that —

“No practical solution of this question will ever be found without the assistance of religion and the church. It is we who are the chief guardian of religion, and the chief dispenser of what belongs to the church; and we must not by silence neglect the duty which lies upon us.... We affirm without hesitation that all the striving of men will be vain if they leave out the church. It is the church that proclaims from the gospel those teachings by which the conflict can be put an end to, or at least made far less bitter; the church uses its efforts not only to enlighten the mind, but to direct by its precepts the life and conduct of men;. . . and acts on the decided view that for these purposes recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the help of the law and of State authority.

“No man may outrage with impunity that human dignity which God himself treats with reverence, nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of heaven. Nay, more; a man has here no power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being, is beyond his right: he cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man’s own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, most sacred and inviolable. From this follows the obligation of the cessation of work and labor on Sundays and certain festivals. This rest from labor is not to be understood as mere idleness; much less must it be an occasion of spending money and of vicious excess, as many would desire it to be; but it should be rest from labor consecrated by religion.”

In times of such difficulties as these, it is with peculiar force that the papacy suggests itself to the minds of rulers and statesmen as the source of the greatest help. In times of anarchy and revolution, when the very foundations of States, and even of society itself, seem to be moved, it is almost instinctively that the European statesman grasps the hand of the papacy. The papacy has passed through revolution after revolution, and complete anarchy itself is no terror to her. She saw the fall of the Roman empire. And as that empire was the “mightiest fabric of human greatness” ever seen by man, so its fall was the most fearful ever seen in history. Yet the papacy not only passed through and survived it all, but she gathered new strength from it all.

When Alaric and Genseric — Goth and Vandal — poured destruction upon destruction upon the devoted city, the papacy came forth from it with no weakness upon her, and the wrath of the terrible Attila was turned away by the efforts and the personal presence of the pope. When the floods of barbaric rage swept over all Western Europe, spreading destruction, misery, and anarchy for centuries, instead of disturbing the papacy, it was but her opportunity. The papacy thrives on revolutions; the perplexities of States are her fortune; to her, anarchy is better than order, unless she can rule. Therefore, when revolution is imminent, and anarchy threatens, it is almost instinctively that the European statesman grasps the hand of her who has survived the anarchy of the Middle Ages and the revolutions of fifteen centuries.

But all such advances can end in nothing else than the aggrandizement of the papacy, and its re-assertion of power. For as surely as any person or power enters into negotiations with the papacy upon an equal basis, that person or power will be over-reached. Negotiations backed by force may succeed, but not otherwise, and even then only for a time; because, though a pope may be beaten and die, the papacy lives and works. And “it is impossible to deny that the polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom.... The experience of twelve hundred eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and oppressing mankind, it occupies the highest place.” — Macaulay.^{f893}

The labor problem, as well as the Sunday cause, is an element that is urged as demanding the longed-for union of Protestants and Catholics in the United States. In the New York Evangelist, a leading paper of the Presbyterian Church, of February 9, 1888, “Rev.” Charles W. Shields D.D., of Princeton, discussing the question of the re-union of Christendom, maintained that it would not do to insist upon the exclusion of a certain doctrine, for the following reasons: —

“You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, the mother of us all, the church of scholars and saints, such as Augustine, and Aquinas, and Bernard, and Fenelon; the church of all races, ranks, and classes, which already gives signs of becoming American as well as Roman, and the only church fitted, by its hold upon the working masses, to grapple with that labor problem before which

our Protestant Christianity stands baffled to-day. You would exclude also the Protestant Episcopal Church, the beautiful daughter of a beautiful mother.”^{f894}

Nevertheless, the labor troubles are deepening every-where each succeeding year. As these troubles deepen, the influence of the papacy rises; and as the influence of the papacy rises, the enforced observance of Sunday is more generally and more strongly insisted upon.

But of all the elements that may tend to the exaltation and aggrandizement of the papacy, the one that stands preeminent is the movement for religious legislation in the government of the United States; the movement to commit this government to a connection with religion, to the guardianship of religious institutions, and the enforcement of religious observances, and above all, that institution and observance — the Sunday.

This government is the only one that has ever been on earth, which, by its fundamental principles and its supreme law, has been in harmony with the word of God as it respects earthly government; the only one that was ever pledged to a distinct and positive separation from religion; and therefore the only government since the papacy arose, that was ever fully separated from the principles of the papacy. Against this the papacy and those who held to her principles, have always protested. They have always insisted that it was an experiment that never could be made to succeed. Yet in spite of it all and in the face of the hoary principles of the mother of harlots, this nation in liberty and enlightenment has been the admiration of all nations, and in progress has been the wonder of the world. And the influence which by these things, and above all by its absolutely free exercise of religious right, this government has exerted upon other nations, has surely and steadily weakened the hold of the papal principles upon them, till even Spain, the home of the Inquisition, has been led to grant toleration.

Now if this government of such glorious principles, shall be subverted, and shall be joined to the religion, and put under the feet, of an imperious hierarchy, and its hitherto splendid powers shall be prostituted to the vile uses of religious oppression and persecution, the reactionary influence upon the other nations will be such as to lift the papacy to such a position of prominence and power as it never before possessed: as much greater than that which it possessed in the midnight of the Dark Ages, as the world is larger now than it was then. In short, this reaction would lift the papacy

to the place where the prophecy would be fulfilled that, “Power was given him over all kindreds and tongues and nations.” ~~66117~~ Revelation 13:7.

As surely as this thing shall ever be done, so surely will there be universal persecution. The exaltation of the day of the sun has been the greatest ambition of the spirit of the papacy from its earliest manifestation. And any one

who will pause and think a little, will clearly see that the only religious thing there is, in the observance of which all nations agree, is THE SUNDAY. They all likewise agree that its observance should be enforced by law. Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Russia, France, Belgium, Holland, Spain, Italy, Roumania, Scotland, England, the United States, Denmark, Brazil and other South American States, Scandinavia, Australia, and even Japan — Catholic, heathen, and so-called Protestant alike — all agree in the exaltation of Sunday to the highest place in human affairs, and in compelling all to observe it. And in all alike, hatred of a Christian’s observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, adds intensity to the zeal for the “sacredness” of Sunday.

But, we repeat, the Sunday is the institution par excellence of the papacy — that which “the church” sets forth as the sign of her authority. The keeping of Sunday by Protestants “is an homage they pay in spite of themselves to the authority of the Catholic Church;” so says “the church,” and Protestants cannot disprove it. And when the nations exalt Sunday and compel its observance, they thereby cause men to honor, obey, and do homage to, the papacy; the “man of sin” is made once more the fountain of authority and the source of doctrine; all men are compelled, under pains and penalties, to recognize it as such, and so, “All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” ~~66118~~ Revelation 13:8.

And further saith the Scripture, “I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.” ~~20721~~ Daniel 7:21, 22.

Of course, in the eyes of those who demand such legislation, and even many others, such proceeding would not be considered persecution. It would only be enforcing the law. But no State has any right either to make or to enforce any such law. Such a law is wrong in itself; the very making

of it is wrong. And to obey such a law is wrong. All that any persecution has ever been, was only the enforcement of the law.

And what would be the result? Precisely what it was before. As surely as the movement to commit the government of the United States to a course of religious legislation, shall succeed, so surely will there be repeated the history of Rome in the fourth and fifth centuries.

First, by hypocrisy, voluntary and enforced, there will be a general depravity, described by inspiration thus: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy. Without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good. Traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God. Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.... But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." ~~2~~ 2 Timothy 3:1-5, 13.

Second, As before, society will grow so utterly corrupt that there will be no remedy, and only ruin can result. The principles, the proposals, and the practices of this movement, are identical with those which characterized that church movement in the fourth century. Two things that are so alike in the making, can be no less alike when they are made. And two things that are so alike in every other respect, cannot possibly be any less alike in the final results. The events of the history have occurred in vain, if this is not the lesson which they teach, and the warning which they give.

By that "mystic symbol of legal government," its Great Seal, the government of the United States stands pledged to "A New Order of Things — *Novos Ordo seclorum*;" and by this same symbol, it is declared that "God Has Favored the Undertaking." That God has favored the undertaking is certain, and is manifest to all the world.

Thus God has made the New Republic, the exemplar to all the world, of the true governmental principles. To this nation God has committed this sacred trust. How will the nation acquit itself? how will the nation fulfill this divine obligation? Will it maintain the high position which God has given it before all the nations? or shall it be brought down from its high estate, be shorn of its power and its glory, and, bound and fettered, be led a

captive in the ruinous triumph of the papacy? Shall the new order of things prevail? or shall the old order be restored?

These are the living questions of the hour. The fate of the nation and of the world, depends upon the answer. The issue out of which the answer must come, even now hangs in the political balance. The answer itself even now trembles upon the tongue of time.

AND WHAT SHALL THE ANSWER BE?

APPENDIX.

HOW SUNDAY LAWS ARE ENFORCED.

WE here present an account of a sufficient number and variety of cases in the history of the Arkansas Sunday crusade to show that the whole proceeding from beginning to end, was only an exhibition of the persecuting spirit.

FIRST CASE.

Elder J. W. Scoles.

Elder J. W. Scoles, a Seventh-day Adventist minister, had gone from Michigan to Arkansas in June, 1884, to assist in holding some meetings at Springdale, Washington county. As the result of the meetings, quite a number of persons adopted the faith of that body, and practiced accordingly. A church was organized in that place early in 1885, and the erection of a meeting-house was begun at once. In addition to his subscription to the enterprise, Elder Scoles agreed to paint the house when it should be ready. Further than this, we have the words of Elder Scoles himself, as follows: —

“I volunteered to do the painting as my share of the work, in addition to my subscription. I worked away at the church at odd times, sometimes a half day and sometimes more, as I could spare the time. The last Sunday in April, 1885, in order to finish the work so I could be free to go out for the summer’s labor with a tent, and expecting to go the next day twenty miles, I went over to the church, and finished up a small strip of painting on the south side of the house, clear out of sight of all public roads; and here I quietly worked away for perhaps two hours, in which time I finished it, and then went home. It was for this offense that I was indicted.”

At the fall term of the Circuit Court held at Fayetteville, Mr. J. A. Armstrong, of Springdale, was summoned before the Grand Jury. He was asked if he knew of any violations of the Sunday law. He said he did.

Grand Jury. — “Who are they?”

Armstrong. — “The ‘Frisco Railroad is running trains every Sunday.”

G. J. — “Do you know of any others?”

A. — “Yes; the hotels of this place are open and do a full run of business on Sunday, as on other days.”

G. J. — “Do you know of any others?”

A. — “Yes, sir ; the drug stores and barber shops all keep open, and do business every Sunday.”

G. J. — “Do you know of any others?”

A. — “Yes; the livery-stables do more business on Sunday than on any other day of the week.”

After several repetitions of the same form of question and answer, in relation to other lines of business, this question was reached: —

G. J. — “Do you know of any Seventh-day Adventists who ever work on Sunday?”

A. — “Yes, sir.”

After getting from the witness the names of his brethren, indictments were found against five persons, all of whom were Seventh-day Adventists. Elder Scoles was one of the five. The indictment read as follows: —

“STATE OF ARKANSAS
vs. Indictment.

J. W. SCOLES.

“The Grand Jury of Washington county, in the name and by the authority of the State of Arkansas, accuse J. W. Scoles of the crime of Sabbath-breaking, committed as follows; viz., the said J. W. Scoles, on Sunday, the 26th day of April, 1885, in the county and State aforesaid, did unlawfully perform labor other than customary household duties of daily comfort, necessity, or charity, against the peace and dignity of the State of Arkansas.

“J. P. HENDERSON, Prox. Att’y.”

Mr. Scoles was convicted. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the State. October 30, 1886, the judgment of the Circuit Court was affirmed by the Supreme Court. Almost a score of cases essentially the same as the case of Elder Scoles, were held over in the different Circuit Courts of the State, awaiting the decision of the Supreme Court in his case. The history of these cases and others is as follows: —

SECOND CASE.

Allen Meeks, Star of the West, Ark.

Mr. Meeks had been a resident of Arkansas since 1856, with exception of one year. He had held the office of Justice of the Peace for a number of years both before and after the war. When he became a Seventh-day Adventist, he refused to hold the office longer, because its duties conflicted with his observance of the Sabbath.

Mr. Meeks was indicted at the July term of the Circuit Court, 1885, for Sabbath-breaking. He was arrested in November, 1885, and held under bonds of \$500 for his appearance in January. The offense for which he was indicted, was planting potatoes on Sunday — the third Sunday in March, 1885. The work was done near Mr. Meeks's own house, and not nearer than two and a half miles to any public road or any place of public worship.

On the day referred to, Mr. La Fever and his wife went to visit Mr. Meeks at his home, and found Mr. Meeks planting potatoes. Mr. Meeks quit his work, and spent the rest of the day visiting with Mr. La Fever. La Fever afterward reported Mr. Meeks to the Grand Jury; and as the consequence, Mr. Meeks was indicted as stated. The fourth Monday in January, Meeks appeared before Judge Herne. His case was laid over to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case.

THIRD CASE.

Joe Mc Coy, Magnet, Cove, Ark.

Mr. McCoy moved from Louisville, Ky., to Arkansas, in 1873. He served as constable seven years, and two terms as Justice of the Peace, in Hot Spring county. In 1884, he became a Seventh-day Adventist. At the August, 1885, term of the Circuit Court in Hot Spring county, he was indicted for Sabbath-breaking, on the voluntary evidence of a Mr. Thomas

Garrett. The particular offense with which he was charged, was plowing on Sunday. The witness was a Mr. Weatherford, a member of the Methodist Church. The work was done half a mile from any public road, and entirely away from any place of public worship.

Mr. Weatherford went into the field where Mr. McCoy was plowing, and spent several hours with him, walking around as he plowed. He was summoned as a witness in the case, by the Grand Jury. In September, 1885, Mr. McCoy was arrested, and held under bonds for his appearance. When he appeared at the February term of the court, his case, with others, was laid over to await the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. McCoy owned a small farm and team, and foreseeing, as he thought, that they would soon be consumed in paying fines and costs, he could not in duty to his family and in harmony with his conscientious convictions of right and duty, allow all his property to go in that way; neither could he afford to lose a whole day every week. He therefore decided to abandon his farm, leaving it to satisfy the demands of the law against him in this case, and leave that country, hoping by this means to save at least his team and personal property. By the advice of Elder Dan T. Jones, and at his earnest request, Mr. McCoy returned to Hot Spring county, at the time for his appearance, February, 1887, and confessed judgment under the indictment. A portion of the cost was remitted, and the fine and a portion of the cost were paid by Elder Jones, and Mr. McCoy was released.

Mr. McCoy said to Elder Jones, with tears in his eyes, that while he was reckless and wicked, he was not molested; but as soon as he turned and tried to live a religious life, he was indicted and fined for it.

FOURTH CASE.

J. L. Shockey, Malvern, Ark.

Mr. J. L. Shockey was a Seventh-day Adventist who moved from Ohio in 1884, and settled on a piece of railroad land six miles north of Malvern, the county seat of Hot Spring county, Ark.

About the middle of April, 1885, Mr. Shockey was plowing in his field on Sunday, one and three quarter miles from any place of public worship, and entirely out of sight of any place of worship. He was observed by D. B. Sims and C. B. Fitzhugh. He was reported to the Grand Jury by Anthony

Wallace, a member of the Baptist Church. Sims and Fitzhugh were summoned as witnesses by the Grand Jury. Mr. Sims was hunting stock when he saw Mr. Shockey at work on Sunday. The Grand Jury found a true bill. Mr. Shockey was arrested September 14, 1885, and gave bond to the amount of \$110 for his appearance at the February term of the Circuit Court in the Seventh Judicial District, held at Malvern. On the 1st day of February, 1886, Mr. Shockey appeared before Judge J. B. Wood. In the meantime, the Scoles case had been appealed to the Supreme Court; and at the request of the judge, the prosecuting attorney consented to continue the case, to await the decision of the Supreme Court.

FIFTH CASE.

James M. Pool.

James M. Pool, a Seventh day Adventist, was indicted for Sabbath-breaking at the fall term of the Circuit Court held at Fayetteville, beginning the first Monday in September, 1885.

He waived his right to jury trial. The only witness in the case was J. W. Cooper. Cooper was a member of the Presbyterian Church, and professed sanctification. He went to Pool's house on Sunday morning, to buy some tobacco, and found Pool hoeing in his garden, he so testified before the court, Judge Pittman presiding. The judge sustained the indictment, pronounced Pool guilty, and fined him one dollar and costs, amounting to \$30.90.

SIXTH CASE.

James A. Armstrong, Springdale, Ark.

Mr. J. A. Armstrong moved from Warren county, Ind., to Springdale, Ark., in 1878. In September, 1884, he joined the Seventh-day Adventist church at Springdale. November, 1885, he was indicted by the Grand Jury for Sabbath-breaking. On the 13th of February, 1886, he was arrested by William Holcomb, deputy-sheriff of Washington county, and was held under bonds of \$250 for his appearance at the May term of the Circuit Court. The particular offense upon which the charge of Sabbath-breaking was based, was digging potatoes in his field on Sunday. Millard Courtney was the prosecuting witness. Mr. Armstrong had a contract for building the school-house at Springdale. Mr. Courtney, tract for putting the tin roof on

the school-house. From the house they went into the field, where Mr. Armstrong was digging potatoes. There the business was all talked over, and the contract was secured for putting on the tin roof. Then this same Courtney became the prosecuting witness against Mr. Armstrong of Sabbath-breaking.

On the first Monday in May, Mr. Armstrong appeared before Judge Pittman, Circuit Judge of the Fourth Judicial District, at Fayetteville; and, waiving his right to jury trial, submitted his case to the court for decision. Judge Pittman sustained the indictment. Fine and costs, amounting to \$26.50, were paid, Mr. Armstrong was released.

SEVENTH CASE.

William L. Gentry.

Mr. Gentry had been a citizen of Arkansas since 1849. He had served as Justice of the Peace for eight years, and then refused to accept the office longer. He had served as Associate-Justice of the County Court for two years. He had been a Seventh day Adventist since 1877, — a member of the Seventh-day Adventist church at Star of the West, Pike county, Ark.

At the January term of the Circuit Court, in 1886, he was indicted by the Grand Jury for Sabbath breaking, the particular offense being his plowing on his own farm, July 2, 1886. He was arrested by the deputy-sheriff, and held under \$500 bonds for his appearance at the July term of the Circuit Court. On the fourth Monday in July, Mr. Gentry appeared before Judge Herne, of the Eighth Judicial District. At his request, his case was continued, to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case. In the month of January, 1887, his case was called for trial, as the Supreme Court had sustained the decision of the Circuit Court in the Scoles case. Mr. Gentry confessed judgment, but did not have the money to pay the fine and costs. Judge Herne ordered the defendant kept in custody until the fine and costs were paid. Mr. Gentry, having the confidence of the sheriff, was allowed the freedom of the town. On the last day of court, the sheriff notified him that unless the fine and costs were paid, he would “hire him out.” The laws of Arkansas provide that in cases where the parties fail to satisfy the fines imposed, they shall be put up by the sheriff, and sold to the highest bidder, the bids being for the amount of wages to be paid per day.^{f901} They are then worked under the same rules and regulations as convicts in the penitentiaries. Mr. Gentry was sixty-five years old, and not wishing

to submit to such barbarous treatment, paid two dollars, all the money he had, and gave his note for the remaining amount, \$26.80.

EIGHTH CASE.

Ples. A. Pannell, Star of the West, Ark.

Mr. Pannell, a Seventh-day Adventist, was indicated by the Grand Jury in January, 1886, for Sabbath-breaking, the particular offense charged being his plowing in his field on Sunday. He was arrested, and held under bonds of \$250 for his appearance. At his request, his case was laid over to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case. At the January term, in 1887, that case having been decided adversely, he appeared, and confessed judgment. His fine and costs amounted to \$26.80; and not being able to pay, he was kept in jail four days, and then informed that unless some satisfactory arrangements were made, he would be sold, and would have to work out his fine and costs at seventy-five cents a day, the law not allowing the sheriff in such cases to accept less than that amount. Mr. Pannell paid two dollars in money, gave his note for \$26.80, and was released.

NINTH CASE.

J. L. James, Star of the West, Ark.

Mr. James, a Seventh day Adventist, was indicted by the Grand Jury in January, 1886, for Sabbath-breaking. The particular offense was doing carpenter work on Sunday. The indictment was founded on the testimony of Mr. Powers, a minister of the Missionary Baptist Church. Mr. James was working on a house for a widow, near the Hot Springs Railroad. The work was done without any expectation of receiving payment, and wholly as a charitable act for the poor widow, who was a member of the Methodist Church. Mr. James worked in the rain to do it, because the widow was about to be thrown out of the house in which she lived, and had no place to shelter herself and family. Powers, the informer, lived about six hundred yards from where the work was done, and on that very Sunday had carried wood from within seven rods of where Mr. James was at work, and chopped up the wood in sight of Mr. James.

Mr. James was arrested, and gave the usual bond for his appearance in court. He appeared before Judge Wood at the January term of the Circuit

Court of 1886. His case, with others, was laid over to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case. The first Monday in February, 1887, his case was called for trial. As the Supreme Court had decided against Scoles, James confessed judgment; the regular fine and costs were assessed, and were paid by Elder Dan T. Jones, as the agent of Mr. James's brethren at large.

TENTH CASE.

Allen Meeks, the second time.

At the January term in 1886, Mr. Meeks was indicted the second time. July 13, he was arrested on a bench warrant in the hands of William La Fever. Meeks gave bonds for his appearance at the July term of court; the offense, fixing his wagon-brake on Sunday. He was reported to the Grand Jury by Riley Warren. Warren had gone to Meeks's house on the Sunday referred to in the indictment, to see Mr. Meeks about hiring a teacher for their public school, as both of them were members of the school board of their district. In the course of their conversation, Mr. Meeks incidentally mentioned having mended his wagon-brake that morning. This was reported to the Grand Jury by Warren, and the indictment followed.

At the July term, this, with other cases mentioned, was held over to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case.

At the January term in 1887, Meeks's case was called. He confessed judgment; the usual fine and costs were assessed, paid by Meeks, and he was released.

ELEVENTH CASE.

John A. Meeks, Star of the West, Ark.

John A. Meeks, aged fourteen years, son of Edward L. Meeks, was indicted by the Grand Jury at the January term of the Circuit Court of 1886, for Sabbath-breaking. The offense was, shooting squirrels on Sunday. The place where the squirrels were shot was in a mountainous district entirely away from any public road, or any place of public worship. He was reported by a Mr. M. Reeves. The sons of Mr. Reeves were hauling wood with a team on that same Sunday, and were present with the Meeks boy in the woods, and scared the squirrels around the trees for the

Meeks boy to shoot. When the sport was over, the Meeks boy divided the game with the Reeves boys.

Then the father of the Reeves boys reported the Meeks boy, and he was indicted. His case was held over to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case. At the January term in 1887, the boy confessed judgment, and was fined \$5 and costs, and \$3 county tax was assessed, amounting in all to \$22 The fine was paid, and the boy was released.

TWELFTH CASE.

John Neusch, Magnet Cove Ark.

Mr. Neusch is a fruit-raiser. On Sunday, June 21, 1885, he was gathering early peaches which were over-ripe, and were in danger of spoiling. He was half a mile from any public road, and some distance from any place of public worship, and not in sight of either. The orchard was on the top of a mountain, and Mr. Neusch was not seen by any one except a brother and a Mr. Hudspeth. Mr. Hudspeth was with Mr. Neusch about one hour. He went to see him in behalf of a young man who had been working for him, and who, with others, had been caught stealing peaches from Mr. Neusch's orchard on the preceding Sunday. Mr. Hudspeth offered Mr. Neusch pay for the peaches, if he would not report the young man. Mr. Neusch both refused to accept the money, and promised to say nothing about the offense, on condition that it should not be repeated.

February, 1886, Mr. Neusch was indicted for this offense of working on Sunday, as related. Neusch, having been advised that there was most probably an indictment filed against him, went to the county clerk, and made inquiry in regard to the matter. The clerk handed him a writ for his arrest, and Neusch took it to the sheriff, and gave bond for his appearance at court. In August, his case was laid over to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case. As soon as that decision had been rendered, Neusch went and confessed judgment, and paid the fine and costs, amounting to \$25. Mr. Neusch was an observer of the seventh day.

THIRTEENTH CASE.

F.N Elmore. Springdale, Ark.

Mr. F. N. Elmore was indicted at the March term of the Circuit Court of 1886, on the charge of Sabbath-breaking. The indictment charged him with violating the Sunday laws by working on Sunday, November 1, 1885. Mr. Elmore was arrested in April, 1886, by Deputy-Sheriff Wm. Holcomb, and was held in \$250 bail for his appearance in the May term of the Circuit Court. On the 4th of May, Mr. Elmore appeared before Judge Pittman, and waiving his right to jury trial, submitted his case to the court for decision. Millard Courtney was the only witness examined. He testified that he had seen Mr. Elmore digging potatoes on the day above referred to, on the premises of Mr. J. A. Armstrong. This work was done by Elmore on the day when Courtney took his friend to Armstrong to secure the contract for putting the tin roofing on the school-house; and that is how Courtney knew Elmore had worked on that day. Elmore was convicted. The fine and costs were \$28.95. which was paid, and he was released. Mr. Elmore was a Seventh-day Adventist.

FOURTEENTH CASE.

William H. Fritz, Hindsville, Madison Co., Ark.

Mr. Fritz was indicted at the April term of the Circuit Court in 1886, for Sabbath-breaking, and held under \$250 bonds for his appearance at the September term, at Huntsville. Mr. Fritz is a wood-workman, and the offense charged was for working in the shop on Sunday. The shop was in the country, and two hundred yards from the public road. The indictment was sustained. The defendant was fined one dollar and costs, amounting to \$28. Mr. Fritz was a Seventh-day Adventist.

FIFTEENTH CASE.

Z. Swearingen.

Mr. Z. Swearingen was a member of the church of Seventh-day Adventists, who went from Michigan to Arkansas in 1879, and settled on a small farm eleven miles south of Bentonville, the county seat of Benton county. He and his son Franz, aged seventeen years, were indicted by the Grand Jury at the April term of the Circuit Court of 1886, upon the charge of Sabbath-breaking by "performing labor other than customary household duties of daily comfort, necessity, or charity, against the peace and dignity of the State of Arkansas, on February 14, 1885," the same day being Sunday.

Both were arrested by F.P Galbraith, sheriff of Benton county, in May, 1886, and were put under bond of \$250 for their appearance at the fall term of Circuit Court. September 27, 1886, the defendants appeared before Judge Pittman, of the Fourth Judicial District.

John G. Cowen, witness for the State, testified that he saw Mr. Swearingen and his son hauling rails on Sunday, the 14th day of February, 1885, as he returned from the funeral of Mrs. Boggett. Hon. J. W. Walker, attorney for the defendants, explained to the jury that the defendants conscientiously observed the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, in accordance with the faith and practice of the church of which they were members. The prosecuting attorney stated to the jury that it was "one of those Advent cases." The jury found the defendants guilty, as charged in the indictment. As Mr. Swearingen did not have the money to pay the fine and costs for himself and son, amounting to \$34.20, they were sent to jail until the money should be secured.

They were put in jail October 1, 1886. On the 13th of the same month, the sheriff levied on, and took possession of, a horse belonging to Mr. Swearingen. The horse sold at sheriff's sale, the 25th of the same month, for \$26.50, leaving a balance against Mr. Swearingen of \$7.70; yet both he and his son were released the same day that the horse was sold. On the 15th day of December, the sheriff appeared again on the premises of Mr. Swearingen, and presented a bill for \$28.95. Of this sum, \$21.25 was for the board of Mr. Swearingen and son while in jail, and \$7.70, balance on the fine. Mr. Swearingen had no money to pay the bill. The sheriff levied on his mare, harness, wagon, and cow and calf. Before the day of the sale, however, Mr. Swearingen's brethren raised the money by donations, paid the bill, and secured the release of his property. One thing about this case is to be noted particularly: The witness upon whose testimony these people were convicted, said that he saw them hauling rails on Sunday, the 14th day of February, as he returned from the funeral of Mrs. Boggett. Now, the act under which this prosecution was carried on, became a law March 3, and was approved by the Governor, March 7. Consequently, they were convicted for work done seventeen days before the act was passed under which they were convicted.

SIXTEENTH CASE.

I. L. Benson.

Mr. Benson was not at that time a member of any church, made no pretensions to religious faith, and did not observe any day. He had the contract for painting the railroad bridge across the Arkansas River at Van Buren, Ark. He worked a set of hands on the bridge all days of the week, Sundays included. In May, 1886, Mr. Benson and one of his men were arrested on the charge of Sabbath-breaking. They were taken to Fort Smith, and arraigned before a Justice of the Peace. The Justice did not put them through any form of trial, not even to ask them whether they were guilty or not guilty, but read a section of the law to them, and told them he would make the fine as light as possible, amounting, with costs, to \$4.75 each. They refused to pay the fines, and were placed in custody of the sheriff. The sheriff gave them the freedom of the place, only requiring them to appear at the Justice's office at a certain hour. Mr. Benson telegraphed to the general manager of the railroad in regard to the matter. The general manager telegraphed to his attorney in that city, to attend to the cases.

Mr. Benson and his men appeared before the Justice for a hearing in their cases. It was granted, with some reluctance. The attorney, Mr. Bryolair, told the Justice it was a shame to arrest men for working on the bridge at the risk of their lives to support their families, when the public work in their own town was principally done on Sunday. A hearing was granted, and the trial was set for the next day.

They were not placed under any bonds at all, but were allowed to go on their own recognizance. The following day, a jury was impaneled, and the trial begun. The deputy-sheriff was the leading witness, and swore positively that he saw them at work on Sunday. The jury brought in a verdict to the effect that they had "agreed to disagree." This was on Wednesday. The following Monday was set for a new trial. No bond was even at this time required. The defendants appeared at the time appointed, and pleaded not guilty. The justice, after giving them a brief lecture, dismissed the case.

Since that time Mr. Benson has become a Seventh-day Adventist. He would not have fared so easily had he been a Seventh-day Adventist when he was indicted.

SEVENTEENTH CASE.

James A. Armstrong, the second time.

On the 9th of July, 1886, Mr. Armstrong was arrested the second time, by A. M. Dritt, marshal of Springdale, for working on Sunday, June 27, and taken before the mayor, S.L. Staples. When brought before the mayor, Mr. Armstrong called for the affidavit on which the writ was issued. The mayor stated that he himself had seen Mr. Armstrong at work in his garden on Sunday, and that Mr. A. J. Vaughn had called his attention to Armstrong while he was at work, and had said, "Now, see that you do your duty." This made an affidavit unnecessary. The case was tried before the mayor, acting as Justice of the Peace. A. J. Vaughn was the first witness.

Justice of the Peace. — "What do you know about Mr. Armstrong's working on Sunday, June 27?"

Vaughn. "I did not see Armstrong at all that day; I only heard he was at work."

J. I. Gladden was the next witness called.

Justice. — "What do you know about Mr. Armstrong's working on Sunday, June 27?"

Gladden. — "While at the depot, I saw some one at work hoeing in Mr. Armstrong's garden; but I do not know for certain who it was."

Millard Courtney was the next witness called.

Justice. — "Tell us what you know about Mr. Armstrong's working on the Sunday in question?"

Courtney. — "While on the platform of the depot, I saw some one hoeing in Mr. Armstrong's garden. I am not positive who it was."

Having failed to prove anything from the witnesses regularly summoned, the case was "rested," while the marshal was sent out to find somebody else. He brought in Gideon Bowman, who was then questioned as follows:

Justice. — "Do you know anything about Mr. Armstrong's doing work other than customary household duties of daily necessity, comfort, or charity on the Christian Sabbath, June 27?"

Bowman. — "I do."

J. — "State what you saw."

B. — “As I came into town, having been out east, in passing Mr. Armstrong’s house, I saw him hoeing in the garden.”

J. — “Did you recognize this person to be J. A. Armstrong?”

B. — “I did.”

Here the prosecution rested the case, and Elder J. G. Wood assumed the cross-examination in behalf of the prisoner.

Wood. — “Mr. Bowman, you say you were coming along the road from the east when you saw Mr. Armstrong at work in his garden?”

B. — “I did.”

W. — “Were you coming to town?”

B. — “I was.”

W. — “About how long were you in passing Mr. Armstrong’s house? and what was the length of time you saw him at work?”

B. — “I can’t tell.”

W. — “Do you think the time to have been two minutes, or more?”

B. — “Don’t know; can’t tell.”

W. — “Could it possibly have exceeded one minute?”

B. — “I don’t know. It makes no difference. I am not here to be pumped.”

W. — “Mr. Bowman, we are only wanting the facts in the case. Are you sure it was Mr. Armstrong you saw hoeing? Might it not have been some other man?”

B. — “I am not mistaken. I know it was J. A. Armstrong.”

W. — “What was he doing?”

B. — “I told you he was hoeing.”

W. — “What was he hoeing? Was he hoeing corn, or hoeing out some potatoes for his dinner?”

B. — “He was hoeing; that is enough.”

At this point the Justice of the Peace interfered: —

“It seems, Mr. Wood, that you are trying to make it appear that Mr. Armstrong was only digging a mess of potatoes for his dinner. If that is so, and he was doing a work of comfort, necessity, or charity, he can prove it.”

W. — “If your honor please, Mr. Armstrong is not here to prove a negative. The law allows him to do such work as is of necessity, comfort, or charity; and until it is clearly proven that he has violated this law, which thus far has not been proven, it is unnecessary for him to offer proof. A man stands innocent until he is proven guilty.”

Justice. — “We proceed.”

W. — “Mr. Bowman, you say you were in the road when you saw Mr. Armstrong?”

B. — “Yes.”

W. — “Do you remember whether there was a fence between you and Mr. Armstrong?”

B. — “Yes; there was. “

W. — “About what is the height of that fence?”

B. — “Don’t know.”

W. — “Was it a board fence five boards high?”

B. — “Can’t say.”

W. — “Was there a second fence between the road and the garden, beyond the house and lot?”

B. — “I think there was.”

W. — “Was that second fence a board fence or a very high picket fence?”

B. — “I don’t know, nor don’t care. It makes no difference.”

W. — “I understand, then, that you don’t know. Well, Mr. Bowman, what time in the day did you see Mr. Armstrong in the garden?”

B. — “In the afternoon.”

W. — “About what time in the afternoon, — was it one or two o’clock, or later?”

B. — “It makes no difference. I am not here to be pumped. If you want to pump me any more, just come out on the street with me.”

W. — “Sir, I have no desire to pump anything but truth from you, and only wish to know the facts in this case. Was it about one or two o’clock in the afternoon, or about four or five? Please tell us about the time of day.”

B. — “It was between twelve noon and sunset. That is near enough.”

This closed the testimony in the case. Mr. Armstrong was declared guilty, and fined one dollar and costs, the whole amounting to \$4.65. In default of the payment of his fine, the mayor, acting as Justice of the Peace, told him he would send him to the county jail, and allow him a dollar a day until the fine and costs were paid.

The marshal went at once to the livery-stable to get a team, and within four hours from the time of his arrest, Mr. Armstrong, in charge of the marshal, was on his way to jail at Fayetteville. He was locked up with another prisoner, with nothing but a little straw, and a dirty blanket about thirty inches wide, for a bed for both. The next night, he was allowed to lie in the corridor on the brick floor, with his alpaca coat for a bed, and his Bible for a pillow. The third night, a friend in town furnished him a quilt and a pillow. On the fourth night, his friend brought him another quilt, and thus he was made quite comfortable. On the fifth day, at noon, he was released.

When Mr. Armstrong returned to Springdale, the mayor notified him that his fine and costs were not satisfied, and that unless they were paid in ten days, an execution would be issued, and his property sold. Mr. Armstrong filed an appeal to the Circuit Court, the appeal was sustained, and he was released from further penalty.

EIGHTEENTH CASE.

J. L. Munson, Star of the West, Ark.

Mr. Munson, a Seventh-day Adventist, was indicted by the Grand Jury at the July term of the Circuit Court of 1886, for working on a Sunday in

March, 1886. Mr. Munson was cutting briars out of his fence corner at the back of his field, one fourth of a mile from any public road, and one and one half miles from any place of public worship. He was indicted on the voluntary evidence of Jeff. O'Neal, a Free-will Baptist preacher. He was arrested November 3, 1886, and held under bonds of \$300 for his appearance January, 1887. He confessed judgment, and Judge Herne assessed the legal fine of one dollar, with three dollars county tax. and costs, amounting to \$14.20. This was paid by Mr. Munson, and he was released.

NINETEENTH CASE.

James M. Pool, the second time.

Mr. Pool was indicted the second time at the September term of court in 1886, and was held under bonds of \$250 for his appearance May 16, 1887; and although the act under which these prosecutions were conducted, was repealed before the date of trial, Pool was tried under the indictment, and fined one dollar and costs, amounting to \$28.40.

TWENTIETH CASE.

J. L. Shockey, the second time.

In August, 1886, Mr. P. Hammond, a member of the Baptist Church, appeared before the Grand Jury in Hot Spring county, and charged J. L. Shockey with hauling rails and clearing land on Sunday, the first day of the week, July 11, 1886. The Grand Jury presented an indictment. On December 14, 1886, Mr. Shockey was arrested and taken to Malvern, locked up until the next day, when he gave the usual bond for his appearance at court, and was released. The work for which Mr. Shockey was indicted, was done on a new farm which he was opening up in the woods, three fourths of a mile from any public road, and more than a mile from any place of public worship, and not in sight of either. The witness, Mr. Hammond, passed by where Mr. Shockey was at work, and after he had gone some distance, returned, and spoke to Mr. Shockey about buying from him a Plymouth Rock rooster. The bargain was then made, Hammond agreeing to pay Shockey fifty cents for the rooster.

Shockey was indicted, and his case set for trial February 7, 1887. This case, with the one before mentioned and some others that had been held

over to await the decision in the Scoles case, was called, and February 11 fixed as the day of trial for all.

In the meantime, Elder Dan T. Jones, president of the Missouri Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, had an interview with the prosecuting attorney, Mr. J. P. Henderson, and explained the nature of all the cases, and showed him that the Adventists were faithful, law-abiding citizens in every respect, except in this matter of working on Sunday; that the defendants in cases were all poor men, some of whom were utterly unable to pay any fines and costs, and consequently would have to go to jail; and asked Mr. Henderson if he would be willing to remit a portion of his fees, which were ten dollars in each case, provided the remainder was raised by donations by the Seventh-day Adventists throughout the country, for the relief of their brethren.

Mr. Henderson replied that if these cases were of the nature of religious persecution, he would not feel justified in taking any fees. He said he would not be a party to any such action, but would want some time to investigate the cases, to satisfy himself that this was true. Upon investigation, he became so fully satisfied that the prosecutions were simply religious persecutions, that he generously refused to take any fees in any of the cases.

When the cases were called, the defendants confessed judgment, and the fine prescribed by law was assessed. The county clerk reduced his fees about one half; the sheriff, one half of his; and the prosecuting attorney, all of his, which reduced the total expenses about one half. The remainder was advanced from funds supplied by Seventh-day Adventists throughout the country, for the relief of their brethren in Arkansas.

TWENTY-FIRST CASE.

Alexander Holt, Magnet Cove, Ark.

Mr. Holt, a Seventh-day Adventist, was a medical student of the Memphis Hospital and Medical College, Memphis, Tenn.

In 1885 he was working on a farm in the northern part of Hot Spring county, Ark. At the February term of the Circuit Court in 1886, he was indicted for Sabbath breaking. The particular charge was working on Sunday, October 11, 1885.

C. C. Kaufman was the informer. Mr. Holt had worked one Sunday near a public road, but not nearer than a mile to any place of public worship. Hearing that there had been an indictment found against him, Mr. Holt did not wait for the sheriff to come and arrest him, but went to the county seat, ten miles distant, taking a bondsman with him, and inquired of the proper officer if there was an indictment against him. The warrant for his arrest was then read to him by the deputy-sheriff. Holt gave bonds to appear at the August term of the Circuit Court, and was released.

At the August term of court, the case was laid over to await the decision of the Supreme Court in the Scoles case. February, 1887, Holt's case was called for trial at Malvern. The Supreme Court having decided adversely, Holt confessed judgment, and paid the fine and costs, amounting to \$28.

There were a number of other cases, but they are all of the same kind, — causeless arrests upon information treacherously obtained to vent religious spite.

We append also some statements of prominent citizens of Arkansas, who are not observers of the seventh day, in relation to the workings of that Sunday law, which show that our report of the cases is not “manufactured” in any particular.

The first is from Judge S. W. Williams, of Little Rock, an ex-judge of the State Supreme Court, and one of the foremost lawyers in the State: —

“LITTLE ROCK, ARK., March 21, 1887.

Rev. Dan T. Jones.

“SIR: As requested, I give you a short resume of the history of our Sabbath law of 1885. Up to the time of the meeting of the legislature in January, 1885, our Sunday law had always excepted from its sanctions the cases wherein persons from conscience kept the seventh day as the Sabbath. It had been the case for many years at the capital, that no Sabbath laws were observed by the saloon-keepers. After the election of 1884, the newly-elected prosecuting attorney of that district, commenced a rigid enforcement of the law. A few Jewish saloon-keepers successfully defied it during the session of the legislature. This led to the total and unqualified repeal of the conscience proviso for the seventh day in the old law. This was used oppressively upon the seventh-day Sabbath

Christians, to an extent that shocked the bar of the whole State. A test case was brought from Washington county. Our Supreme Court could not see its way clear to hold the law unconstitutional, but the judges, as men and lawyers, abhorred it. Judge B. B. Battle, one of the three judges, was, with Judge Rose and myself, a member of the standing committee on law reform of our State Bar Association. In our report, as you see, we recommended a change, which the Association adopted unanimously, Chief-Justice Cockrill and Associate-Justices Smith and Battle being members, present and voting. At the meeting of the General Assembly the next week (January, 1887), Senator Crockett introduced a bill repealing the obnoxious law, in so far as it affected those who keep holy the seventh day, still forbidding the opening of saloons on Sunday.

“Truly yours,

“**SAM W. WILLIAMS.**”

In the following letter, Judge U. M. Rose, of the law firm of U. M. & G. B. Rose, Little Rock, one of the leading lawyers in the State, and a member of the committee on law reform of the State Bar Association, gives his opinion of the reasons why the law was enacted, and also his views as a lawyer on the propriety of such legislation. We print his letter in full: —

“LITTLE ROCK, ARK., April 15, 1887.

“**Rev. Dan T. Jones,**

“Springdale, Ark.

“DEAR SIR: Yours received. The law passed in this State in 1885, and which has since been repealed, requiring all persons to keep Sunday as a day of rest, although they might religiously keep some other day of the week, was enacted, I think, to meet the case of certain Jews in this city who kept saloons and other business houses open on Sunday. It was said that those persons only made a pretense of keeping Saturday as a day of rest. Whether these statements were true or not, I do not know. The act of 1885 was found to work oppressively on persons believing as you do that Saturday is the Christian as well as the Jewish Sabbath; and hence its repeal. It was manifestly unjust to them as well as to Jews who are sincere in their faith.

“You ask me to express my opinion as to the propriety of such legislation as that contained in the repealed act. Nothing can exceed my abhorrence for any kind of legislation that has for its object the restraint of any class of men in the exercise of their own religious opinions. It is the fundamental basis of our government that every man shall be allowed to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. It was certainly not a little singular, that while in our churches the command was regularly read at stated times, requiring all men to keep the Sabbath, which, amongst the Jews to whom the command was addressed, was the seventh day of the week, men should be prosecuted and convicted in the courts for doing so. As to the theological aspect of the matter, I am not competent to speak; but as a civil requirement, my opinion is that any legislation that attempts to control the consciences of men as to the discharge of religious duty, can only be the result of that ignorance and fanaticism which for centuries proved to be the worst curse that ever afflicted humanity.

“Very respectfully yours,
“U. M. ROSE.”

Mr. E. Stinson is a farmer and teacher in Hot Spring county, and writes: —

“MALCOLM, HOT SPRING COUNTY, ARK., March 27, 1887.
“Mr. Jones.

“DEAR SIR: In answer to your inquiry, will say that since the repeal of the exemption clause in our statutes, which allowed persons who kept another day than Sunday as Sabbath, to go about their ordinary work or business on that day, several indictments have been found in Hot Spring county. In each and every case the parties so indicted have been conscientious observers of the seventh day, so far as I know them. To my knowledge, others have worked on Sunday who did not observe the seventh day, and no bills were found against them. I believe the prosecutions to be more for religious persecution than for the purpose of guarding the Sunday from desecration. The men who have been indicted are all good moral men and law-abiding citizens, to the best of my knowledge. The indictments, to the best of my belief, were malicious in their character, and without provocation. I believe the unmodified

Sunday law to be unjust in its nature, and that it makes an unjust discrimination against a small but worthy class of our citizens. I am a member of the Baptist Church, and not an observer of the seventh day; but I accept with gratitude the recent change in the laws of our State, which shows more respect for the conscientious convictions of all our citizens. I do not believe that if the same acts for which the indictments were lodged against Seventh-day Adventists, had been committed by those who did not keep the seventh day, any notice would have been taken of them.

“Respectfully,
“E. STINSON.”

The next is from the physician and the proprietor of the Potash Sulphur Springs Hotel, a health resort seven miles southeast of Hot Springs. These gentlemen are both old residents of the place, and are personally acquainted with some of those who were convicted of “Sabbath-breaking” in Hot Spring county “POTASH SULPHUR SPRINGS, ARK., March, 1887.

“To whom it may concern: —

“We, the undersigned, herewith testify that the recent prosecutions against the observers of the seventh-day Sabbath in our vicinity, have brought to the surface a religious intolerance and a spirit of persecution, the existence whereof a great many imagine not to exist any more in our time.

“J. T. FAIRCHILD, M. D.
“E. E. WOODCOCK.”

Mr. Fitzhugh, who wrote the following letter, was acting as deputy-sheriff in Hot Spring county during the two years in which these persecutions were being carried on, and therefore had the best of opportunities to know whereof he speaks.

“STATE OF ARKANSAS, COUNTY OF HOT SPRING, SALEM
 TOWNSHIP, April 9, 1887.

“On the second day of March, 1885, the legislature of Arkansas repealed the law allowing any person to observe as the Sabbath any day of the week that they preferred, and compelled them to keep the Christian Sabbath, or first day of the week. The effect of this

change worked a hardship on a class of citizens in this county, known as Seventh-day Adventists, who observe the seventh instead of the first day of the week, as the Lord's Sabbath. There were five or six of them indicted (and some of them the second time) by the Grand Jury of this county, for the violation of this law. In fact, these people were the only ones that were indited for Sabbath-breaking, during the two years in which this law was in force. I was not intimately acquainted with but one of these people, Mr. John Shockey, who moved from Ohio, and settled within one and one fourth miles of me, some two and a half years ago. I know nothing in the character of this gentleman but what would recommend him to the world at large. As a citizen, he recognizes and regards the laws of our country (with the above exception); as a neighbor, he might well be called a Samaritan; as a Christian, he is strict to his profession, and proves his faith by his works.

“Respectfully,

“**BENJ. C. FITZHUGH**, Justice of the Peace.

“Malvern, Hot Spring County, Ark.”

FOOTNOTES

^{ft1} “Caesar,” chap. 2, par. 6.

^{Ft2} Id., par.8.

^{ft3} Id.,par. 7.

^{Ft4} Id., par. 8, 9.

^{Ft5} Id., chap. 1, par. 5.

^{Ft6} Id., chap. 2, par. 9.

^{Ft7} Reference to the Roman Constitution must not be understood in the american sense, as being a written constitution. The Roman Constitution was, as is the British, merely a system of precedents and unwritten rules of long-established usage.

^{Ft8} Id., chap. 3, par. 5.

^{Ft9} Id., chap. 4, par. 6.

^{ft10} Id., chap.7, par.8.

^{ft11} Froude uses the spelling “Sylla” instead of “Sulla.” I have preferred the latter form. It is that used by Merivale, Mommsen, and the “Encyclopedia Britannica.”

^{Ft12} Id., chap. 8, par. 10, 13.

^{ft13} “History of the Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 4, par. 22.

^{ft14} Id., par. 33.

^{ft15} “History of Rome,” book 5, chap. 11, par. 72.

^{ft16} “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 11, par. 4 from end.

^{ft17} “Caesar,” chap. 21, par. 3.

^{ft18} Plutarch’s “Lives,” Numa, chap. 31. Merivale, “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 4, par. 42; and chap. 20, par. 11.

^{ft19} The girl’s name was Clodia. She was Fulvia’s daughter by Clodius, her former husband.

^{ft20} “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 26, par. 13.

^{ft21} Id., par. 14.

^{ft22} “History of Rome,” chap. 59, sec. 4, par. 10.

^{ft23} Id.

^{ft24} “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 26, par. 15.

^{ft25} “Lives of the Caesars,” Augustus, chap. 27

^{ft26} “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 27, par. 2.

^{ft27} “History of Rome,” chap. 60, sec. 3, par. 1.

^{ft28} “Antony and Cleopatra,” act 2, scene 2.

^{ft31} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 3, par. 17, 18..

^{ft32} “Annals,” book 1, chap. 4.

^{ft33} Article “Augustus.”

^{ft34} “Lives of the Caesars,” chap. 12.

^{ft35} Id., chap. 13. Merivale, “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 22, par. 4.

^{ft36} Id., chap. 69.

^{ft37} “Lives of the Caesars,” Augustus, chap. 65.

^{ft38} “History of Rome,” 72, sec. 1, par. 9.

^{ft39} “Lives of the Caesars,” Tiberius, chap. 24.

^{ft40} Id., chap. 25.

^{ft41} “Annals,” book 3, chap. 65.

^{ft42} Id., book 1, chap. 72.

^{ft43} “History of Rome” chap. 73, par. 2.

^{ft44} “Annals,” book 4, chap. 30.

^{ft45} Id., book 6, chap. 19.

^{ft46} “Lives of the Caesars,” Tiberius, chaps. 48, 49.

^{ft47} “Lives of the Caesars,” Tiberius, chaps. 61, 62.

^{ft48} “Annals,” book 6, chap. 20.

^{ft49} “Lives of the Caesars,” Caligula, chaps. 13, 15.

^{ft50} Id., chap. 22.

^{ft51} Id.

^{ft52} Id., chap. 13.

^{ft53} “Lives of the Caesars,” Claudius, chap. 12.

^{ft54} “Seekers after God,” chap. 6, par. 10-12; and chap. 9, par. 2.

- ft55 “Annals,” book 11, chap. 12.
- ft56 Id., chap. 27.
- ft57 Id., chap. 31.
- ft58 Id., chap. 38.
- ft59 “Seekers after God,” chap. 10, par. 5.
- ft60 “Intellectual Development of Europe,” chap. 8, par. 22-24.
- ft61 ~~ft60~~ Romans 1:22-32.
- ft71 “Intellectual Development of Europe,” chap. 9, par. 8.
- ft72 “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 4, par. 6.
- ft73 “Annals,” book 15, chap. xiiv. 1 adopt Gibbon’s Translation. See “Decline and Fall,” chap. 16, par. 14.
- ft74 “History of Christianity,” book 4, chap. 2, par. 17, note.
- ft75 “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 62, par. 17.
- ft76 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 16, par. 18.
- ft77 “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 62, par. 15
- ft78 These two letters are found in English in Dissertation 3, at the close of Whiston’s “Josephus.”
- ft79 Eusebius’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 4, chap. 9.
- ft80 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 4, par. 9, 16.
- ft81 Id., chap. 16, par. 34.
- ft82 Id., chap. 6, par. 10, 12.
- ft83 “Ecclesiastical History,” book 6, chap. 28.
- ft84 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 7, par. 8.
- ft85 Id., par. 9, 10.
- ft86 Id., chap. 10, par. 14.
- ft87 Ante-Nicene Fathers,” Treatises of Cyprian, “On the Lapsed,” chap. 6.
- ft88 Id.
- ft89 Eusebius’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 7, chap. 10.
- ft90 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 10, par. 50.
- ft91 “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” vol. 1, part 1, Section First, div. 3, par. 1.

- ^{ft92} Quoted by James Freeman Clarke in “Ten Great Religions,” chap. 8, sec. 4, par. 1. He does not cite the place where Mommsen says it. I have noted quite carefully Mommsen’s “History of Rome,” and have not found it. The substance of it is there, in book 3, chap. 13, par. 1, but this quotation itself is not there. It must have been taken from some other of Mommsen’s works.
- ^{ft93} Quoted in Neander’s “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Section First, div. 3, par. 2.
- ^{ft94} “Romans Under the Empire,” chap. 22, par. 21.
- ^{ft95} “Ten Great Religions,” chap. 7, sec. 3, par. 1, 4.
- ^{ft96} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 15, par. 15.
- ^{ft97} “History of Rome,” book 1, chap. 12, par. 22.
- ^{ft98} “History of Christianity,” book 2, chap. 3, par. 2.
- ^{ft99} Neander’s “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol.1, Section First, part 1, div. 3, par. 2.
- ^{ft100} Id.
- ^{ft101a} “History of Christianity,” book 2, chap. 3, par. 27.
- ^{ft102a} Id., par. 5.
- ^{ft102aa} “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” sec. 1, div. 3, under “Dlocletian.”
- ^{ft103a} Eusebius’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 8, chap. 17.
- ^{ft104a} “History of European Morals,” end of chap. 3.
- ^{ft105a} “History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States,” book 5, chap. 1, par. 10.
- ^{ft101} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 3, par. 33.
- ^{ft102} “Annals,” book 4, chap. 33.
- ^{ft103} Id., chap. 13, par. 28.
- ^{ft104} Id., chap. 16, par. 45.
- ^{ft105} Id., par. 44.
- ^{ft106} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 8, chap. 1.
- ^{ft107} “Decline and Fall,” chap xvi, par. 48.
- ^{ft108} “History of European Morals,” chap. 3, par.3 from the end.

^{ft109} Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book 8, chap. 17. I adopt Gibbon's translation, "Decline and Fall," chap. 16. par. 56.

^{ft110} Id chap. 14, par.1.

^{ft111} Id., chap. 14. par.10.

^{ft112} Id.,par.14.

^{ft113} Id.,par.15.

^{ft114} De Cormenin, "History of the Popes," Marcellus, Eusebius and Melchlaides; Bower "History of the Popes," Liberius par. 16; Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," chap. 14, par.20.

^{ft115} Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History," book 10, chap. 5.

^{ft121} This is so among the Hindus of India, even to this day. "The most sacred and the most universally used — even to the present day — of all Vedic prayers is that composed in the Gayatri meter, and thence called Gayatri, or , as addressed to the vivifying Sun-god, Savitri : 'Let us meditate on that excellent glory of the Divine vivifier; may he enlighten our understanding.'

"Turning toward the Eastern sky, he repeats the Gayatri or Savitri... This prayer is the most sacred of all Vedic utterances, and like the Lord's prayer among Christians,... must always among Hindus take precedence of all other forms of supplication. The next division of the service is called Upasthana (or Mitro-pasthana) because the worshiper abandons his sitting posture, stands erect with his face toward the rising sun, and invokes that luminary under the name of Mitra. The prayer he now repeats is Rig-veda 3, 59, of which the first verse is to the following effect :

"Mitra, raising his voice, calls men to activity.

Mitra, sustains the earth and the sky.

Mitra, with unwaking eye, beholds all creatures.

Offer to Mitra the oblation of butter!' "

The use of this hymn is the morning service of every Hindu." — "Religious Thought and Life in India." chap 1 last par., and chap. 15, par., 41, 57.

^{ft122} Sun worship, with that of the other heavenly bodies, continued till the rise of Mahomet. The father of Mahomet, when a boy, was devoted as a sacrifice to the sun, but fortunately was ransomed. (See Gibbon," Decline and Fall," Chap. 1, par 9.) It was from the horrors of sun-

worship that Mahomet turned Arabia.

^{ft123} “Classical Dictionary,” article “Hercules.”

^{ft124} The obelisk, or Cleopatra’s Needle, brought from Egypt and now standing in Central Park, New York City, is one of these stone sun-images.

^{ft125} Article “Christianity.”

^{ft126} Book 1, chap xcix.

^{ft127} “Classical Dictionary,” Bacchus.

^{ft128} Id.

^{ft129} “History of Romans Under the Empire, “ chap 22, par. 19,20.

^{ft130} “Classical Dictionary,” article “Cybele.”

^{ft131} Id., “Hercules.”

^{ft132} “History of Rome, “ book 1 chap. 12, par. 25.

^{ft133} Read also the whole of Leviticus chapters 18, 20.

^{ft134} “Romaus Under the Empire.” chap 33, par .13.

^{ft135} “Decline and Fall,”chap. 6, par. 22.

^{ft136} Id., par. 23.

^{ft137} “History of Christianity,” book 2, chap. 8, par. 22.

^{ft138} “Decline and Fall,” chap.11, par.43.

^{ft139} Id., Chap. 12, par.41.

^{ft140} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 1, par. 36.

^{ft141} “Ecclesiastical History,” Century 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 1, Murdock’s translation.

^{ft142} Id., par. 3.

^{ft143} Id., par. 5.

^{ft144} “Classical Dictionary,” Eleusinia.

^{ft145} Id.

^{ft146} Article “Mysteries.”

^{ft147} “Ecclesiastical History,” Century 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 5.

^{ft148} Id., par. 7, Maclaime’s translation.

^{ft149} “Apology,” chap.16.

- ^{ft150} “Ad Nationes,” book 1, chap. 13.
- ^{ft151} “History of the Popes,” under “Pius” and “Anicetus.”
- ^{ft152} “Ecclesiastical History,” Century 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 11, Maclaine’s translation.
- ^{ft153} Id., chap. 1, par. 6, Murdock’s translation.
- ^{ft154} Id., chap. 3, par. 5.
- ^{ft155} “The Instructor,” book 2, chap. 1.
- ^{ft156} Id. chap. 1.
- ^{ft157} Id., chap. 1.
- ^{ft158} Note to Mosheim’s “Ecclesiastical History,” Century 2, part 2, chap. 1, par. 7, Maclaine’s translation.
- ^{ft159} Quoted in Maclaine’s Mosheim, Century 3, part 2, chap. 3, par. 5, note.
- ^{ft160} Id. With such a system as this for a basis, it is logical enough that the Catholic Church should forbid the common people to read the Scriptures. For Origen is one of the chiefest fathers of the Catholic Church ; and “from the days of Origen to those of Chrysostom, there was not a single eminent commentator who did not borrow largely from the works of” Origen. “He was the chief teacher of even the most orthodox of the Western Fathers.” — Farar’s “History of Interpretation,” last paragraph under “Origen.”
- ^{ft161} Id., Century 2, part 2, chap. 1, par. 12, Murdock’s translation.
- ^{ft162} Id., Century 3, part 2, chap. 1, par. 5.
- ^{ft163} “History of Christianity,” book 2, chap 8, par. 22.
- ^{ft164} Id., book 2, chap. 8, par. 24.
- ^{ft165} Id., par. 28.
- ^{ft166} “Ecclesiastical History,” Century 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 2, note. Maclaine’s translation.
- ^{ft167} “Ante-Nicene Library,” Gregory Thaumaturgus, introduction, par. 1.
- ^{ft168} “History of Christianity,” book 2, chap. 9, par. 7.
- ^{ft169} Id., book 3, chap. 1, par. 1.
- ^{ft171} D’Aubigne’s “History of the Reformation.” book 6, chap. 3. par. 7.
- ^{ft172} “History of the Christian Beigion,” Vol. 1, Section Second, part 1, div.

1, A, par. 5.

^{ft173} “Ecclesiastical History,” Century 2, part 2, par.4, Maclaine’s translation.

^{ft174} Id. chap. 4, par. 4, Murdock’s translation.

^{ft175} “Epistle to the Ephesians,” cha;. 6, and “To the Smyraeans,” chap. 9.

^{ft176} “Against Heresies, “book 4, chap. 26, par. 2; book 3, chap. 3, par.2;and book 3, chap. 4, par. 1.

^{ft177} “On the Lapsed,” Chap. 6.

^{ft178} “Ecclesiastical History,’ Century 3, part 2, chap. 2, par. 4.

^{ft179} “History of the Christian Religion,” vol. 1, second Section, part 1. div. 1, B, par. 5.

^{ft180} Epistle 26, chap. 1, and epistle 63, chap. 8.

^{ft181} Epistle ixiv, chap. 3.

^{ft182} “History of Christianity,” book 4, chap. 1, par. 22.

^{ft183} Epistle, chap. 5.

^{ft184} Id., 51, chap. xiiv.

^{ft185} “Lives of the Popes,” Stephen, par. 8.

^{ft186} “Eusebius’s Ecclesiastical History,” book 7, chap. xxx.

^{ft201} “History of the Christian Religion,” Vol. 2, Section First, part 1, A, par. 11.

^{ft202} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 1, par. 33.

^{ft203} Schaff, “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, 2, par. 15.

^{ft204} Id.

^{ft205} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap, 1, par. 41.

^{ft206} “History of the Christian Church,” Vol 3, chap. 2, par. 24, and note 2.

^{ft207} “History of Christianity,” book 3. chap. 1, par. 42, 39.

^{ft208} Life of Constantine,” book 1, chap. 40.

^{ft209} “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, chap. 2, par. 25.

^{ft210} Id., chap. 75, par. 5.

^{ft211} Fletcher (five hundred dollar) Prize Essay, “Abiding Sabbath,” p. 229. Copyrighted and published by American Tract Society, 1884.

- ^{ft212} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 1, par. 44.
- ^{ft213} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 6, par. 15.
- ^{ft214} “History of the Christian Religion,” Vol. 2, Section First, part 1, A, par. 33.
- ^{ft215} “History of the Eastern Church,” Id. par. 14.
- ^{ft216} Id., Lecture 4, par. 4.
- ^{ft217} Decline and Fall,” chap. 18, par. 6.
- ^{ft218} Id., par. 7.
- ^{ft219} History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 2, par. 12.
- ^{ft220} Id., par. 13, 10.
- ^{ft221} Theodoret’s Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 17.
- ^{ft222} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 17.
- ^{ft223} History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 3, par. 5.
- ^{ft224} Id., par. 4.
- ^{ft225} History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 6, par. 42.
- ^{ft226} Id., par. 6.
- ^{ft227} Id., par. 7.
- ^{ft228} Id., par. 7.
- ^{ft229} Id., chap. 4, par. 39.
- ^{ft230} “History of the Eastern Church,” end of Lecture 6.
- ^{ft231} Id. Lecture 6, par. 7 from the end.
- ^{ft232} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 4, par. 3 from the end,
- ^{ft233} “Life of Constantine,” book 4, chap. 6.
- ^{ft234} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 6, par. 5 from the end.
- ^{ft235} “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, chap. 2, par. 10, 11.
- ^{ft236} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 6, par. 26.
- ^{ft237} “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, chap. 2, par. 6.
- ^{ft241} “Intellectual Development of Europe,’ Chap. 9, par. 22.
- ^{ft242} “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 2.
- ^{ft243} “Life of Constantine,” book 1, chap. 12.

^{ft244} Id., chap. 20

^{ft245} Id., chap.

^{ft246} Id., chap. 38.

^{ft247} Id., chap. 42.

^{ft248} “History of the Christian Religion and Church.” Vol. 2, Section First, part 1, div. A, par. 26.

^{ft249} Id., Section First, part 1, div. A, par. 27.

^{ft250} “Life of Constantine,” book 2, chap 12.

^{ft251} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 8.

^{ft252} “Life of Constantine,” book 2, chap. 18.

^{ft253} Id., book 3, chap. 10.

^{ft254} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap, 11.

^{ft255} “Life of Constantine,” book 3, chap. 15.

^{ft256} Stanley, “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 5, par. 34.

^{ft257} “Life of Constantine,” book 4, chap. 33.

^{ft258} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 6, par. 24.

^{ft259} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 18.

^{ft260} “Encyclopedia Britannica,” article “Millennium.”

^{ft261} “Life of Constantine,” book 4. chap. 48.

^{ft262} “Life of Constantine,” book 4, chap. 67.

^{ft263} Id., book 1, chap. 4.

^{ft264} Id., book 4, chap. 72.

^{ft265} Id., book 1, chaps. 1, 2.

^{ft266} “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol. 2, Section First, part 1, div. A, par. 45, note.

^{ft267} “Life of Constantine.” book 1, chap. 27.

^{ft268} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 6, par. 10.

^{ft269} Quoted by Waddington in “Note on Eusebius,” at the end of chapter 6, of his “History of the Church.”

^{ft270} “History of the Church,” chap. 6, par. 2.

^{ft271} “Intellectual Development of Europe,” chap. 10, par. 6.

^{ft272} Id., chap. 9 par. 24.

^{ft273} Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book 10, chap. 5.

^{ft274} Id.

^{ft275} "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 1, par 10 from the end.

^{ft276} "History of the Popes," Melchiades, par. 2.

^{ft277} Id., par. 3.

^{ft278} Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History," book 10. chap. 7.

^{ft279} "History of the Popes," Melchiades, par . 5.

^{ft280} Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book 10, chap. 5.

^{ft281} Id.,

^{ft282} "History of the Popes," Sylvester, par. 1, note A.

^{ft283} Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History," book 10, chap. 6.

^{ft284} "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. par. 5 from the end.

^{ft285} Id.,

^{ft286} "Ecclesiastical History" Century 4, book 2, part 2, chap. 5, par. 5, Murdock's translation.

^{ft287} "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 2 par. 2, 3.

^{ft288} Id., par. 3.

^{ft289} Id.,

^{ft290} Id.

^{ft291} "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 11.

^{ft292} "Decline and Fall," chap. 20, par. 18.

^{ft293} Id.

^{ft294} "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Section First, part 1, A. par. 38.

^{ft295} Stanley, "History of the Eastern Church," Lecture 5, par. 13 from the end.

^{ft296} "Ecclesiastical History," book 1, chap. 11.

^{ft297} "History of the Christian Religion and Church,' Vol. 2, Section Third, part 1, div 1, par. par. 1.

- ft298 “History of the Christian Church, “ Vol. 3, chap. 22, par. 2.
- ft299 “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol. 2, Section First, part 1, div. C, par. 1.
- ft271a “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1. par.2
- ft272a “History of the Christina Religion,” Vol 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 3
- ft273a Id., Section Third, part 2, div. 3, par. 2
- ft274a Schaff’s translation, “History of the Christian Church,” Vol, 3, chap. 75, par. 5 note 1. The following is the Latin, from the same place: “Imperator Constantine Aug. Helpidio: Omnes iudices, urbanaeque plebes et cunctarum artium officia venerabili dies Solis quiescant. Ruralesque positi agrorum cultura libere licenterque inserviant, quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die furmenta sulcis aut vinea scrobibus mendantur, ne occasione momentalis pereat commoditas coelestis provisionis concessa.”
- ft275a “Commentary on the Psalms, 92, quoted in Cox’s Sabbath Literature,” Vol. 1, p. 361, and in the “Sabbath Manual,” by Justin Edwards, pp. 125-127.
- ft276a “oration in Praise of Constantine,” chap. 3.
- ft277a Id. The reader may more fully understand this by reference to the illustration, opposite page 507 of this book. There at the upper left-hand corner of the picture can be seen the sun in his chariot driving four horses. It is evidence that in this picture which the bishop has drawn of the emperor, he was playing upon the sun-worshipping sentiments of the “bishop of externals.”
- ft278a Id. chap. 2.
- ft279a “History of the Christians Religion and Church,” Vol. 2. Section Third, part 2, div. 3, par.2
- ft280a Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 8.
- ft281a “Oration in Praise of Constantine,” chap. 9.
- ft282a Id., chap. 17.
- ft283a “Life of Constantine,” book 4, chap. 20.
- ft284a “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 4. par. 9 from the end.

ft285a Id., chap. 1, par. 44.

ft286a “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, chap. 75, par.5.

ft287a “History of Rome,” chap. cii, part 1, par. 4 from the end.

ft288a Socrate’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1. chap,. 9.

ft289a Hefele’s “History to the Church Council,” Laodicea. In both Greek and Latin copies of this canaon, the word “Sabbat” is used instead of “Saturday,” and the word “anathema” — Accursed — is one which Hefele translates “shut out.” The following is the Latin: “Quod non oportet Christianos Judizere et otaire in Sabbato, sed operai in eodem die. Preference autem in veneration Dominicum diem si vacare voluerine,t at Christiani hoc faciat; quod si reperti fuerint Judaizerer Anathema sint a Christo.”

ft290a “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol. 2, Section Third, part 2, div. 3. par. 4.

ft291a Id.

ft292a Id.par. 5.

ft293a Id.

ft294a Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” Fifth Carthaginian.

ft295a “History of the Christian Religious and Church,” Vol. 2, Section Third, part 1, div. 3, par. 5.

ft296a Id.

ft297a Id.

ft298a “The Correction of the Donatists,” chap. 6. 1 adopt Schaff’s translation, “History of the Christian Church, Vol. 3, par. 12.

ft299a ”History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol. 2, Section Second, part 3, div, 1, last par.

ft300 Id., Section Third, part 2, div. 3, par. 5

ft301 Eusebius’s “Life of Constantine,” book 3, chaps. 64, 65.

ft302 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 21, par. 1.

ft303 “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 3, par. 8.

ft305 Theodoret’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 4.

ft306 Id., chap. 5.

ft307 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 21, par. 8.

- ^{ft308} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 23.
- ^{ft309} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 4, par. 5.
- ^{ft310} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 3, par. 10.
- ^{ft311} Eusebius’s “Life of Constantine,” book 2, chaps. lxxv-lxxii.
- ^{ft312} Id., book 3, chap. 8.
- ^{ft313} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 3, par. 22.
- ^{ft314} Id., Lecture 4, par. 2,3. I take this occasion to remark that which has already become apparent, and which becomes more and more emphatic as the history proceeds, that the term “Christian” in such connection as it is here used by Stanley, is totally misapplied. This was not an assembly of the Christian Church; It was not the Christian Church that united with the State. This was an assembly of the Catholic Church; it was the Catholic Church that formed the union with the State. The history of “the church” is not the history of Christianity. The history of Christianity has not been written except by the rack, by sword, and by flame; in tears, in sufferings, and in blood, — and in the books that shall be opened at the last day. Faithfulness to the authors whom I quote will oblige me in a few instances to copy this misapplication of the word “Christian.” But the reader will need merely to note the connection to see that the word is sadly misused, and this note will be the assurance in every such case that I do not indorse the use of the word in any such connection.
- ^{ft315} Id., par.4.
- ^{ft316} Stanley, Id., par. 6.
- ^{ft317} Id., par. 9.
- ^{ft318} Id., par. 9.
- ^{ft319} Id., par. 22.
- ^{ft320} Id., par. 22.
- ^{ft321} Id., par. 28.
- ^{ft322} Id., par. 29.
- ^{ft323} Id., par. 34.
- ^{ft324} Socrates’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 9.
- ^{ft325} “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 4, par. 39.
- ^{ft325} Id., par. 41.

- ft326 Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book 1, chap. 9.
- ft327 Id.
- ft328 Stanley, "History of the Eastern Church," Lecture 4, par. 41.
- ft329 Id.
- ft330 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 4, par. 1.
- ft331a "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 1.
- ft331 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 4, par. 21.
- ft332 Id., par. 23.
- ft333 Id., par. 29
- ft334 "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Section Fourth, div. 2, a, par. 30.
- ft335 "Intellectual Development of Europe," chap 9, par. 39.
- ft336 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 4, par. 32, and note.
- ft337 Article "Constantine."
- ft338 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 5, par. 9
- ft339 Id., par. 11.
- ft340 Id., par. 18; Socrates's "Ecclesiastical History," book 2, chap. xvi; Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," chap. 21, par. 36.
- ft341 Id., par. 14.
- ft342 See the original, in Milman's "History of Christianity," book 3., chap. 5, note to par. 34.
- ft343 "History of the Popes," Julius, par. 5; Hefele, "History of the Councils," Sardica, canons 3, 4, 5.
- ft344 "Decline and Fall," chap. 21, par. 26.
- ft345 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 5, par. 15
- ft346 "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 4.
- ft347 "History of the Church Councils," sec. 74, par. 6.
- ft348 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 5, par. 22.
- ft349 "History of the Church Councils," sec. 75, par. 1.
- ft350 "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 6.

ft351 Id., par. 19.

ft352 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 5, par. 28.

ft353 "Decline and Fall," chap. 21, par. 33.

ft354 Id., chap. 21, par. 31, and chap. xxiii, par. 27. November 30, A. D. 361, he was murdered by the pagans. In the fifth century — A. D. 494 — Pope Gelasius made him a martyr. In the sixth century he was worshiped as a Catholic saint; and since the Crusades, he has been "the renowned Saint George of England, patron of arms, of chivalry, and of the Garter."

ft355 "Ecclesiastical History," book 2, chap. 17.

ft356 Id., and Bower, "History of the Popes," Liberius par. 7.

ft357 "Decline and Fall," chap. 21, par. 35.

ft358 History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 21

ft359 Hefel's "History of the church Councils," sec. 82, par. 1

ft360 Id., par. 2.

ft361 "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 24.

ft362 Id., par. 24, 25.

ft363 Id., par. 28.

ft371 "History of the Popes," Liberius, par. 29.

ft372 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 6, par. 9.

ft373 "History of the Christian Religion and Church," Vol. 2, Section First, part 1, A, par. 74.

ft374 "Ecclesiastical History," book 3, chap. 25.

ft375 Id.

ft376 "Decline and Fall," chap. 25, par. 9.

ft377 Id. par. 13.

ft378 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 8, par. 28.

ft379 Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. 27, par. 6.

ft380 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 9, par. 1.

ft381 "Decline and Fall," chap. 27, par. 3.

ft382 "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 16.

ft383 Id., par. 19.

^{ft384} Id., par. 20.

^{ft385} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 27, par. 9; Schaff’s “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, section 65, last par. but one; Stanley’s “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 2, par. 10 from the end.

^{ft386} Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 97.

^{ft387} Id., sec. 98.

^{ft388} Id., sec. 99.

^{ft389} Id.

^{ft390} “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 101, par. 1, 2.

^{ft391} Stanley’s “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 2, par. 10 from the end.

^{ft392} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 27, par. 11.

^{ft393} Id.

^{ft394} “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 104.

^{ft395} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 28, par. 5.

^{ft401} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 9 par. 36.

^{ft402} Id., par. 45.

^{ft403} “Decline and fall,” chap. 27. par. 9, note.

^{ft404} Id., par. 13.

^{ft405} Hefele, “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 115, par. 4.

^{ft406} Id., par 6.

^{ft407} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 9, par. 46, note.

^{ft408} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 32, par. 11.

^{ft409} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 9, par. 50.

^{ft410} Id., par. 51.

^{ft411} Id., par. 54.

^{ft412} Socrates’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 6, chap. 18.

^{ft413} “History of Christianity,” book 3, Chap. 9, par 56.

^{ft414} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 6, chap. 18.

^{ft415} “History of the popes,” Innocent 1, par. 8.

^{ft416} Bower, Id., par. 14.

^{ft417} “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 3, par. 23.

^{ft418} Id., par. 21.

^{ft419} Socrates’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 7, chap. 29.

^{ft420} “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 3, par. 20.

^{ft421} Id., par. 15.

^{ft422} “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 131, par. 1.

^{ft423} Id., sec. 133.

^{ft424} Id., par. 3.

^{ft425} “Schaff’s “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, section 171, par. 10.

^{ft425} “History of Latin Christianity, book 2, chap.3, par. 49.

^{ft425} Id., par. 22.

^{ft427} Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 134, par. 6.

^{ft428} Milmah’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 3, par. 56.

^{ft429} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 7, chap. 22.

^{ft430} “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 3, par. 64.

^{ft431a} “Decline and Fall,” chap. 47, par. 15.

^{ft432a} “Encyclopedia Britannica,” article “Immaculate Conception.” The following is the original as there given; “Auctoritate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ac Nostra, declaramus, pronuntiamus et definimus, doctrinam, quae tentet Beatissimam Virginem Mariam in primo instanti suae Conceptionis fuisse singulari Omnipotentis Del gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu, Salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpae labe praeservatam immunem, esse a del revelatm, atque idedireco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam.”

^{ft431} “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 4, par. 22.

^{ft432} Bower’s “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 22.

^{ft433} Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 172, par. 3.

^{ft434} Id., par. 13.

^{ft435} Id., par. 21.

^{ft436} Id., par. 22.

- ^{ft437} “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 24.
- ^{ft438} Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 172, par. 22-24; and Bower’s “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 46.
- ^{ft439} Bower, Id., par. 25.
- ^{ft440} Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 173, par. 10.
- ^{ft442} Id., sec. 178, par. 5.
- ^{ft443} Id., sec. 175 par. 3.
- ^{ft444} Id., par. 6.
- ^{ft445} Id., sec. 178, par. 6, 7.
- ^{ft446} Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 4, par. 30.
- ^{ft447} Bower’s “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 31.
- ^{ft448} Id.
- ^{ft449} Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 178, par. 15.
- ^{ft450} Bower’s “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 32; Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 4, par. 30; and Hefele’s of the Church Councils,” sec. 178, par. 16, and sec. 179.
- ^{ft451a} Bower, Id., par. 34.
- ^{ft451} “History of Latin Christianity”, book 2, chap. 4, par. 2.
- ^{ft452} Id., book 1, chap. 2, par. 1.
- ^{ft453} “History of the Christian church,” Vol. 3, section 62, par. 6.
- ^{ft454} “History of Popes,” Siricius, par. 21.
- ^{ft455} Id., “Innocent,” par. 8 from the end.
- ^{ft456} “History of Popes,” Celestine, par. 15.
- ^{ft457} “History of Popes,” Celestine, par. 15.
- ^{ft458} Milman,”History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 4, par. 2.
- ^{ft459} Id., par. 16; and Bower,”History of the popes,” Leo, par. 8.
- ^{ft460} “History of; the Popes,” Leo, par. 35.
- ^{ft461} “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 40.
- ^{ft462} Id.
- ^{ft463} Bower’s “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 43.
- ^{ft464} Evagrius’s Ecclesiastical History,” book 2, chap. 4.

- ^{ft465} “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 189, par. 4. This is the Theodoret whose “Ecclesiastical History” has been several times referred to in this book.
- ^{ft466} Quoted by Stanley, “History of the Eastern Church,” Lecture 2, par. 8 from the end.
- ^{ft467} Hefele, “History of a the Church Councils,” sec. 189, par. 4.
- ^{ft468} “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 4, par. 38.
- ^{ft469} “History of the Popes,” Leo, 1 par. 45.
- ^{ft470a} Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 183, last three par. Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 4, par. 38. In the rest of this chapter, I follow so closely and so fully, Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” that I shall not attempt to cite particular references. The only references that I shall make are to passages not derived from Hefele’s account. In following Hefele, however, I have maintained the uniformity of the narrative by turning indirect quotations into direct, and so have preserved as far as possible the personality of the speakers.
- ^{ft471a} Bower, “History of the Popes,” Leo, par. 40.
- ^{ft472a} Evagrius’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 2, chap. 4. par. 4.
- ^{ft473a} Quoted by Stanley, “History of Eastern Church,” Lecture 2, par. 24.
- ^{ft474a} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 2, chap. 5; Hefele’s “History of the Church Councils,” sec. 193, par. 5, note; Schaff’s “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, section 140, par 9. note; section 141, par. 12, note 4.
- ^{ft475a} “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3. section 142, par. 1, 2.
- ^{ft471} “History of Latin Christianity,” book 1, chap. 2, par. 1.
- ^{ft472} “History of Christianity,” book 3, chap. 3, par. 1.
- ^{ft473} “History of the Christian Church,” Vol. 3, section 55, par. 1, note.
- ^{ft474} “History of the Popes,” Damasus, par. 8.
- ^{ft475} “Ecclesiastical History,” book 1, chap. 9, par. 2.
- ^{ft476} “History of Christianity,” book 4, chap. 1, par. 49.
- ^{ft477} “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 12.
- ^{ft478} “History of the Christian Church,” Vol, 3, section 16, par. 5.

- ft479 Neander, "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 14; and the canon itself in Hefele's "History of the Church Councils."
- ft480 "History of Christianity," book 4, chap. 5, par. 17.
- ft481 See Schaff, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 175.
- ft482 Neander, "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 14.
- ft483 Id., par. 17, note.
- ft484 "Decline and Fall," chap. 20, par. 22.
- ft485 "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. 2, Section Third, part 1, div. 1, par. 5, 6.
- ft486 "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 49, par. 2.
- ft487 Neander's "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 2, par. 9, note.
- ft488 Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 49 par. 2, note 5.
- ft489 "Intellectual Development of Europe," Vol. 1, chap. 10, par. 6.
- ft490 "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 59, par. 2.
- ft491 "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 10, par. 2.
- ft492 Id., book 4, chap. 1, par. 35.
- ft493 "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 2, par. 3.
- ft494 "History of Christianity, book 4, chap. 1, par. 53-56.
- ft495 "History of Latin Christianity," book 2, chap. 3, par. 40.
- ft501 "History of the Christian Religion," Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 1, par. 7.
- ft502 "History of Christianity," book 6, chap. 1, par. 39.
- ft503 Id.
- ft504 "Historical Studies," Bishops of Rome, par. 13.
- ft505 "History of Latin Christianity," book 1, chap. 2, par. 18, and note.
- ft506 Book 27, chap. 3, par. 12-15, Bower's translation, "history of the Popes," Damasus, par. 6.
- ft507 "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 53, par. 3.

- ^{ft508} Quoted and translated by Milman, "History of Latin Christianity," book 1, chap. 2, par. 20, note 1.
- ^{ft509} "History of Christianity," book 4, chap. 1, par. 13, 13, 15.
- ^{ft510} Quoted by Bower, "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 12.
- ^{ft511} Quoted by Bower, "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 12.
- ^{ft512} Id.
- ^{ft513} History of Christianity," book 4, chap. 2, par. S.
- ^{ft514} Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 2, section 77, par. 3, 4, and the notes; Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. 22, par. 8, note. Neander's "History of the Christian Religion," Section Third, part 2, div. 3. par. 21-23, and the notes.
- ^{ft515} Id.
- ^{ft516} "History of the Christian Church," section 74, par. 4.
- ^{ft517} "History of Christianity," par. 14.
- ^{ft518} Id., par. 15, 16.
- ^{ft519} "Intellectual Development of Europe," Vol. 1, chap. 10, par. 5.
- ^{ft520} "History of Christianity," book 4, chap. 2, par. 13, note.
- ^{ft521} Id., book 4, chap. 1, par. 58.
- ^{ft522} "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 2, section 32, par. 15.
- ^{ft523} "Ecclesiastical History," book 1, chap. 21.
- ^{ft524} Quoted by Bower, "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 13.
- ^{ft525} "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," chap. 5, par. 17, and chap. 4, par. 7.
- ^{ft526} "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 50, par. 8.
- ^{ft527} "History of Christianity," book 4. chap. 1, par. 58, note and 60.
- ^{ft528} "Conversion of the Northern Nations," Lecture 4, par. 10, 12, 13.
- ^{ft529} "History of the Popes," Damasus, par. 14.
- ^{ft530} "Conversion of the Northern Nations," notes and illustrations, E.
- ^{ft531} "History of Sacerdotal Celibacy," chap. 5. par. 20.
- ^{ft532} "History of the Christian Church," Vol. 3, section 23, par. 2.
- ^{ft533} Quoted by Schaff, Id., section 12, par. 3.
- ^{ft534} Id.

ft535 Id. section 24, par. 2.

ft501a “History of the Popes,” Leo, last par. but one.

ft502a “History of Latin Christianity,” book 2, chap. 2, para. 21; Socrates’s “Ecclesiastical History,” book 7, chap. 30.

ft503a “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 2, para. 27.

ft504a Id. par. 28.

ft505a “Decline and Fall,” chap. 38, par. 6.

ft506a “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 2, par. 27.

ft507a “Decline and Fall,” chap. 38, par. 8

ft508a Id., par. 11.

ft509a Id., par. 12, and Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 2, par. 29.

ft510a “History of Latin Christianity,” Id., par. 29.

ft511a Id., par. 33, 34.

ft512a “History of the Popes,” Felix 2, par. 1.

ft513a “The Holy Roman Empire,” chap. 4, par. 7.

ft514a Gibbon, “Decline and Fall,” chap. 39, par. 5.

ft515a Id., par. 6.

ft516a “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 3, para. 3.

ft517a “Decline and Fall,” chap. 39, par. 14; and Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity, 3, chap. 3, par. 5.

ft518a Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 3, par. 8 from the end.

ft519a Id., par. 11.

ft520a Id., par. 14.

ft521a “History of the Popes,” Symmachus, par. 9, 10.

ft522a Id., par. 16.

ft523a Id., par. 18.

ft524a “Decline and Fall,” chap. 17; Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 3, para. 23.

ft525a Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 3, par. 30.

ft526a Id.

ft527a Id.

ft528a Id., par. 32.

ft529a Id., para. 28

ft530a Bower's "History of the Popes," Felix 3, par. 1.

ft531a "Decline and Fall," chap. xlvii, par. 23.

ft532a "History of Latin Christianity," book 3, chap. 4, par. 2.

ft533a "History of the Popes," Boniface 2, par. 3.

ft534a Id., <ft43021> John 2, par. 1.

ft535a Id., par. 2.

ft536 "History of Latin Christianity," book 3, chap. 1, par. 5.

ft537 Id., Bower calls him Timothy the Cat; but whether "weasel" or "cat," the distinction is not material, as either fitly describes his disposition, though both would not exaggerate it.

ft538 Id., par. 31.

ft539 Id., par. 21, 22.

ft540 Id.

ft541 Croly's "Apocalypse," chap. 11, "History," under verses 3-10.

ft542 "History of Latin Christianity," book 3, chap. 4, par. 6.

ft543 Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," chap. 12, par. 3.

ft544 Id., par. 7-12.

ft545 "History of the Popes," Agapetus, par. 5, note A.

ft546 "Decline and Fall," chap. 12, par. 11.

ft547 "History of Latin Christianity," book 3 chap. 4, par. 7.

ft548 "Decline and Fall," chap. 12, par. 22.

ft549 Id., par. 23, 28 and chap. 43, par. 4. Afterward, from 54a till 553, there was carried on what had been called the "Gothic" War; but those who made the war were not Goths. They were "a new people" made up of Roman captives, slaves, deserters, and whoever else might choose to join them, with but a thousand Goths to begin with. See Gibbon, Id., chap. 43, par. 4 and 6.

ft550 Article "Popedom," par. 25.

- ft551 “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 4, last two par.
- ft552 “History of Latin Christianity,” book 3, chap. 7, par. 1.
- ft553 Article “Lombards,” par 6.
- ft554 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 14. par. 18.
- ft555 Id., chap. 49, par. 9.
- ft556 “History of Latin Christianity,” book 4, chap. 9, par. 14, 26.
- ft557 Milman’s “History of Latin Christianity,” book 4, chap. 9, par. 24.
- ft558 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 49, par. 12.
- ft559 Id., par. 13.
- ft560 “History of Latin Christianity,” book 4, chap. 11, par. 24.
- ft561 Id., par.25.
- ft562 Id., par. 28.
- ft563 Id., par. 31.
- ft564 Id., par. 41.
- ft565 Id., chap. 12, par. 16.
- ft566 Id., par. 26.
- ft567 Id., par. 31, and Gibbon’s “Decline and Fall,” chap. 49, par. 20.
- ft568 “Decline and Fall,” chap. 14, par. 22.
- ft569 Schaff’s “History of the Vatican Council,” Decrees, chap. 4. The “pontificate” is that of Plus 9.
- ft570 Speeches of Pope Plus 9, pp. 9, 17; Gladstone’s Review,.
- ft571 Neander’s “History of the Christian Religion and Church,” Vol. 2, Section Second, part 1, div. 2, par. 29.
- ft601 D’Aublgne’s “History of the Reformation,” book 6, chap. 11, par.9.
- ft602 Id., par. 13.
- ft603 Id., book 7, chap. 11, par. 13.
- ft604 Id., book 9, chap. 8, par. 14.
- ft605 Id., par. par. 22.
- ft606 Id., book 10, chap. par. 19.
- ft607 Schaff’s “History of the Christian Church,” “Vol. xiv, section 11, par. 22, 23.

- ^{ft608} “Ecclesiastical History,” Century 17, sec. 2, part 2, chap. 1, par. 16
- ^{ft609} For these quotations, under “Zwingle,” see D’Aubigne’s “History of the Reformation,” book 16, chap. 4 par. 1. chap. 1, par. 7. chap. 4, par. 2: and chap. 8, par. 6 from the end.
- ^{ft610} Id., book 9, chap. 10, par. 9.
- ^{ft611} Id., book. 18, chap. 5, par.5.
- ^{ft612} Id., book 9, chap. 10. par. 12.
- ^{ft613} Id., par. 17.
- ^{ft614} Id., book 18 chap. 5, par. 10-12
- ^{ft615} Id., book 9, chap. 10, par. 20-24
- ^{ft616} Id., book 19, last chap., last par. but one.
- ^{ft617} “Larger History of the English People, “book 5, chap. 4, par. 16.
- ^{ft618} Id., par. 21, 22.
- ^{ft619} Id., book 6, chap. 1, par. 5, 1 and book 5, chap. 4, par. 13.
- ^{ft620} Essays, “Hallam,” par. 27.
- ^{ft621} “History of Protestantism,” book 14, chap. 10, last par. but one.
- ^{ft622} Id. Everybody had to be at home by nine o’clock at night; and hotel keepers were required to see that this rule was observed by their guests. Rules were made “restraining excess in dress, and profusion at meals:” and everybody was required to attend both preaching and other religious services.
- ^{ft623} Article “Calvin” It was written by W. Lindsay Alexander, D. D., one of the Bible revisers, and in clearly favorable to him.
- ^{ft624} Hallam describes him as “a sort of prophet-king,” in “Constitutional History,” chap. 4, par. 13, note.
- ^{ft625} “History of the United States,” chap. “Prelates and Puritans,” par. 11. It is not without reason that, by one of his admirers, Calvin has been compared with Innocent 3. — Wylie’s “History of Protestantism,” book 14, end of chap. 24.
- ^{ft626} Article “Presbyterianism,” par. 32.
- ^{ft627} “History of Civilization,” Vol. 2, chap. 5, last par. To this “famous chapter” the reader is confidently referred as the best and most fruitful result of that “minute reading” which is above said to be requisite to

enable a person to judge concerning the system.

^{ft628} “History of the Puritans,” preface, par. 6.

^{ft629} Hallam’s “Constitutional History,” chap. 4, par. 5.

^{ft630} Id., par. 3 from the end.

^{ft631} “Larger History of England,” book 6, chap. 5, par. 31.

^{ft632} Q uoted by Hallam, “Constitutional History,” chap. 4 par. 13.

^{ft633} It was good cause that it was so rejected; for even before the death of Charles I, the Presbyterian Parliament had dealt “the fiercest blow at religious freedom which it had ever received.” “An Ordinance for the Suppression of Blasphemies and Heresies, ‘which Vane and Cromwell had long held at bay, was passed by triumphant majorities. Any man, ran this terrible statute, denying the doctrine of the Trinity or of the divinity of Christ, or that the books of the Scripture are the ‘word of God,’ or the resurrection of the body, or a future day of judgment, and refusing on trial to abjure his hereby, ‘shall suffer the pain of death.’ Any man dealing (among a long list of other errors) ‘that man by nature hath free will to turn to God,’ that there is a purgatory, that images are lawful that infant baptism is unlawful ; any one denying the obligation of observing the Lord’s day, or asserting ‘that the church government by presbytery is anti-Christian or unlawful,’ shall, on refusal to renounce his errors, ‘be commanded to prison,’” — Larger History of England,” book 7, chap. 10, par. 11.

^{ft634} Id., book 6, chap. 5, par. 31.

^{ft635} “Neal’s History of the Puritans,” part 2, chap. 1. par. 2.

^{ft636} Id.

^{ft637} “History of the United States,” chap. “The Pilgrims,” par. 8.

^{ft638} Fiske’s “Beginnings of New England,”.

^{ft639} Bancroft’s “History of the United States,” chap. “Prelates and Puritans,” par. 3 from the end.

^{ft640} Bancroft’s “History of the United States,” chap. “New England’s Plantation,” last par. but one.

^{ft641} “Beginnings of New England,”.

^{ft642} Id.

^{ft643} Adams’s “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft644} “History of the United States,” cha. “Self-Government in Massachusetts,” par. 25.

^{ft645} “The Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft646} Id.

^{ft647} “Beginnings of New England,”.

^{ft648} Backus’s “Church History of New England,”.

^{ft649} Bancroft’s “History of the United States,” chap. “The Providence plantations,” par. 3-6.

^{ft650} Blakely’s “American State Papers,” page 68, note.

^{ft651} Bancroft’s “History of the United States,” chap. “The Providence Plantation,” par. 6.

^{ft652} Id., par. 7-11.

^{ft653} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft654} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft655} Id.

^{ft656} Id

^{ft657} Id.

^{ft658} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft659} “Beginnings of New England,”; and Bancroft’s “History of the United States,” chap. “The Colonization of new Hampshire,” par. 8.

^{ft660} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft661} Id.

^{ft662} Charters and Constitutions, Connecticut.

^{ft663} Id.

^{ft664} “History of the United States,” end of chap. “The Colonization of Connecticut.”

^{ft665} “Beginnings of New England,”.

^{ft666} “National Reform Manual,” 1890.

^{ft667} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft668} Id. Under the year 1649, Hildreth gives the copy of a law embodying the provisions cited above, with other important points. It seems to be the same law, if it really belongs under 1949, it must be a re-enactment

with addition. It runs thus: “‘Although no human power be lord over the faith and consciences of men, yet because such as bring in damnable heresies, tending to the subversion of the Christian faith and destruction of the souls of men, ought duly to be restrained from such notorious impieties,’ therefore ‘any Christian within this jurisdiction who shall go about to subvert or destroy the Christian faith or religion by broaching and maintaining any damnable heresies, as denying the immortality of the soul, or resurrection of the body, or any sin to be repented of in the regenerate, or any evil done by the outward man to be accounted sin, or denying that Christ gave himself a ransom for our sins, or shall affirm that we are not justified by his death and righteousness, but by the perfection of our own works or shall deny the morality of the fourth commandment, or shall openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of the ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy, or their lawful authority to make war, or to punish the outward breaches of the first table, or shall endeavor to seduce other to any of the errors and heresies above mentioned; ‘ — any such were liable to banishment.’ — History of the United States,” Vol. 4, chap. 12, par. 1, 2.

^{ft669} Backus’s “Church History of New England,”.

^{ft670} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft671} Backus’s “Church History of New England,”.

^{ft672} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft673} Besse’s “Suffering of the Quakers,.”

^{ft674} Id.,

^{ft675} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft676} Backus’s “Church History of New England,”.

^{ft677} Besse’s “Sufferings of the Quakers.”

^{ft678} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft679} “Beginnings of New England,”.

^{ft680} Id.

^{ft681} Id.

^{ft682} Id. This was not in any sense an expression of difference as to the teachings of the Quakers; because by discussion Roger was constantly

combating them. He wrote a book against them entitled, “George Fox Dugged out of his Burrowes,” and at the age of seventy-three he “rowed himself in a boat the whole length of Narragansett Bay to engage in a theological tournament against three Quaker champions.” — Id.

^{ft683} Id.

^{ft684} Besse’s “Sufferings of the Quakers.”

^{ft685} Id.,

^{ft686} Id.,

^{ft687} Id.,

^{ft688} Id.

^{ft689} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft690} Besse’s “Sufferings of the Quakers.”

^{ft691} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft692} Id., p. 169.

^{ft693} Id.

^{ft694} Id.

^{ft695} Id.

^{ft696} Besse’s “Sufferings of the Quakers.”

^{ft697} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”; “Beginnings of New England,”.

^{ft698} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”; “Beginnings of New England,”.

^{ft699} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft700} Id.

^{ft701} Id.

^{ft702} Id.

^{ft703} “Emancipation of Massachusetts,”.

^{ft704} “History of the United States,” chap. “The Place of Puritanism in History,” par. 5. In his last revision, however, this is softened into this: “The uncompromising Congregationalists of Massachusetts indulged the passions of their English persecutors.”

^{ft705} “History of the United States,” Vol. 1, chap. 12, par. 1, 2.

^{ft706} Trumbull’s “Blue Laws, True and False,” p. 83, with note.

- ^{ft707} Besse's "Sufferings of the Quakes."
- ^{ft708} Charters and Constitutions, Pennsylvania.
- ^{ft709} "John Wesley a Missioner to Georgia," by William Stevens Perry, D.D., bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Iowa; New York Independent, March 5, 1891, pp. 5, 6.
- ^{ft710} "History of the United States," chap. "Self-Government in Massachusetts," par. 22.
- ^{ft711} In Argument in Cincinnati Case, Minor et al. Bible in the Public Schools,".
- ^{ft712} Quoted by Stanley Matthews, Id., p. 242.
- ^{ft713} Quoted in Bancroft's "History of the United States," Vol. 3, chap. 7, par. 14-12.
- ^{ft714} Constitution, Article 6.
- ^{ft715} Id., First Amendment.
- ^{ft716} "Treaty with Tripoli," Article 2.
- ^{ft717} Charters and Constitutions, Virginia.
- ^{ft718} Baird's "Religion in America," book 3, chap. 3, par. 9-16.
- ^{ft719} Id., par. 21-23.
- ^{ft720} Blackly's "American State Papers,".
- ^{ft722} Id.
- ^{ft723} Id.
- ^{ft724} Bancroft's "History of the Formation of the Constitution," book 4, chap.3, par. 17.
- ^{ft725} Blakely's "American State Papers,".
- ^{ft726} "History of the Formation of the Constitution," book 5. chap. 1, par. 10, 11.
- ^{ft851} The reader will find these and many others like them in the "Proceedings of the faith National Reform Convection, "held in Pittsburg, February 4, 5, 1874, issued by the National Reform Association, and sold by the Christian Statesman Publishing Company, Philadelphia, PA.
- ^{ft852} In lending his name and influence to this Association, Mr. Street seems to have forgotten the experiences of his denominational ancestors in

New England under a government with which that which is now proposed by this Association is identical.

ft853 Dr. Fitzgerald has since been made a bishop a bishop of the methodist Episcopal Church South This makes the number of bishop vice presidents twelve.

ft854 Hon W.T. Harris United States commissioner of Education President Harrison's Administration.

ft855 There is an accommodated sense in which the word "morality " is used with reference only to men's relations to their fellow-men ; and with reference to this view of morality, it is sometimes said that the civil power is to enforce morality upon a civil basis. But morality on a civil basis is only civility , and the enforcement of morality upon a civil basis is the enforcement of civility, and nothing else. When such is the meaning, in the use of the term "morality," we may agree with all that is said of it, but never can consent to call it morality "Morality" is infinitely a deeper and a broader term than is the term "civility." The field of morality is much wider than that of civility, and in fact is essentially distinct from it; and this clear distinction should always be recognized and maintained. Again; the term "morality" has become, to a considerable exility, but a sort of sentimental, theoretical something that each theorist may have framed for himself, meaning much more than civility and infinitely less than morality But such usage is wrong. it comes down to our time from the time when the papacy was supreme, and when accordingly there was utter confusion of all things pertaining to the Church and to the State, of the civil and the religious; when, in short, everything was held to be moral, according to the papal idea of morality. And everybody who has looked into the history of those times, knows full well that under the papal dominion and in the papal system, there never was any such thing as either morality or civility.

ft856 See Symmachus, this book; and Pope Gelasius 1, A.D, 492 496, expressed it to the emperor Anastasius thus: "There are two powers who rule the world, the imperial and the pontifical. You are sovereign of the human race, but you bow your neck to those who preside over things divine. The priesthood is the greater of the two powers; it has to render an account in the last day for the acts of kings." — milman's History of latin Christianity," book 3 chap 1 par 30.

ft857 Let not the reader think that because this was spoken so long ago, it is

now out of date; for that Association has ever since been advertising and selling this speech as representative National Reform Literature, and unless the edition is exhausted, the pamphlet in which it is contained can be had by sending twenty five cents to the Christian statesman, 1520 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, PA.

^{ft858} While this chapter is being made up into pages, there comes the Christian statesman it May 28, 1891, giving an account of how “the Protestants and Roman Catholics united” at a recent election of the School Board of New Haven Conn., and secured the election of men who favored the restoration of religious exercises in the public schools of that city; and how that a committee of five, “consisting of three Protestants — Ex-President Woolsey of Yale, the Rev. Dr. Harwood, and Rev. John E. Todd — and two Roman Catholics — Fathers Fitzpatrick and Murphy — were appointed to arrange a form of worship” for the schools. The result was that a responsive exercise for teachers and pupils was framed, in which the following passage was to be recited between the Lord’s prayer and the “Apostles’” Creed: —
 “Teacher — Hall, Marry, full of grace; the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus!
 “Children Respond. — Holy Mary, mother of Go, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen.”

^{ft859} Christian Cynosure, November 17, 24, 1887.

^{ft860} The gentleman cannot have made this so very much of a study after all, or he would have known that Jefferson was not in this country at that time, and had nothing to do with the framing of the Constitution. Yet even though he had, it would only have been to his everlasting honor, and would have been no reflection on that document.

^{ft861} Senate Hearing on “Sunday Bill,”.

^{ft862} There is no such statement in the Bible.

^{ft863} “The-rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death, and banished the ‘Antinomians’ and ‘Anabaptists,’ not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violations of the civil laws. This is the justification which they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse !... So the defenders of the Inquisition have always spoken and written justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal.” — Baird, “Religion in America,” book 2, chap. 19, par. 14,

note.

^{ft864} Bower's "History of the Popes," Palagius, par. 6.

^{ft865} For record of cases see Appendix.

^{ft866} At each successive session of the legislature since, strong efforts have been made again to repeal this section.

^{ft867} Blakely's "American State Papers,".

^{ft868} "Government Chaplains," by Lorenzo D. Johnson, 1856.

^{ft869} Yet instead of allowing the institution to stand self-condemned upon his own positive evidence, and demanding its unconditional abolition, he advocated a "reform" that would be nothing less than a positive establishment of religion — he wanted a governmental examining board of clergy to pass upon the qualifications for all candidates for chaplaincies in the army and navy. As for chaplains for Congress, he wanted them taken in succession, a week each, from the settled pastors of Washington City.

^{ft870} Blakely's "American State Papers,".

^{ft871} Congressional Record, Fifty-first Congress, first session, p. 8,341.

^{ft872} *Id.*, p. 8,353. All the quotations in this division are from the same number of the Record; that is, the Congressional Record dated July 25, 1890, giving the proceedings of the 24th.

^{ft873} In the New York Independent of March 19, 1891, Janes M. King, D. D., who was present at Washington, working against the appropriations, describes "the most humiliating spectacle, to see representatives of sovereign States, as well as the representatives of districts,... give expression to their fears that their vote in accord with their convictions would prejudice their political future." The opposition succeeded in reducing the appropriations to the Protestant denominations by the sum of \$8,814, while in spite of all opposition, the appropriation to the Catholic Church was increased by the sum of \$6,392, for the fiscal year 1891-92. (See Independent February 12, 1871.)

^{ft874} The proceedings in both these hearings, are printed in full in the United States State Document, "Religion and Schools, Notes of Hearings," of above dates.

^{ft875} It is true that both Senator Blair and Senator Edmunds are now out of

senatorial office; but their influence in behalf of such legislation as this is not much lessened by that, except in the power to vote for it.

^{ft876} That this point not misplaced was made evident shortly afterward in Plainfield, N. J. The Pearl of Days, the official organ of the American Sunday Union, in March, 1889, gave the following statement from the Plainfield [N.J.] Times [no date]: "As a rule Plainfield, N. J., is a very quiet city on Sunday. Liquor, provision, and cigar stores are closed by the enforcement of a city ordinance. If a resident wants a cigar, he will either have it given to him by one of the many pharmacists who refuse to sell on Sunday, or he will go to the two dealers who are allowed to open their places on Sunday because they observe Saturday as their Sabbath. Some time ago a man of Catholic faith, who had an eye to Sunday business in that line, became a regular attendant at the Seventh day Baptist church. Eventually he asked to be admitted into the fellowship of the church. A member of the official board was advised that the applicant for membership was only working for business ends. He was closely examined by the church officers, and he finally admitted that he wanted to open a cigar store and do business on Sunday. The man appeared at the wrong place for aid in carrying out his mercenary purpose. He was not received into membership and the southern sentinel of Dallas we have an example of how the law can be evaded. Parties have leased the billiard hall of the new McLeod Hotel, and have stipulated in their lease that they are conscientious observers of the seventh day [though to the best of the common knowledge and belief they are not]; that, in consequence, their business house will be closed on Saturday, and will be open on Sunday."

^{ft887} Let us not be misunderstood in this. We do not deny the right of any person to keep Sunday. So far as earthly government, or any authority of mankind is concerned, any person has just as much right to keep Sunday as anybody has to keep the Sabbath. This is their right, and they are responsible to God only, for the exercise of it. What we object to is their assumption of authority, and their demand for laws, to compel anybody to keep it. Nor do we object to their doing this because there is no command of God for it. We would object just as much to their doing it, though there were ten thousand commands of God for it. No authority but that of God can ever of right enforce a command of God. Men are responsible to God alone for their conduct with respect to anything by him.

^{ft892} Christian Statesman, August 31, 1881.

^{ft893} Essays, “Von Ranke.”

^{ft894} See ~~<667B>~~ Revelation 17:5: “Upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.”

^{ft901} This savors strongly of the “breath of the Puritan” which Dr. Herrick Johnson so devoutly invokes.

PUBLISHERS NOTES

CONTACTING AGES SOFTWARE

For more information regarding the AGES Digital Library, whether it be about pricing structure, trades for labor or books, current listings, policies — or if you wish to offer suggestions — please write us at...

AGES SOFTWARE • PO BOX 1926 • ALBANY OR 97321-0509

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE DIGITAL LIBRARY?

The Library consists of books and other literature of enduring value to the Christian community. Our goal since the beginning has been to “make the words of the wise available to all —inexpensively.” We have had in mind the student, teacher, pastor, missionary, evangelist and church worker who needs a high quality reference library, one that is portable, practical and low in cost.

ON WHAT BASIS WERE THEY SELECTED?

Volumes in the Library have been added based on several criteria: usefulness, user request, breadth of content or reputation. This has meant that the collection is eclectic and may include works that contain positions with which we at AGES Software do not agree. This paradox is consistent with our design, however: any useful library consists of books on a wide variety of subjects and sometimes includes information for reference purposes only. The AGES Digital Library hopefully will reflect — as its components are released — the necessary breadth and depth for a solid personal library.

HOW WERE THESE VOLUMES PREPARED?

Most of the books and documents have been scanned or typed from works that have entered the public domain. Some have been reproduced by special arrangement with the current publisher or holder of the copyright. They have been put in a format that can be readily used by computer users everywhere.

ARE THESE EXACT COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL WORKS?

Usually not. In the process of preparing the Library, we at AGES Software have taken the liberty to make certain edits to the text. As we discovered

errors in spelling, certain archaic forms, typographical mistakes or omissions in the original we have done our best to correct them. Our intention has been to remove anything that might obscure the meaning or otherwise detract from the usefulness of a book for the modern reader. We have, however, attempted to retain the essential content and thoughts of the original — even when we found ourselves in disagreement.

WHY IS THE DIGITAL LIBRARY COPYRIGHTED?

While much of the content is in the public domain, the transcription, form and edits of these works took many people many hours to accomplish. We ask each purchaser to respect this labor and refrain from giving away copies of this or any volume of the Library without written permission from AGES Software. Our policy, however, is to work with each individual or organization to see that the price of Digital Library volumes not be a hindrance in their reaching the hands of those who need them. If price is an obstacle, please contact us at the address above and present your situation.