

He had a penetration, an understanding, combined with this was the very remarkable ability as a writer. He had been a teacher in rhetoric, as a writer and a speaker he was able to present his thoughts in potent language which were effective both to the church leaders and to the rank and file. And the result was that this influence came to spread through all the Christian world to a very large extent during his lifetime. And after his death it continued to be one of the greatest influences and has been up to this day. And there are those who consider Luther and Calvin as being merely men who revised the teachings of St. Aug. And it is true that there is a very very large amount of it in the stress of ~~S~~ Luther and Calvin which had been always given, ~~but~~ by St. Aug. and very strongly stressed by him. Though there are points which Aug. believed in and stressed, which they ~~very~~ strongly refused. And, of course, it is also true that in the Roman Catholic church there are tendencies and developments which we repudiate, which Aug. gave a big push forward to; and certain of his ideas have had a great deal of influence with them in pushing them in the direction in which they have gone. So that I do not think that we would consider him altogether consistent with our ideas, and yet not so very inconsistent. That is, the ideas were on different areas, certain areas of ideas, which ~~the~~ the Roman Catholics have taken, certain areas we have taken. We think that there is an inner contradiction between the two, but not nearly so great and so obvious as it would have been in any one particular area. But in each area he is quite consistent.

(question) I would say that the great bulk of his theology is accepted by Roman Catholics and by the protestants, but there are certain of his most stressed emphases, which the Roman Catholic church has more or less officially claimed to hold to, and yet ~~the~~ it has, in various ways, pushed aside and actually does not fall at all. And there have been groups, within the last four centuries, in the Roman Catholic Church, which have followed these emphases, which were the emphases of Luther and Calvin, taken directly from ~~the~~ Aug., and which have been ~~repudiated~~ repudiated for their emphases, by the Roman Catholic church and strongly persecuted for their emphases, but they have

never been claimed to be persecuted, the church has never claimed to be persecuted for following such things and say that they were misinterpreting it. "They would not admit that Aug. was wrong on some of these things.

(question) Well, the ~~the~~ Arminian controversy did not come until much later, it was the ~~the~~ Pelagian controversy. And we will go into that rather at ~~a~~ length. But the Roman Catholic Church has ~~not~~ held to a position on this in actuality. But they have never admitted differences. That is, they will claim that he is misunderstood, rather than claim a difference from him. But some of those groups within their church, which have adopted these ideas, have claimed to take them from him. And it seems to us that they are, very definitely. ~~It~~ We don't say that we agree with the way they are taken.

Well, Aug. is a man of such very great influence and such great importance that I would like to read you one or two quotations of how ~~highly~~ highly people have regarded him. Schaff's Church History has a very good section on him, and it speaks as follows of his confessions. The Confessions, which he wrote in the forty-fourth year of his life still ~~burning~~ burning in the ardor of his first love, are full of the fire and unction of the Holy Ghost. They are sublime effusion, which Aug. like David in the 51st Psalm, confesses to God in view of his own and succeeding generations without reserve the sins of his youth, and they are at the same time a hymn of praise to the grace of God which set him out of darkness into light and called him to service in the kingdom of Christ. Here we see the great church teacher of all time, prostrate in the dust, conversing with God, basking in His love, his readers hovering ~~before~~ before him, only as a shadow. He puts away from himself all honor, all greatness, all beauty and lays them gratefully at the feet of the All-merciful. The reader feels at every hand that Christianity is no dream or illusion, but truth and light, and he is carried along in adoration of the wonderful grace of God. That is a very strong statement of praise, on Schaff's part, for ~~this~~ this book called the Confessions of St. Augustine, which he wrote before the end of the century which we are now ~~are~~ studying. He wrote it in 398, when he was 44 years of age. ~~the~~ the part of his life which is greatest in importance

for Church History comes after this point, in the next century. But if he had done nothing else, than to write the Confessions, he would be remembered as one of the great characters of the ancient church. Even during his lifetime, editions of them were published, all over the Christian world, and since his time they have been ~~publixix~~ published over and over again, and translated into many different ~~axnguage~~ languages. ¶

Just to give an idea of how much they have been repeated, ~~xxx~~ in the years between 1475, about when printing began, and 1776, there ~~xx~~ were a multitude of separate editions, ~~xxx~~ of Aug. confessions, in Latin, Italian, Spanish, Portugese, French, English, and German, in ~~xxxx~~ those three hundred years before the American Declaration of Independence. And since that time there have been a number of new editions, and new translations, into various languages. Schaff says that the historical part of these confessions, to the tenth book, is one of the devotional classics of all three, and second in popularity only to the Imitation of Christ by Thomas Akempis, and Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress. He says, certainly no autobiography is superior to it in true humility and spiritual depth and universal interest.

Well Aug, then, in these Confessions, gives a picture which is addressed to God, praising God to his goodness to Aug. and ~~xx~~ ^{for} bringing him through the experiences he had, and leading him to a full knowldege of the grace of God, and confessing his sins and errors along the way, and his ~~xxxxxxx~~ describing the various events in his life in considerable detail. They are for us today used to our tablaid type of reading, some of it is a little slow, but not compared to most writings of antiquity. But along with the exhoratations and the prayers, the statements of adoration of God with which they are filled, there is a great deal of very interesting narrative, accoutns of his experiences, woth other people, and of his soul searchings, his thinking about various subjects. Of how he came to it until he was finally converted. His story of his conversion is quite a dramatic one, I of course read a summary of it in Foakes-Jackson. As you know he was a north African, went to Rome to study, and then taught in the land. And ofcourse, you know who the great teacher was

Milan

the great Christian leader, under whom he was converted in ~~the~~ Milan, and who had such a great influence upon him. In fact, it was ~~him~~ claimed later that some of the great hymns had been originally sung epiphany by Ambrose and Aug. together one after the other, there when he was just a young Christian. Whether there is anything to that, of course, we have no way of knowing.

Milan

But he went through those stirring experiences, in ~~the~~ Milan, when Ambrose was opposing the ~~his~~ efforts to have an Arian church established in Milan. And all of these things had a very deep affect upon him. In his own lifetime, he was a ~~great~~ great letter-writer, and people would write and ask his opinion on the most diverse questions. And ~~as~~ he would ~~write~~ write and go into them, and he would look at them from different ~~and~~ viewpoints, and give his answer, and his letters give us a wonderful ~~picture~~ picture of situations in his day and of his ideas as he related them all to his understanding of ~~the~~ Christianity. He wrote other books which were just as respected as his confessions, his influence is one of the greatest influences in Christian history.

(question) His hearing of the sermons of Ambrose and seeing Ambrose' life was a big factor in his conversion. Whether, humanly speaking, it would have occurred without that, we can't say. That that alone did it, is ~~not~~ certainly not true. There were other ~~as~~ very important factors, which entered in.

Well,, now, I think beyond that which you have read, and these words ~~about~~ about the confessions, and the brief reference to his early life, I think that we will leave now until we get into the next century. His early life had an influence on the church, but it was in the next century when he was active as a bishop, as an organizer, as a director, as a writer, and he carried on activities which in the last five or ten years of ~~this~~ this century were important, but which became ~~so~~ far more important in the succeeding years. And so we will keep further consideration until the ~~fifth~~ fifth ~~century~~ century.

I, St. John Crystostom. We ~~had~~ must include Cryst. in our outline, ~~because~~ because he is a character of great ability and outstanding influence and because his experience, here, gives us a picture of how the church, how things

were developing. I think it gives an interesting idea of why the church of Rome was able to go ahead and to receive quite the prominence it did, to see what happened to this godly bishop of Constantinople. ~~Constantinople~~ Constantinople was new Rome, it was the fifth time a city of even greater wealth than Rome. A city of even perhaps ~~g~~ greater influence now, although it didn't have the ~~history~~ history of course. It was only fifty years old. It had been followed by Constanine. But it was the great city of the ~~empire~~ empire. But the bishop of this city was overshadowed by the emperor, who was right in the ~~same~~ same city. And who, being ~~right~~ right in the same city, was apt to take a constant interest in what the bishop was doing, and what attitude the bishop was taking. And was apt to insist upon his own views and his own attitudes. The emperor, in the last five years of the fourth ~~century~~ century, and the ~~first~~ first few years of the fifth, Arcadia, whose wife took such a distaste to Crys. and was the cause of Crys.' misery, this emperor/ lived with the most extreme marks of putting him above everybody else. I will just read you a few words which Schaff quotes from a contemporary writer. He sayd, when Arcadius condescended to reveal to the public the majesty of his sovereignty, he was preceeded by a vast multitude of attendants, dukes, tribunes, civil and military officers, their horses glittering with golden ornaments, with ~~shields~~ shields of gold set with precious stones, and with golden lances. They procalimed the coming of the mperor, and commanded the ignoble crowd to clear the ~~streets~~ streets for him. (end of record)

Record 124

Distingusihed by shields with ~~fn~~ golden vases set round with golden eyes. And white mules with gilded trappings. The chariot was ~~xxx~~ set with precious stones, and ~~golden~~ golden fans vibrated with the movement and ~~cooled~~ cooled the air. The multitude ~~contemplated~~ contemplated of this as the snow white ~~cushions~~ cushions and the silken carpeting with dragons inwoven upon rich colors, those who were fortunate enough to catch a glimpse of the emperor beheld his ears loaded with golden rings, his arms with golden chains, his diadem set with gems. His purple robes, which with the diadem were reserved ~~for~~ for the

emperor. In all ~~times~~ their sutures, and rendered with precious stones, the ~~the~~ wondering people on the return to their homes could talk of nothing but the splendor of the spectacle. The robes, the ~~the~~ mules, the carpets, the silent splendor of the jewels. On his return to his palace, the emperor ~~was~~ walked on gold. Ships were employed with the express purpose of bring gold dust from remote provinces, which was strewn by the ~~official~~ officious care of the host of attendants, so that the emperor rarely set his foot upon the bare pavement.

Well, now, this just gives an idea of the tremendous way in which the emperor was exalted in Constantinople, ~~where~~ Well, now the bishop, in the same time, might be a great leader and an important man, as Crys. was, but if the emperor's wife took a distaste to him, it could bring about his downfall. The pope of Rome, be it said to his credit, at this time, in his disgust at the way the emperor treated Crys. ~~where~~ broke off all relations with the church of Constantinople and with all eastern churches which agreed with what had been done to Crys. And it was fifteen years or more before ~~relations~~ relations were reestablished with them. And by that time Crys. had died in exile, had been reestablished in memory of the great leader of the church, and his name put up in monuments in the ~~the~~ eastern church. But the ~~the~~ bishop of Rome was not overshadowed by a great dignitary in the ~~the~~ same town. He was the outstanding figure in old Rome, the city with the greatest ^{history} ~~history~~ of the empire, and one of the two or three ~~wealthiest~~ wealthiest cities in the empire. But Constantinople, though the bishop of Const., who would logically have become one of the most important men in the empire, he was so overshadowed by the prestige of the ~~the~~ emperor, and worse than that, by the interference of the emperor, from time ~~to~~ to time, that it meant that it gave the bishop of Rome a tremendous advantage, in comparison. Now that is one of the great reasons for our being fully aware of the tragic ~~history~~ history of St. Crys., one of the real Christians, and one of the great Christian leaders. One of the great fine influences, one of the great Christian speakers, and a man who in his life showed patience and humility and forbearance and

to a remarkable extent.

But the way he was treated by the emperor, simply showed the difficulty for the church in the eastern empire. It was not concluded by anyone as a persecution of the church, simply of the man. Another man who was archbishop, a man who the emperor chose with all the prestige which the emperor could give him, and it ~~was not~~ did not purge the church like the persecutions under the days when Christianity was the prescribed religion had ~~come~~ come. But it did make it difficult for good leadership, and for leadership to get anything like the recognition that it could get in Rome, where the emperor's seat had been removed. so many hundred and hundreds of years before.

Well, now, we won't spend any more time on Crys., it is very important, but you have studied it in Foakes-Jackson. Now, J, the Roman Church in the fourth century. The Roman Church in the ~~fourth~~ fourth century. I have stressed to you previously, the important events, the ~~importance~~ importance of the events in the history of the Roman church in the first, second, and third centuries. The history of the Roman church in the fourth century is a ~~history~~ history of a great deal of ~~details~~ details to it. We know much more about it than those earlier centuries. And it would ~~be~~ be very easy ~~for~~ for us to become confused in the amount of detail. I do not ~~want~~ want to do that. I want you to get an impression of the situation, and to get an ~~understanding~~ understanding of what is vital about it.'

Now, the first thing that is vital for us to know about, is that in this century, one of the greatest centuries in the history of the Christian church, a century in which the last greatest persecution of all took place, a century in which Christianity emerged as the dominant religion in the empire, a century in which it resisted ~~in~~ one of the most ~~insidious~~ insidious and powerful heresies in all history and come out triumphant, but the end of the century, a century in which there were great writers, ~~great~~ great speakers, and great leaders. Men like ~~Athanasius~~ Athanasius and Ambrose and Jerome. There were eleven bishops of the church of Rome, some of whom are very good administrators, some of whom stood rather bravely for what they believed to be right, some of whom through their

influence in favor of the right in the controversy about ~~xxxxxxx~~ Arianism. But no one of whom deserves to be mentioned as a leader or a character in even in the same bracket with a man like Aug. or Ambrose⁶ or Jerome or Athanasious, or St. Martin of Tours, or even St. Anthony or ~~p~~ Petomius. It is remarkable that in this great century in the history of the Christian church, the eleven bishop sof Rome contained no really ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ outstanding indivudal at all. Though they were men of a fair amount of influence. Every one of the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ bishops of Rome during this period is called St. by the Roman Catholic Church. It is interesting to go through alist of the popes as the Roman Catholic church calls them, as you know in early days that term was applied o all bishops. It is interesting to go through the list. I have a list here before me, in this book The Catholic Church ~~History~~ History. U^r to the present, Pope Pius XII, they list two hundred and sixty popes. Of those ~~xxx~~ 260 popes, the first 54, every one of the first 54 they preface his name with the ~~w~~ word saint. After that, they preface an occasional one with the word st. For a while there were practically none with the word st. But in the first 54 they call all of them st. Of the last 54 there is only one whom they call st. They are now talking of adding another one to the list, which will mean there willbe two whom they will call st. out of the lat 54. And they called all the first 54 st. The history of the last ~~xxxx~~ 54 is very fully known. Of the first 54, the first half are hardly known at all. But they are all given the title of St.

Now, it is interesting that the man whom they call St. Marcellinus, they recore as being bishop from 296 to 304. The next one they record as becoming ~~xxxx~~ bishop ~~f~~ of Rome in 308. There is four years when they don't list anybody as bishop of Rome. Does anybody have an idea why that might be? How many do, would you raise your hands. I said that Marcellinus was recorded as being bishopof Rome from 296 to 304 and the next bishop they record as bishop from 308 to 309. I am just azking how many ~~there~~ there are who would think up ax¹ reason why four years they would record no one as bisho of Rome. I would think everybody would immediately think that those were the years that there was the great persectuion under Diocletian. It began in 303, in the next year Marcellinus

~~xxxx~~ died. Or at least he stopped being bishop. And for the next four years, with that greatest of all persecutions, it is not at all strange that it would not be possible to select a bishop to succeed him.

Now, what about this Marcellinus, then? ~~Was~~ Was he one of the great martyrs of the Diocletian persecution. There have been bishops of Rome before who are distinguished for their martyrdom, many of them, because they were in the most conspicuous place in Rome, where as the persecution broke out the leader of the Christians in that place was apt to be the very one who would be seized first. This history, this church history, was written for people who will study and will read evidence against the Roman Catholic Church. Some things are explained or excused, but nothing that can be historically fully proven is denied in it. And statements are made ~~only~~ as fact only when the author feels that he can safely defend the statement. Now let me read you what he says about St. Marcellinus. He mentions him in connection with the end of the list of the popes in the third century. He says, St. Marcellinus began to rule just before the outbreak of the persecution under Diocletian. ~~100~~ 100 years after his death, a Donatus bishop in Africa ~~affirmed~~ affirmed that Marcellinus had denied the faith, but the truth of this report was questioned by St. Aug. There remains, however, a probability that during the persecution he did not behave with sufficient bravery to win the respect of the faithful. Now that is an interesting point to ~~take~~ notice. It is nothing against the Roman Church, that one of its bishops had failed in the persecution, that it would be said 100 years later that he had denied ~~that~~ the faith. We can expect in any church to have leaders who are good and leaders who are weak. But it is not what we would expect if the head of the Roman Church had been ~~divinely~~ divinely ordained to be the head of Christendom. We would expect, then, a man of different character, who had been selected ~~to~~ to this position, if that were the case.

Now, of these eleven bishops, who were bishops of Rome ~~at~~ during this period, ~~most~~ most of them I am not going to give you the names of. They are not figures of any great ~~importance~~ importance. ~~Note, St. Notus, bishop of Rome, who was bishop of Rome in the year 258.~~ Note, St. Notus, so-

called, who was the bishop from 311 to 314, is ~~not~~ not of outstanding importance at all, but ~~his~~ he is worth mentioning, because that was the time when Constantine assumed power in Rome. And according to later ~~tradition~~ tradition, Constantine had given the bishop of Rome most of Italy as a gift. This donation of Constantine was proven a 1,000 years later to be entirely a forgery. It is now guessed that perhaps he gave just a building, a fine old palace, and this writer accepts that view. He says that Notlety established the ~~ap~~ papal residence in the laterin palace, donated by Constantine.

The bishop who succeeded him. St Sylvester I, is distinguished by having been bishop for 21 years. It was a long period, 314 to 335, we have no reason to think of him as an outstanding character. I will read you what McSorley says, ~~St Sylvester I sent two priests to the Council of Nicea. And during his time at Rome witnessed the building of the Basilica, the Church of St. John.....(14) Legend, linking the pope with Constantine, added many imaginary episodes to this simple history. And a spurious document records the emperor's donations to Sylvester of this city of Rome and all the provinces and towns of Italy and the western land. In other words, he has a very simply history as far as history is concerned, and we have no reason to think he ever did anything of any special importance. But legend, later, made him cure Constantine of leprosy and do all sorts of things and receive wonderful gifts from Constantine, and five centuries later there were written a lot of.....(end of record)~~

Record 125

(question) There was no donation of Constantine, it is purely a legend which came later on. And Notlety, having only been bishop for about three years, and Sylvester about 21 years, most of the accounts later on were to tie it to the name of Sylvester. Nevertheless, since Notlety was actually the one there when Const. came, there would be some reason to suspect that if there had been such a thing, he might have been the one, and so McSorley ~~mentions~~ mentions it in connection with both of them. And I guess it is rather uncertain to tie it to, and in the legend it probably had two forms. Sylvester was

the greater bishop because he lived longer. He lived twenty years as bishop, but Notiety, McSorley actually said, Notiety established the papal residence in the lateral palace, donated by Const. Then, McSorley says, five centuries later traditions added many imaginary sources, and recorded the emperor's donation to Sylvester of the city of Rome and so on. And all this. So it is purely a myth, and yet there is the fact that Const. did give the lateral palace to the bishop. Which is ~~x~~ very likely, but to which bishop he gave it, no one knows. There is no proof. But we know the lateral palace ~~wasn't~~ ~~built~~ built them, because we know, because it was a pagan Roman building. At one time we know that after this time the bishop of Rome had it, so it is a pretty good guess that Const. gave it, but we do not know.

Well, Sylvester I, then, is worthy of attention, not because he ever did ~~anything~~ anything of importance, ~~but~~ but because of the legend that hung about his name in later years, and which did so much to strengthen papal power during the Middle Ages. And which would doubtless be quoted today as the strength of papal power if it were not for the fact that a papal secretary in the renaissance fifty years before the ~~reformation~~ reformation, proved the whole thing was a forgery. And at that time when the papal power seemed perfectly secure and there was no actual strong movement against it, it seemed perfectly safe to admit that it was all a forgery and ~~that~~ the powers which it had were not in the least bit affected then by the ^{admission} ~~admission~~ of the forgery. Of course, I don't say admission to the forgery as if somebody said, I admit it. I ~~am~~ made a forgery, nobody ~~i~~ knows who did it. There are even those who claim that there were those bishops in France trying to strengthen their power that made up all these things. ~~And~~ We just don't know who did it. But whoever did it, the popes in the Middle Ages did not hesitate to make a full advantage of it.

Now, one man we must mention, ~~was St.~~ ~~was St.~~ Liberius, who was bishop of Rome from 352 to ~~356~~ 366. And those include the nine last years of Constantius. Those years ~~in~~ in which Constantius was determined to make the empire Arian. And Constantius tortured many bishops and forced them to become Arians, and of course he did show his patronage to the Arians in such a way in the east, as

Jerome said, the empire woke up, rose to find itself Arian. Because ~~St~~ Constatnius just simply ~~changed everything~~ changed everything ~~as much as he could~~, he exiled all the bishops that held the orthodox view in the east, in the west it was further ~~xxx~~ away from it, and its power was not complete, the west was not given to ~~speculation~~ speculation on these points, but held to the simple statements of the Scripture, and Liberius, as the bishops preceeded him, supported Athanacious and held to Athanacious' views. Constantius exiled him. Now McSorley says of Liberius, we know little more than the two facts. That is interesting. We know little about these bishops of Rome. He says of him, we know little beyond this. Or the simple story was later embroidered with superstition. You don't say that is the first thing about Athanacious. You don't say it about Aug. or about Jerome. We know much about them. ^{They} were important in character. By their power of personality and their leadership, ~~people~~ people were interested in what they did, and there is a tremendous amount of material available about their history. But ~~the~~ the bishops of Rome at this time were not outstanding characters. And of Liberius we know little more than the two facts that he was exiled by the emperor Constantius for his refusal to condemn St. Athanacious, and that after his death his orthodoxy became the subject of long and fierce dispute. Various writers of the time, as McSorley says in the footnote, in quoting St. Jerome, it is learned that the ~~pope~~ pope was allowed to return from exile only after he ~~had~~ had ~~signed~~ signed an Arian creed. McSorley goes on to say, such an act under compulsion ~~would not~~ would not, of course, involve papal infallibility. A circumstance overlooked by many who have ~~attached~~ attached undue importance to the contrary. We don't know much about it, but the view of most protastants is that ~~Liberius~~ Liberius always held the orthodox view, on the person of Christ, and that after he returned to Rome he maintained it, at the end of his life, as he had in the beginning as a bishop. But right in between, when he was taken off into exile by Constantius and held there, in order to get back it seems to be a case that he did sign an Arian creed. Now did he sign it because of forgery, because of longing to return to Rome, because of pressure of some sort, without any pressure, simply because he wanted to

back to Rome. We do not know. We have very little about it. But it is very different from the martyr spirit of the men who faced the pagan emperors and died rather than deny Christ. For a man who signed a heretical creed, even if he didn't believe it, in order to get back to Rome. It is very different. And ~~xxxxxxx~~ we have weak men in every church that ever existed, and it is not ~~surprising~~ surprising that we would have it in Rome. But it does not fit with the ideal that the Bishop of Rome was in any way infallible or that he were supernaturally selected to be the leader of ~~Chr~~ Christ's Church.

Though Liberius is worth remembering for the claims that were made right at that time, in the next succeeding fifty years, that he had been heretical, that he had signed a heretical statement at least, whether he believed it or not.

(question) ...by infallibility, are you referring to their conduct and character) No. But if a man signs the creed you would expect his infallibility to extend to that surely.

(question) In other words the infallibility as claimed if you get them in a ~~big~~ hole, is a very mysterious thing which has practically no meaning. But with all the talk about the infallibility of the pope, the impression that is given and held is something far more than that. And it is, the impression, is very inconsistent with the idea of a man writing books, signing creeds, making statements, which were contrary to what is accepted by the Christian church. And so Liberius is well worth remembering in this connection.

Now, in connection with him, also, we see something of the situation which was developing in Rome. The Christian Church in Rome was now a very very large group. A large group with a great many people in it, and a great deal of wealth, and the bishop had a position of very great prominence. A strong pagan who was approached by the next bishop, Damasus, and tried to convert him to Christianity, ~~xxxxxxx~~ said to Damasus, make me bishop of Rome and I will become a Christian tomorrow. And with his statement, in view of the position and the standing and the wealth which had now come to him. Now, when Liberius was away, the Romans elected another man to occupy his place. McSorley says,

Constantius ~~xxxxxxx~~ placed the Roman archdeacon Felix on the papal throne. I guess we do not know for sure whether the Romans selected him or whether Constantius did. But any rate, a man named Felix occupied the position, and then when Liberius returned, after his rumored ~~repudiatedxxxxxxx~~ ^{repudiation of} ~~xxxxxxx~~ Athanasius, the emperor proposed that Felix should cooperate with Liberius in the govt. of the church. McSorley says, but the Romans shouting, one God, one Christ, one bishop, ~~xxxxxxx~~ and drove Felix from the city. And he lists, Felix II, 355 to 358, anti-pope. And there is an interesting thing. They had great ~~re~~ riots, twice, over who was to be ~~xxxxxxx~~ pope, ~~and~~ who was to be bishop. Felix or Liberius. But the next pope elected was one of Felix's supporters. And the supporters of Liberius were the ones who were in the minority, and were drivwn into exile and so their man is called anti-pope. And that, of course, is one thing about the papacy, that the papacy has usually ~~o~~ oscillated from one group to another, and that is one thing that has helped to allow it to become permanent. When a group has become strong, it is able to take it over, instead of opposing it. That is the thing, the oscillation of the papacy that we will find repeatedly in our history.

And right at this point I would like to say a little more about it, but I have to run now, so we will do that tomorrow at nine.....
break in record.

We were speaking yesterday about the Roman Church in the 4th century. If it were not for the work of the Jesuit order in the last four centuries, apart from which I believe the Roman Catholic Church would have died out long before this, but as a result of the ac/tivities of this order, which have resulted instead on this greatly increasing its power in many areas and becoming a vital and healthy force in the world today, in view of that, it is necessary that we note what is important about the history of the Roman Church. If the Roman Church had died out, the Roman Catholic Church, as I believe would have happened if it were not for the Jesuit order, if that were the case, we would pass over the Roman Church in the 4th century with a few words. We would say, there were many true Christians in Rome and also ~~xxx~~ many very wordly people. (end of record)

Record 126

But as it is, the claim as presented and believed by many highly intelligent people in the U.S. and in other parts of the world, that ~~this~~ God established his church upon the Apostle Peter, and that ~~through~~ to Peter Jesus Christ gave the power of complete and absolute control over the church. And that He gave Peter the right to be the authoritative teacher and director of the doctrine of the church and also of its organization, the absolute monarch over the church. We find no such claim made by Peter in the epistle. That is the present claim of the Roman Catholic Church. And then that Peter was bishop of Jerusalem, but that when he went to Antioch his power and control over the entire church went with him to Antioch and did not stay in Jerusalem. And then that he was bishop of Antioch for some years, but that when he left Antioch his power of absolute control over the whole church went with him and did not stay in Antioch. And then he went to Rome and was bishop of the Roman Church for a while, and that when he died his power of absolute control over the church of Christ went on to his successor as bishop of ~~Rome~~ Rome. And then that each succeeding bishop of Rome received this authority direct from Christ, to speak with the voice of Peter, as a representative of Christ, and to have absolute power to put down and raise up officials in the church throughout the world. And power to assert what is true doctrinally, and power to put out of the church any who do not hold what he declares to be the true doctrine. They claim that this power is ~~passed~~ passed on from Peter to the leader of the church. And any good Roman Catholic presentation will tell you that if the pope were suddenly ~~killed~~ killed, and the situation was left where there was a great catastrophe, the pope and ~~the~~ the cardinals were killed and removed, that the control of the universal church would then be a matter to be determined by the Roman Church, not by the church as a whole. That the bishops outside of Rome would have absolutely nothing to say about it. That it is the Roman clergy, the church of Rome that would determine who was to be its bishop. And the man whom they ~~selected~~ selected for this bishop, would be the man who would be the divinely ordained head of the universal church.

Now that is the claim which the Roman Catholic Church ~~makes~~ makes about the bishop of Rome. And it is the position which the bishop of Rome holds in the ^{the} Roman Catholic church today, theoretically. Actually it is the Jesuits, rather than the pope who determine most things. The pope does something that they don't like and they just ignore it. And they do what they think ~~is~~ is the ~~best~~ right thing to do, but it is always done in the name of the pope. And theoretically it is the pope who has the authority, this complete absolute authority over the church. During the Middle Ages they claim that he also had authority over all, that he could raise up and put down kings, as he thought wise. ^{And} he did it on various occasions. Today this claim is one which cannot be exercised over the ruler of any Roman ~~Catholic~~ Catholic country, to say nothing of the ruler of a protestant country. I do not believe that theoretically the ~~claim~~ claim has ever been given up. No attempt is made today to exercise it, because it would be absolutely impossible to do it.

But it is a view, which from almost any reasonable viewpoint, from any exegetical viewpoint, has so many weaknesses in it, that the ~~tendency~~ tendency of the average protestant is to ignore it and ~~say~~ say why should we bother about it. But it is a fact that ~~many~~ many an intellectual leader of our day, disgusted with the futility and barrenness of modernistic protestantism, is turning to the Roman Catholic Church for a voice of authority that ~~can~~ can give him an answer to eternal problems. And if this is not the voice of authority that can give that answer, we must be able to give a reason to understand the full situation. Now I do not say the way to deal with the Roman Catholic is to start arguing with him about the orthodoxy of the pope Liberius. I do not even say that the way to deal with the Roman Catholic is to start arguing with him about the primacy of Peter. I think the way to deal with the Roman Catholic is to get him in to read his Roman Catholic Bible. Which the Roman Catholic Church said, is God's Word, and is authoritative. And which the pope said he will receive a few days indulgence if you read. ~~Every~~ Every day, if you read fifteen minutes in the Roman Catholic Bible, you will receive a certain number of days indulgence from purgatory. Well, of course, you can get years instead of

days, by going to certain services. A much cheaper way of getting indulgences, than by reading the Bible.

Nevertheless, the fact that they say that, and that it is printed in the front of ~~xxxx~~ some of the Roman Catholic Bibles, gives answer to any ~~my~~ objection which a Roman Catholic may give to ~~read~~ the Bible. And it is not a good translation. We have better translations, but it is a good enough translation to show the ~~xxx~~ way to be saved, and it is ~~x~~ a good enough translation to show them the fact that the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are not founded on ~~Scripture~~ Scripture. I would say, do not say to a Roman Catholic, the doctrine of the mass, the doctrine of ~~xxxx~~ purgatory, these doctrines are not founded in Scripture. I wouldn't say that. I would say, take the Roman Catholic Bible and read it, and see what it tells you about how to get to Heaven. And see what it says about purgatory. And make careful notes on what it says about how to get to Heaven and what ~~ix~~ it says about purgatory. And if you will read it that way, if you will ~~x~~ take the Roman Catholic N.T. and read it through, and every day note down everything it says about how to get to heaven, and everything it says about ~~xxxx~~ what purgatory is, and ~~xxxx~~ how to stay out of it, or how to get out ~~x~~ of it, you will find that at the end of the time, when he has read it through, that he will have a whole notebook full of suggestions of how to get to Heaven, and if he has studied these ~~xxxxxxxixxxxxx~~ suggestions and reads the verses outlines, he has got ~~xxxx~~ salvation by faith very clearly. And that he will have a blank page where he was to put down what ~~ix~~ it says about purgatory, because it says nothing whatever about it, and yet the church today is talking about it all the time. I ~~wix~~ would say that that is the right approach to an intelligent Roman Catholic, and to any Roman Catholic the approach is through the Word and not through arguing. ~~x~~

Nevertheless, the time comes when it is necessary to go into these matters. There are situations where it is necessary and it is vital for your own understanding in dealing with them. And in dealing with situations which will arise wherever you are, to know the true ~~xxxx~~ situation on these matters. And the proof of it is in what the Bible says. If the Bible says that ~~the~~ Peter is absolute

authority on earth, Peter is. And there is no historical or philosophical arguments that could possibly upset it. And if the Bible says that Peter takes this authority to Rome and passes it on to his successors in Rome, that is true, but the Bible never says it. And no historical ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ or philosophical authority can possibly upset it. On a viewpoint of Biblical exegesis, those points can be quite ^{conclusively} ~~xxxxxxxx~~ proven to be unfounded. But that is not our purpose in this course. Our purpose is less vital, in this class, but it is nevertheless of real importance.

And that is to look at the historical situation ~~xxxx~~ and if you find that somebody says the Bible says that Peter is to be the head of the church and the Bible says that his successors will control the church, and then you say, look, here is the church that Peter founded. And here is the line of his successors, they have not all been great men, but most of them. They have not all been extremely godly men, but most of them have been extremely godly. The general run of the leadership of this church is such to make perfectly evident to anybody that looks at it that it stands above all other churches through the ages. Well, you say, I won't have to study that exegesis with extreme care. I look at it and say the Bible says that this by their fruits ye shall know them. ~~Kxxxx~~ I see their fruits, and of course if somebody can show me that the exegesis is false, then no matter how fine the church has been we must not stand by it. But you won't be terrifically worried about it if you have a certain amount of evidence from an exegetical viewpoint. You won't feel you have to go into it at great lengths, because of these clear proofs that are available to you. But if you find, on the other hand, that the claim is made that the church is to be like this, and then you look at it and you find a few godly men, many a mediocre, and some extremely wicked, you find a few great men, very very few, a great many men of fair ability, and a large number of extremely mediocre, you find doctrinally some who have had a very clear understanding of Christian doctrine, a great many who have ~~xxxx~~ had very hazy ideas, and some who have been absolutely false in their ~~x~~ ideas of Christian doctrine. You are very apt to say, by their fruits you shall know them, you can't know them by these

~~fix~~ fruits. There is no evidence here that would fit with what you would expect if Christ established this position to be the head of His church. And so it is important that we know what the history is on this point, that we see exactly what the facts are.

Now, it was in ~~1854~~ 1870, the Vatican Council, when the pope called a council of bishops from different parts of the world to rule on the matter of whether he was infallible. And the bishops who came from different parts of the world to this council, included men who were very very disgusted at the idea. And there were many very prominent Roman Catholic writers and defenders of the Roman Catholic position who were astounded and disgusted at the suggestion that the pope was infallible, and presented all sorts of historical arguments against it. Nevertheless, the pope's control of this council was sufficient that he was able to force through a statement that the pope was infallible in ~~an~~ official doctrinal utterances. And that statement was forced through, and then the bishops present were presented with the alternatives of signing it or being excommunicated. And practically every ~~the~~ bishop signed the statement, but some very prominent Roman Catholic ~~leaders~~ leaders left the church, ~~rather~~ rather than sign it. And since 1870, it is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, which no one can remain in the church in good standing without holding it. It is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that the pope is infallible in his official doctrinal utterances. Now, exactly what that means is hard to define. But there are many who know that it is so ridiculous that they try to define it in such a way that it drops it down to practically nothing. But it is only carrying to an extreme the position which the whole Roman Catholic Church has held since the council of Trent, the position that the pope is the authority in the church. The authority in doctrine. You can be an authority and not have every minute possibility of your statements be infallible. And the infallibility, of course, carried even beyond that. But we are interested ~~to see~~ to see, has the Roman Catholic bishops, have the bishops of Rome been on the right side in emphasis on doctrinal matters.

(question) That is a very important point. The Roman Catholic Church

does not claim a right ~~on~~ on the part of the council of bishops or on the right of the ~~pope~~ pope to make any new doctrine. They do not claim the right to make any ~~change~~ change whatever. They ~~insist~~ insist that whatever they say is not a new doctrine ~~by~~ but simply an ~~explanation~~ explanation of what the doctrine has always been, though not fully understood. They do not claim that the pope receives revelations from God which enable him to give new truths. They ~~claim~~ ^{claim} that they have a tradition, which has been passed on from the days of the apostles, which is just as ~~authoritative~~ authoritative as the Word of God, though no more so.....(end of record)

Record 127.

(question) I think that one ~~should~~ should say to a Roman Catholic, you are putting your faith entirely in a man, a certain human organization. You are putting your faith in ~~it~~ it. Now if that is correct, that thing you are putting your faith in, is correct, that is wonderful. But how do you know it is correct. Now maybe my lead is a better lead than your lead. All right, somebody will say, it is a blind leap in the dark. Well, I would say, all right if you want to take a ~~blind~~ blind leap in the dark, that is your privilege. But certainly you must recognize it that you are taking a terrific danger when you take a blind leap; suppose your leap is wrong. But suppose you suffer in eternal hell because you took a blind leap. Well, he say, but I know that I won't. Well, how do you know that you won't. The pope says so. Well, how do you know that the pope is right. Well, because my mother says so. How ~~do~~ do you know that she is right. Well, how do you know? Well, if you are just ~~going to~~ going to shut your eyes and say that I will take a leap, if it is a ~~leap~~ leap in the right direction, that is fine. But just suppose that it ~~isn't~~ isn't. Well, now, you certainly have to admit that there is some possibility you can't say, how do you know that it is the right leap. You just know. If you ever feel that it would be a little safer have a little more surety that your leap is right, why the church itself tells you that it is a good thing to read the Word. And the church has still said that ~~it is~~ it is explained in the Word of God. And it says that it is building its doctrine on the Word of God. But if you read it right, don't you,

think you will find your position strengthened. And you will be that much safer. Wouldn't that be a wise approach.

(question) According to them there is tradition which has been passed on and the pope will ~~xxxxxxx~~ be able to determine what is the correct thing, and where there is a question about it. And of course, as far as that is concerned too, any intelligent person, who says that the church says it, I ~~am~~ must accept it, will read a little bit of Romans 9, will find that there have been great differences among leaders in the Roman Catholic church. On many points. There have been very great differences. Very great differences of opinions, differences of attitude. And if these points are important. it is necessary to have some way of making a ~~xxxxxxx~~ decision. If it just here. an organization, I belong to the organization and I am saved by I know ~~xxxx~~ not what, well just look about you and see how much more saintly those lives of all the people belonging to this organization are. Then the people that belong to other churches. That is a pretty good ~~xxxxxxx~~ proof that it is a safe organization to trust to. Now, it isn't to disprove that they aren't but at least it is the proof that you can't ~~be~~ depend upon it.

I think it is very foolish to think that you can walk up to a man who has held a view all his life and is strongly set in it, and you can immediately disprove it. The minute you begin to try to do that, you put him on the defensive. And aside from his views, his faith is at ~~xxx~~ stake. He is not going to admit that you have proven his arguments. ~~xxx~~ But if you can plant the seed of questioning in his mind, and you can suggest to him the wisdom of studying the Scripture on which his church claims to be based, in the maintenance, and which it claims to interpret. If you can deposit a few seeds of question in his mind, even if he were to tell you the last thing he would think of doing was to read that book, because after ~~it~~ all the great church leaders read it why should he bother, when your back is turned, he might be reading it. It is the fact that ~~xxx~~ Paul plants and Apollos waters, and God gives the increase. But the person that you can walk right up to on the street and start talking to and completely change his whole viewpoint, is usually a person who the next day

meets somebody else who completely changes his view to something else. (laughter)

(question) I was speaking about some of the Jesuit leaders, on moral questions. On moral questions they say if they find that church authority that holds a certain view, I don't have to decide between the two views, I can simply ~~take~~ take the one I want. And that is the one of expediency. Not the way to determine truth, but it is a way to get an excuse for doing the thing you want. And not have to worry about what is happening. Now if all church authorities happen to agree ~~that it is wrong~~ that it is wrong to lie, I had better watch out. If I lie, I might land in Hell. But if I find one church authority who says that there are many circumstances under which a lie is all right, well it is not necessary for me to make a very careful study to see what those circumstances are, I know that there is sufficient evidence that perhaps I can be ~~safe~~ safe and go ahead. You see. It is an argument of expediency. Which is held in certain parts, but it certainly wouldn't be held officially by the church.

(question) There is a festival day in ~~the~~ commemoration of the assumption of Mary, which the Roman Catholic Church ~~has~~ has celebrated every year for at least six or seven centuries. They have celebrated the assumption of Mary on this particular day. Some in the church have said the body of Mary, after her death, that was taken up into heaven. Others may even have said that ~~she~~ she didn't die, but that she was taken to heaven ~~without~~ without dying. Others have said there is nothing to this. She ~~did~~ died like any other person. There were various attitudes on it. But there were many who said the body of Mary was taken up into Heaven. There were many that held to that for centuries, and there is a festival day ~~is~~ observed by most of the church, and has been for many centuries. Well, now, the pope said, would it be a good time to make a definite statement on this to clear up misunderstanding as to what the true doctrine is. So he wrote the bishops all over the world, and asked their advice. And some of them wrote and said yes, it is an excellent idea. Others wrote and said, we do not think this is a very good time to make such a pronouncement. But he announced the ~~figure~~ figure and said that the overwhelming

majority of them said that this was a good time to make such a pronouncement. And so he made an infallible pronouncement that the body of Mary had been taken up into heaven. But he did not claim to give any new truth, which was not known before, but simply to settle the uncertainty regarding the point which many had believed, and which he would ~~now~~ say that all ~~had~~ believed from the very beginning. I mean, that is his claim.

(question) I received yesterday a letter in a plain envelope, I opened it up and it said, A Mary New Year To You. And it is from the Roman Catholic Cathedral down on 13th and Market, it is a tract which they have put out, which declares the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. And it explicitly states do not get this confused with the Virgin Birth. The Virgin Birth is a matter of Jesus having been born of the Virgin Birth. The immaculate conception is that Mary was similarly born, without any sin attaching itself in any way to her from even before her conception. That is the claim of the doctrine which sprung up in the Middle Ages, and which has been claimed by the Roman Catholic Church ~~unanimously~~ unanimously now for many centuries.

(question) Ex-cathedra probably means speaking officially. And he certainly spoke officially as a man can speak on that occasion.

Well, we were discussing, now, J, the Roman Church in the 4th century. And we want to make clear that in the 4th century there were 11 bishops of Rome, who were men of rather inferior capabilities on the whole. Some of them may have been quite capable in an administrative way. ~~There~~ No one of them was ~~such~~ a man of outstanding Christian character as far as any evidence goes. Though, on the other hand, there was no one of them of whom we have any evidence that he fell into gross sin. ~~There~~ The first of them was reputed to have denied the faith in the persecution, but there is no proof that this is true. But it will be admitted that there is no proof that it is not. Liberius, in the middle of the century, was one of the more important because of the fact that for 14 years he was bishop of Rome. And he is important because of the fact that at the time many of the greatest ~~Christian~~ Christian leaders of the times strongly criticized him ~~for~~ personally. In a way which is hard to think of ~~such~~ such a

thing in the face of the fact that he was the supreme and authoritative head of the church. Jerome says of him, Liberius, worn out by the tedium of exile, and ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ subscribing heretical pravity, entered Rome as a conqueror. And later in another place, Jerome says, ~~thisxx~~ Bishop Fortunatus of Acrida is to be blamed because when Liberius, bishop of Rome, was ~~ix~~ enduring exile for the faith, he first solicited him and subdued him and compelled him to the subscription of heresy.

Athanasius speaks very very strongly of the perfidy of Liberius. This bishop of Rome. There was an Englishman, a century ago, named Numan, an anglican who joined the Roman church. ~~xxxxxx~~ Today in almost any college in the United States, you will find a Numan's Society, which is the society actively trying to interest young men in the college in Roman Catholicism. Numan, being the English clergyman who became a Roman Catholic, and later was ~~a~~ made a cardinal, ~~theyx~~ he is taken as sort of a symbol for them. Numan wrote a book on Arianism, and in this book he spoke of the scandalous fall of Liberius. He records it ~~a~~ as this miserable apostasy and he called him a renegade. Now, of course, those statements about Liberius were made by a man ~~before~~ before the bishop~~x~~ decided that the pope is infallible. Now, of course, someone might try to get around it and say that infallibility merely means that once in thirty or forty some queer feeling comes over you and ~~an~~ enables you~~x~~ to speak correctly. But, at any~~xxxxxxxx~~ rate, it is pretty hard to think of a man as an authoritative leader, one whose doctrinal pronouncements are absolutely dependable, and who has the right ~~a~~ to expel anyone who is doctrinally ~~was~~ wrong, if he himself signed an ~~heretic~~ heretical doctrine and opposes that which is true. (end of record)

Record 128

But after Numan had been made a cardinal, a new edition of this book occurred appeared in which these same words were still~~x~~ included. Speaking of Liberius as a renegade, and speaking of his scandalous fall and of his miserable apostasy. Now we are not concerned so much with whether there is such a thing as once in thirty or forty years something suddenly coming over a pope so that he can speak

absolutely infallibly then. We are concerned with the question of whether ~~Christ~~ established the bishop of Rome to be dependable and ~~authoritative~~ authoritative head of His church. And any such view find it difficult to explain the attitude of a man such as ~~Liberius~~ Liberius, here. I don't think that he was a wicked man, but I say that he was a weak man. And I say that in his doctrinal statement, is that which was absolutely contrary to the faith of the church. Not only that, ~~probably~~ probably contrary to that which he himself believed, which makes// it, I think, all the more worse.

Now, Liberius, while he was away, there was an archdeacon who was put in his place. And there is some question now as to whether the clergy of Rome elected ~~him~~ this leader in the church under him to be his successor, when he was away, or whether the emperor put him in. I don't know ~~how~~ that we have proof of it. But this man acted as bishop during several years when Liberius was in exile. And when Liberius came back, he didn't want to give up the position ~~of~~ of bishop, and so ~~the~~ Liberius wanted to take it over again, and this man and his followers wanted him to have him continue as the bishop. And in the lists of popes today, they mention this man as Felix II, anti-pope. But you will find books which will tell you that through the Middle Ages ~~he~~ he was included in the list of the popes. And that he was included even as a martyr. Today they tell you that is a different Felix, who was a martyr. The evidence isn't altogether clear on it. But a very interesting thing is that when Liberius died, in 366, the Romans elected as his successor, a man who had been one of his opponents, and one of Felix's strong supporters. And this man named Damasus, had been a strong supporter of Felix. Who had been such a strong opponent of Liberius. And many of the supporters of Liberius were against this ~~Damasus~~ Damasus, and they supported a man, a friend of the former bishop, called ~~Ursinus~~ Ursinus.

And the thing came to a terrific ~~no~~ riot. And there was a very great riot, a very great confusion about the matter, which actually(4) and many people were killed. And Ursinus was driven out of Rome with fighting and with bloodshed. Ursinus, the man who had been the supporter of the previous bishop.

And Damasus, who had been the opponent of the previous bishop, his men were stronger and more terrible and won out in the fight, and he ruled as bishop for the next 18 years. And the position was one which ~~a~~ carried a lot of money with it, and much power, and was very much desired. But the peculiar thing is how today, according to the Roman ~~Church~~ Church, Liberius was the great authoritative leader, Felix was an anti-pope, and then the supporter of Felix became the great authoritative leader following him, and the supporter of Liberius became the anti-pope. There were hundreds of people killed, in the fighting over who would be the succeeding bishop.

Now this Damasus was a very headstrong character, a very brutal sort of fellow evidently, but he had one very good point about him. He ~~had~~ had the good judgment to recognize the abilities of St. Jerome. And he got St. Jerome to come to be his secretary and he stimulated Jerome into beginning the translation of the Vulgate. But otherwise, he does not seem to have been a man of any outstanding goodness. And when Damasus died, he was succeeded by Ceritius, a man of very different views, a man who looked with hostility on Jerome, and Jerome found it wise to leave Rome and go off to Palestine.

(question) You see, that is the peculiar thing about it. Is whoever wins out, whoever gets the majority vote, whoever becomes the bishop, he is the ~~authoritative~~ authoritative leader. Now, from a human ~~viewpoint~~ viewpoint, it must be ~~a~~ said that it is one of the things that has contributed to the continuance of the power of the bishop of Rome. That it ~~has~~ has not been possible for a man permanently ~~a~~ to set up a dynasty, or to keep his friends in power. No bishop, no pope has the right to say who his successor is going to be. He may speak with absolute authority on doctrine, he may remove any bishop in the church, he may excommunicate any bishop in the church but he cannot, once he is dead, his authority comes to an end, and he has not a single word to say about who is going to be his successor. And it has occurred repeatedly, even in recent years, that a man who has been one of the strongest enemies of the pope has become his successor, It has happened often, even in recent years. And the result is that there is a sort of alternation on it. Like in those

days. When you had Liberius in power, and then you had one of his great enemies in power. And then you had one of Damasus enemies come into power. And this alternation has meant that the organization has gone on, even though parties within it have lost out for a ~~time~~ time, and then have come back. And it has been its strength.

(question) No, the pope has not always been. There have been times when two men have claimed to be ~~pope~~ pope. There was one ~~time~~ time when there were three. And a church council did away with all three of them and appointed a new one. But the Roman Catholic Church gets ~~around~~ around that by ~~apparently~~ claiming that one of the three was the real pope. And he ~~abdicated~~ abdicated and that the cardinals really elected his successor. But the fact is that the council had to do it. There have been other times. Now there was the time of Damasus and Ursinus. Each claimed ~~to~~ to be bishop of Rome. And they had a ~~battle~~ battle, and one side won out. And then the Roman authorities said, we have got to have peace here, and this one who lost out, they exiled him from the city.

(question) Well, ~~if~~ if the pope is the authoritative head of Christendom I don't see ~~how~~ how you can get around ~~the~~ the conclusion that they must be divinely led in their selection. There is no way out of it. I mean, that is what they must believe, and it is peculiar to know just how they are divinely led in it. And the method of selecting the pope has varied through the ages. Until finally it became fixed. It is the Roman Clergy that elects him. Now one who is not a clergyman of a church in Rome has ~~no~~ any authority ~~to~~ to determine who ~~is~~ the pope is to be. And next week I may ask you, at the beginning of the hour, since it is only the Roman clergy who has any voice in determining who the pope is going to be, how has it come about that arch-bishop Spellman of New York will cast a vote for the election of the next pope, if he is still living at that time. Well we will meet again next Wednesday morning.
(break in record)

Some call him Augustine and some call him Augustin~~e~~. There was a professor in Princeton Seminary, ~~thirty~~ thirty years ago, and a student asked him whether it was Augustine or Augustin. And he said, ~~St.~~ St. Augustine is in

Florida, and St. ~~Aug~~~~xxx~~~~Aug~~~~xxx~~~~Amf~~ Augustin is in Heaven. I don't know whether that is correct. After all, the Latin pronunciation was Augustin^a, and if you are going to put that into English I don't know why Augustine isn't as good as Augustin. The pronunciation seems to differ pretty broadly. The city of St. Augustine was certainly named after him, and why one should be St. Augustine and the other S^a. Augustin, I don't know. And so I have not come to a solid conviction on that point, and I am ~~af~~~~ra~~~~id~~ afraid that my practice is rather inconsistent. It probably would be better to come to a solid consistency in the way you say it. St. Augustin or St. Augustine. But actually you will hear it said both ways and you want to understand it. So I don't know as it makes a great deal of difference. He never spoke English and nobody in his day called him by either of these two names. It is like the time in Germany when I went into a barbershop and a man said, oh, here comes an American, he can settle it for us. They were talking German. And I said, what ~~ix~~~~ix~~ is the ~~argu~~~~ment~~ argument? Well, they said they were having a big argument over how you pronounce the name of those big falls you have in America. Which is correct, Neeagaaara, or Neeagara? And I told them Niagara, and they looked very ~~pu~~~~zz~~ puzzled. (laughter) To Germans, Niagara just doesn't make sense. And it is the same way with the Latin. We have to anglicize them some way or other, and it ~~x~~ doesn't make too much difference how we do it, just so long as it is intelligible, and of course ~~ex~~~~er~~~~ix~~ if there does come to be a ~~so~~~~lid~~ solid agreement on ~~pr~~~~act~~~~ice~~ practice, then it is good that we concede to it. But on this one, there are the two forms in use.

But though we discussed his early life briefly, though not much because I can ask you to study it, I didn't see much point in simply repeating what you could just as well read in books. ~~x~~~~men~~~~ix~~~~ha~~~~re~~~~x~~ You all, I hope, of course, mentioned the most common person in ~~x~~ connection with the early life of Augustine. Everybody should know of his relationship to Augustine. That is St. Ambrose. And I trust that nobody forgot to mention him. (laughter) In the other people, in connection with his early life, one of them is a person who is well remembered in the church ever since. And I did ~~not~~~~think~~ a little instead of

asking this question, that I should ~~k~~ just ask you to tell me who was the person after whom the California city of Santa Monica was named. But I didn't do that. She is, of course, not nearly as important in Church History as St. Ambrose, but she is well known for what Augustine tells us of her in his Confessions, and ~~that~~ evidently her very godly life, and he tells us very definitely that she went to church, I think every day, and she did not go for the purpose of gossiping. Augustine tells us that. And he tells ~~us~~ us many fine things about her character, and ~~he~~ she is highly revered in all branches of the Christian Church ever since. But of course she is not a character to be important in her own right in Christian ~~hist.~~ hist. as St. Ambrose. He is not nearly as important as St. Aug. but very important, and it is important that we know the relationship between the two men.

The other people of whom you have three or four very prominent in the account of his early life are not of importance except in ~~their~~ their relation to him. And it certainly is important that you remember the ~~relationship~~ relationship to him with them, their names are not nearly so important as these two. But only a week after the assignment, I trust that any one of you could name five or six ~~people~~ people who were important in the early life of St. Augustine. But I hope that you didn't leave St. Ambrose out.

We now, we got to H, and then we did not study I, St. Crysostum, because you had already done it in the assignment, and I merely pointed out what it indicates, the development in that day. In the east you had the empire overshadowing the church. On the west you had the church overshadowing the civil officials, as a result of ~~the~~ various things that happened. One of which was the removal of the main seat of the empire to Constantinople. And the difficulties that came into the Bizantine empire, the Bizantine church, to some extent can be due to this, and ~~also~~ also the great step forward that the Roman Church made in ~~its~~ its pretentions, which never were recognized.....(~~end~~ end of record)

Record 129

Now let us look at the fifth century. And 5, instead of calling it the 5th century, you can call it the first half of the 5th century. And perhaps

it might be wiser to that. But I wouldn't care to ~~h~~ give a whole 6 to the last half of the 5th century. It is an interesting thing, the first half of the 5th century is one of the most important eras in Ch. Hist. It ~~is~~ one of the eras in which we have constan activity, thriving life, interesting deveopments, results attained that have affected the whole~~xxx~~ Christian Church ever since. And the period from 400 up to 451 is just as important as the period from 300 to ~~###x~~ 400. It might even be considered in some ways more important, than many parts of that period before. ^It is not as important as a whole as the previous century, but it ~~perh~~perhaps is two-thirds as important as the whole previous century. But you get to the middle of the 5th century, and ~~xxx~~ with all this tremendously important material from the 1st half of the 5th century. In the last half you have practiaally nothing. You have practically nobody of any importance in Ch. Hist., you have hardly any development of importance in Ch. Hist. in the last half of the 5th century. You can almost cut it with a knife right in half.

I told you, I believe, at the beginning of last year, that many people say the middlle Ages start at 800 A.D. Others ~~axxxx~~ say it may start at 600, I siad for our purposes in Ch. Hist. and I believe properly for any prupose, it would be wiser to start the middle ages at 451. And I noticed an interesting evidence of it. Here is Schaff's history of the Christian Church. It is a bit old now, 50 or 60 years old. But Schaff did a very extensive ~~pie~~ piece of work and there is not a great deal to do on these periods ~~whi~~ with which he deals. And so this history which goes up to ~~i~~ nearly 1600 AD is about a dozen volumes. It is a very excellent source. It has very splendid presentation of the great bulk of the facts in this~~pxrx~~ period. Well, now, this volume, here, is vol. 3 Nicean and Post-Nicean Christianity, 311 to 600. And if you are interested in special study of this period, I don't know of any better book than this on the period. There are points on which he is much too sketchy, and there are things which he goes into in great ~~inght~~ length, which would be of little interest except ~~st~~ to a specialist in those particular fields. It has its limitations. But it is a very good book, and the subjects he does go into I think he ~~xxx~~

handles very well. It is a very valuable thing. But what I mention it for right now is that this volume he ~~entitles~~ entitles Church History A.D. 311 to 600. And you ~~find that the book has got in it over a thousand~~ find that the book has got in it over a thousand pages. And out of those thousand pages about fifty is devoted to a discussion of the church buildings and the church music and ~~different~~ different things in general. Which we assume were the culture, the church culture of the period as a whole.

(question) I asked Mr. Watson to count the pages for me and his count was different from my recollection. So I will tell you what he told me. He told me that out of about 500 pages, there were about 50 pages which dealt with general culture. And then of the remaining 480 pages, out of those there were 30 pages which dealt with the period from 450 to 600. The last 150 years. And all the rest all ~~the~~ of forty pages, out of nearly 500, dealt with the first 100 years. Now you see what the situation means. Now, my ~~copy~~ copy here, he did it in a library copy, I believe. My copy has a 1,042 pages, instead of 500 pages. ~~And~~ And my observation of my copy, though I haven't counted the pages, would be a guess about ~~what~~ like what he said. I would ~~be~~ be very much surprised if out of these 1,000 pages you will find over 30 pages that are dealing with ~~events~~ events or men who were active during the last ~~of~~ half of the period. Well, now, that is a very interesting thing. Take a book, whether 500 pages, or 1,000 pages, take a book entitled 311 to 600 and out of those 300 years have over nine-tenths of the book dealing with the first 150 years. It is a startling thing. It shows you that the last 150 ~~years~~ years are years of you might say stagnation. As far as church hist. is concerned. Now that is not altogether true, because he ends this volume at 600 and he starts the next on with 590. And the next one has quite a bit ~~to~~ to say about those ten years. And it goes back some, into some events just before ~~that~~ that aren't mentioned here. But the fact is the ch. hist. after 450 ~~is~~ is altogether different from ch. hist. before 450. And the secular history after 450 is altogether different from secular hist. before 450. And the reason for that is because certain ~~developments~~ developments which began as early as the time of Christ, or a ~~little~~ little earlier, gradually increased to the point where you might say it is like a dam that has water

pressing against it. And it presses against it and it ~~becomes~~ becomes weaker and a little water ~~trickling~~ trickling around the side, and you see that for a period of a century or more, and then all of a sudden you reach the point where the dam breaks. And that happens at just about 400, the dam broke. And when the dam broke, the result was that you have a whole series of new ~~events~~ events, and new situations, which come ~~and~~ and which completely overshadow the previous situations. It is almost as if an old civilization was wiped off the map and a new one takes its place. And the new one that came in to take its place had to get settled and established and that took a period of a few centuries. So that the period between 450 and 800 a period of 350 years, is a period of which we know very little. We have legendary things, and we have accounts of certain things, and we have very long ~~gaps~~ gaps, and the first part of this gap is the last 50 years of this period.

Now, from 450 to 500 in the eastern empire, ~~life~~ life is going on just about as it was before, and so most of what we have to learn about this century relates to the area around Constantinople. But the Roman Empire, which had been such a thriving center of life, the western half is just inundated at this time. And so these fifty years from 400 to 450 are a continuation of what precedes. Tremendously interesting, and tremendously important, but then you just have the sweeping over of an entirely different thing and it is cut off. And these 50 years, from 400 to 450 are more important in their relation to us today than they are in relation to the ~~history~~ history from 500 to 600. They have more effect upon us today than they had in the ~~period~~ period from 500 to 600. They ~~are~~ are tremendously important to the whole Christian world today. But in ~~between~~ between, or right after that time, comes this tremendous overturn, which results in such a complete change that though their influence was right through the Middle Ages, it took quite a while to get it established and to get going, ~~and~~ (9) So that you see why I have attempted to speak of the first half of the 5th century. Of what you will know about the 5th cent. when you finish this course, 99% will be of the first half rather than the last half of the 5th

cent. And the ~~xxxxxx~~ chances are that maybe you won't remember anything about the last half of the 5th century, but I trust that you all will remember a great deal about the ~~fixx~~ first half. ~~ixx~~ (laughter)

It was the flowering up and the development to its highest point of the great movement of the Christian Church which have been ~~x~~ coming on before this time. But then they are swept over, the tide and the sea breaking the dam. It was a time of great slaughter and great changes coming tremendously important for the Christian Church. But then it is covered over with a ~~blanket~~ blanket, and some of you will spend a good deal of time on this first half of the ~~xx~~ century, not as much as I would like to~~x~~, and I could well spend the rest of the semester on it. ~~It~~ would like to. I want to get up to 1400 ~~by~~ by the end of the semester, which ~~gives~~ gives you an idea how much faster we are going in that later period, a period which is ~~tremendously~~ tremendously interesting, but comparatively of little importance for us today. While this particular period is of very great importance in ch. hist. today.

Now, then, we will mention as A, the political events of the first half of the 5th century. And this particular period, these fifty years, are different from any fifty years that preceded and there is no following fifty which is quite like them. /those years later have more similar to them in this regard than the previous years have. I mentioned the figure of a dam. It was the population increased in northern Europe which constituted the pressure on the dam/ North of the ~~Danube~~ Danube River, where the Germanic tribes lived, uncultured, ~~uncultivated~~ uncultivated, unlearned, addicted to drunkenness. But very different from the Romans beneath in that they had a strong ~~belief~~ belief in the sanctity of marriage and in moral decency in personal life. The Romans had no such conception, the Germans seemed to have been very strict on this. Until after they conquered the Roman Empire, and loose and lax Roman ideals of ~~xx~~ morality came into the Germans from the people they conquered, and Germanic life, while it still is regarded as probably ahead of most other countries, is nothing like what it was just before it came in contact with the Roman Empire.

Well, the lax moral life, which was characteristic of the Roman Empire

beginning a little before the time of Julius Caesar, and continuing on, ~~xxxxxxx~~ meant that the population was never increasing in the south ~~ix~~ the way it was in the north. Now, among the Germanic tribes, the population was constatnly increasing and there was pressure to expand. They would get too crowded for the area that they had, and they would group of them would say let's pick up and go where we can find a place to live where we own't be in the other people's way. And we find as early as fifty years before the time of Christ, we find two large tribes with thousands of peopæ ~~xxxx~~ in them, Germanic people, headed south and got clear into northern Italy before they were stopped. And Julius Caesar met them with an army and completely destroyed them. And Julius Caesar met a Germanic army up in ~~xxxxxxx~~ France and had a great battle with them in which he marched across the Rhine and he held the barrier there at the Rhine River against them.

The Germanic tribes were never conquered by the Roman Empire, but during the next three or four hundred years, constatnly individuals from among them were ~~xxx~~ coming into the Roman Empire and being received. Usually coming in as soldiers, and then after a time leaving the army and becoming Roman citizenz. So by this time there ~~x~~ were many people of Germanic blood in the empire. But at about 350 or a little after, a group of Tartars, from central Asia, who were known as the Huns, ~~xxxx~~ people who rode small horses, and rode very fast on these small horses, who seemed to have been very brutal, in theri activity. These group of ~~xxx~~ people called the Huns. I don't know ~~xxxx~~ why the ~~xxxx~~ country of the Magyars came to be called the Hungaria, the ~~N~~ Hungarians had no connection with these early Huns. They are a distinct people altogether that came later. But these people called the Huns came and ~~xxxx~~ attacked the Germanic tribes from the rear, and the result of the pressure on the rear was that it increased the pressure to move ~~xxxx~~ forward for the Germanic tribes, and greatly stimulated them. And it was much easier to face the Roman Empire with its generalculture and refinement and lack of physical power than to face the brutality and ~~xxxx~~ ferocity of these tribes of Huns attacking from the rear. (end of record)

Reocrd 130

Ulfilas had been in the Roman Empire and had converted to Christianity and he went back north of the Roman Empire and converted the Goths to Christianity. And what he took with him was Aⁿianism. ~~Arianism~~ Arian Christianity, and he made a system of writings for their language, and he translated all the Bible. Except the book of Kings, which he said he would not ~~translate~~ translate because they were too warlike already and he didn't want to give them any more.

~~Wifix~~ (question) Yes, that is a very good ~~q~~ question, and I would say that it is a very vital one for us. I would say this, that Arianism was a system of belief which struck at the very foundation of Christianity and which carried on logically would mean the utter destruction of Christianity. And therefore I would say that a theologian who took Arianism and taught it would be moving ~~a~~ in a direction~~xxxxix~~ which eventually would mean the end of Christianity. But nevertheless, I would say that the Aⁿian view, which though it denies the basic thing of the deity of Christ, ~~thatxxxxix~~ nevertheless that Christ was before the creation of the world, and by him that God created the world, that He was the first of all created beings, it gives tremendous honor, tremendous importance to Christ, it is a system which a ~~xxxxix~~ simple ~~Christian~~ Christian may hold, without his personal faith being ~~k~~ injured. And therefore I would say that there might be many ~~xxxx~~ very real Christians who held to Aⁿian views. But that if these people became teachers, and leaders, within a period of not many decades, the ~~xxxx~~ church of which they were ~~leadingxxxx~~ leaders and teachers would eventually end up in pure paganism. That is what I believe. Therefore, it is a very dangerous heresy, but not one which necessarily would mean that the simple Christian who held it was wrecked as far as his own personal Christian life was concerned. So that I believe that there were some very ~~xxxx~~ fine Christians who were ~~xxxx~~ Aⁿians. But I don't think they were leading thinkers. If they had been leading thinkers it would have meant the end of Christianity. Arianism was destroyed in the Roman Empire in the 4th century. But the fact ~~that~~ that the Germanic tribes~~that~~ that conquered the Roman Empire were Arians, established a ~~xxxxxxx~~ bond between~~t~~ them and the

Christian of the empire. And resulted in their not being the close association between them, each considering each other the heresy. And there might have been/ And it resulted in the fact that when these people, in time, these people ~~became~~ became more educated and more understanding, received better Christian teaching than if they gave up their Arianism, and Arianism disappeared, but also these people disappeared as real leaders. And on the other hand, it was a ~~tribe~~ tribe which came into the empire, utterly hated, which was converted to Christianity which was truly Christian in its beliefs and in its theology. But they were not as truly converted as the Arians. That is, they received a very ^{degenerate} ~~degenerate~~ sort of ~~Christianity~~ Christianity but ~~theoretically~~ theoretically it was correct. And the result was that the succeeding generation was ~~trained~~ trained in a more direct theology received the support and assistance of the Christians of the Roman Empire. And they became the leaders, and that is how the Frankish tribe came to come out on top of the Germanic tribes. And the western part ~~of~~ Europe came to be called France. It was on account of the fact that they hadn't been reached by Ulfilas and been converted like the others had. Well, we will look at that a little more in detail later. ~~But~~

But these Germanic tribes, these Gothic tribes, about ~~the~~ 360 ~~and~~ said to the Roman Empire, can you let us into the empire. Here in Rumania, what we call today Rumania, south of the Danube, in that area, there is ~~a~~ large section of land with very few people in it. Here are we, thousand of able bodied men, with our families, why not let us come in and we ~~will~~ will become Romans, we will support your empire, we will stand with you, ~~and~~ and we will take over this land and we will cultivate it. And with the forces behind them, the ~~situation~~ situation was that the Romans did not let them in they would probably come in by force. And it would be a helpful thing for the Roman Empire, anyway to have them in, and so Valens, the emperor said fine. Come on in, and he sent Roman officials on up there to ~~bring~~ bring them in. And the officials came, and they were bringing them in, everything in peaceful fashion, and then these officials saw a chance to get some graft, ~~and~~ and so they began ~~grafting~~ grafting

grafting and mistreating these people who were coming in, and the result was that they finally got so disgusted that they flew to arms. And the ~~situation~~ situation then was that the people could do nothing to hold them down and a hurry-up call came to Valens and he rushed up there with an army and met them and was utterly defeated. And so the western Goths settled in the empire, after having ~~been~~ utterly defeated Valens and killed him. And Theodo~~ci~~cius, the new emperor, in a period of eight or ten years, succeeded in beating them in a few battles, and then in making a just peace with them, and giving them a section of the empire where they would be decently treated, and they ~~x~~ became a part of the empire.

And it is impossible that they might have settled down and been a part of the empire and that would be all that there was to it, if it were not for the fact that behind them there were other tribes pushing, still, and the Huns behind them. And then the Roman Empire was weakened. And so within the period of the next 20 years, this proceeded to such a point that at about 400 the western Goths began moving. And the eastern Goths come in in back of them, and then another group called the Vandals, another Germanic tribe, and various other Germanic tribes came into the empire and began trying to take over various sections. Now, the name Vandal has become to mean someone who ruthlessly destroys. But it is an interesting ~~the~~ thing that though the tribe known as the Vandals rightly received this reputation, it was not a characteristic of individuals, but the particular situation in which those people came. At least into which the leadership of this particular group came. Because one of the Vandals had become a member of the army of the western empire, the western part of the empire, became a leader in it, and actually was a Roman general who held the Germanic tribes in check for ten or fifteen years. A Vandal general. And evidently a very fine man, in everything you hear about him.

Well, now, right at this point, I should mention the death of Theodocious in 395. We dealt at considerable length with Theodocious. Theod. death is called by most historians the time of the division of the Roman Empire into eastern and western. This is a very peculiar title for this reason. The Roman Empire had been divided by Diocletian into four parts. But then Constantine

united it. And after Constantine's death it was divided among his sons into three parts, and when one died into two parts. And then it was united again. Valentinian divided it, but he had the west and Valens had the east. It was divided then. Theodosius had the east, and then Theod. united it, and it was only for about five years and it was united. And then when Theod. died it was divided between his two sons, and it was never again united. So 395 most historians say, is the division of the Roman Empire. Well, actually, it was divided a whole century earlier. It was divided by Diocletian. But Diocletian's theory was that it was one empire, simply with two Augustines. One empire. Const.'s theory was that it was one empire, and his two sons ruling in different parts. But it was one empire. That was Theod.'s theory, ~~with~~ one empire with his two sons ruling in two parts. But ~~with~~ actually, as it had often been before when it was divided, it became two separate realms, one quite independent of the other. And it just happened that it never got united again. 100 years later, an eastern emperor tried to unite and almost succeeded. But it never was again ~~united~~. united.

So after Theod.'s death, you have one son reigning in the eastern empire, and one son reigning in the west. And now when this division takes place. it so happens that after it, the Germanic tribes soon begin coming in and they come through the western part of the empire. And in the course of another 80 years, the western part disappears as an empire. While the eastern part continues as an empire for another 1,000 years, after that. There has never been a realm in the ~~the~~ history of the world that has continued as the Roman Empire. For a period of nearly 1500 years.

(question) The tribes were pressing in between the two parts, near the Black Sea, and then also from there clear west. You see, on the Danube, there, it was pressing against the western part of the eastern empire. Well then, when they came in, the easterners were able to put up some resistance, and so they thought it would be easier to move westward.

(question) Well, Goth is a name for a large tribe, very large tribe, which divided in two halves. The western Goths and the eastern Goths. It was the

western Goths that moved in first. The western Goths, they moved into Rumania, but they didn't stay there.

Now, the emperor of the western part, Theod.'s son, had a general, a Vandal general named Silicho. And Theod. was a very great man, a very able man, but his ~~xxxxxxx~~ sons did not inherit his genius, they only inherited his position. And as long as the son who ~~ruled~~ ruled in the west was able to have this able Vandal general really ~~at~~ running his empire for him, he could devote himself to pleasure and constant ceremony and get along very nicely. And Silicho would hold fast the Germanic tribes with his army, and he ~~practically~~ practically ran the western empire. But then, people managed to get the young emperor to be jealous of Silicho, and he became so jealous of Silicho that he had him executed. He got the idea that Silicho was anxious to take over his power, and they got him mixed up in certain personal feelings against Silicho, and the emperor ordered Silicho to be seized and executed, and ~~xxxx~~ once Silicho was out of the way, ~~it~~ there was nobody to hold the ~~the~~ empire in good condition. The emperor was Honorius. He is not an ~~an~~ important character. His father was a very important character. He was simply one who had dealt foolishly.

Now, the movement of the Germanic tribes, during the next 50 years, to trace them would take an hour. And it would involve a great deal of study to know all ~~that~~ they did. And I am not going to expect you to learn the full details of it, but I would like you to get a general idea. Of how these tribes came sweeping in the east. West ~~of~~ of the Black Sea, in Europe, just about where the two parts of the eastern and western empires come together. They came sweeping in ~~the~~ and the eastern part faced them with a rather narrow section, while they had the whole broad end of the western part before them, ~~the~~ The eastern generals...
(end of record)

Record 131

But the result was that these tribes, one after another, being pushed by those behind, came into the western empire and overran the northern areas there. And then they came ~~n~~ into Italy. And ~~a~~ the Visigoths, (the western Goths) under a very able leader named Alaric, a very able king, the Visigoths were held back

by Silicho for a while, but after he was executed, they made their way into ~~Italy~~ Italy. And some of the Roman people who were terrified before them, rushed out into a place in the marshes and built a city there in the marshes, where it would be hard to get at them. And that was the city of modern Venice. Which began at this time. But the army came on down through Italy, made two or three incursions into Italy, and finally in 410 they actually conquered the city of Rome. This is very important in the life of St. Aug. In 410, they took over the city of Rome, and Alaric led his army of the Visigoths into the city of Rome, and for three days they punished the city and many Romans fled for their lives, and they lost tremendous amounts of property. These Visigoths carried off great amounts of plunder. But it is a marvel of history that Alaric was ~~able~~ able to gather ~~his~~ his troops out after only three days that he let them plunder the city. It is a marvel of history. Charles the V's army, a thousand years later, composed half of Spaniards and half of Germans, took Rome and it was weeks before he was able to get them out. But the Visigoths in three days after gathered them out, and they carried great amounts of ~~plunder~~ ^{plunder} with them, but Alaric was a very strict Arian Christian. He gave them strict orders. He ~~said~~ said, these people. they are heretics, we don't agree with them, but they are Christians. Don't hurt any church. And anybody who is in a church, don't hurt them. So people could run into a church and they were safe from the Visigoths, and they didn't plunder any church. ~~They didn't~~ Quite different from the Spanish soldiers of a thousand years later who would seize the cardinals and carry them around in all kinds of mock dress and everything and make fun of them and plunder the churches. They didn't ~~hesitate~~ hesitate at anything. But Alaric plundered Rome ~~and~~ and it was a tremendous blow to the city, though nothing like the blow that such plunders usually are. But more than that, it was the first time that the city of Rome had been pestered by an enemy for nearly 800 years. And there was probably no other city in the world that had a record like that. And there is no city in the world today that has existed 800 years, ~~that hasn't~~ hasn't been plundered at least three times ~~in~~ during the last 800 ~~years~~ years. And Rome for 800 years had no been. It had been the recognized mistress

of the world, a large part of that time, and it had never been defeated by an enemy ~~sufficient~~ sufficient to be able to take it as a plunder.

Well, that had a tremendous affect on people's imaginations. The world seems to be coming to an end. When Rome, the mistress of the world for 800 years, was conquered by rough Germanic people, from the north, and plundered. Alaric pulled his army out of Rome, after three days, marched ~~farther~~ further south with his army, died just a few days later, then the Visigoths marched north out of Italy and they went on over into France. Before they did that, the eastern Goths, ~~another~~ the Ostragoths, another tribe which had been coming behind them, and the Vandals, the tribe to which Silicho belonged, had entered the empire, and they had gone into France. And then the people of Rome and the people of the eastern empire wanted to rescue France, and so they offered the Visigoths, they said, if you will drive the Vandals out of ~~France~~ France, we will let you ~~to~~ hold that country. And so they drove them out of France and the Vandals went into Spain, and some of the Vandals went into Africa, and then from Africa the came north ~~into~~ into Italy and plundered it. But the Ostragoths, after the Visigoths left, went into Italy and they built a kingdom there.

Now, we won't go into these details, I just want to give you a picutre of these forces moving ~~across~~ across Europe, over a period of decades. Living in a place for a while, moving on to another, a whole nation moving from one area to another. And you can ~~see~~ see how it completely upset life, and you can see why at just about 450, I would call it, the Middle ~~Age~~ Ages begins, and a complete turnover ~~of~~ of life in ~~the~~ Europe, a complete change. Well now, we are interested ~~primarily~~ primarily, in these fifty years, in the flowering of the Christian movement of the previous three hundred years, which existed ~~during~~ during these fifty years, and which is tremendously important for us today. But we are also interested in seeing how this was affected, naturally, ~~by~~ by what was happening. There is, St. Aug., for instance. One of his most famous books, ~~his~~ his most famous one next to his Confessions, is the City of God. The City of God was written because when Rome was devastated, and hundreds of fugitives made their way to Africa, people ~~said~~ said, oh, look what is happening. The empire has

become Christian and now it is falling to pieces. The City of Rome, after 800 years ~~is~~ being absolutely safe, has been overrun by these barbarians and plundered, see what Christianity has done to the empire. And so A g. said, no there is ~~xxxx~~ two cities. The pagan city and the ~~x~~ city of God. The pagan city comes to an end, it is plundered, it is devastated. But ~~xxxx~~ he said, there is the city of God which is far ~~xxxxx~~more important, which is being set up by the Christians.

~~xxx~~ And so he contrasted the pagan city and the city of God, the great city that ruled the ~~xxxxxx~~ world for nearly 800 years, and the city of God which was to take its place. And so his great book, the City of God, was an answer to this, the pagans ~~xxxxxx~~ said, the world is coming to an end, it is being ~~x~~ destroyed because Christianity is weakening the empire. He said, no ~~xxxxxx~~ Christianity is substituting something better than the old pagan state. So that is why he called ~~x~~ his book The City of God. And that is why he wrote the particular book to meet that particular crisis. So, that the effect upon the ~~;~~minds of the ~~xxxxxx~~ people of the ~~xxxx~~ this conquest is just indescribable. And there is ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ one thing that we will mention when we get to ~~x~~ the end of Aug.'s life.

Augustine, writing his final works, lying on his deathbed, in the city of Hippo, in North Africa, at the end of his ~~x~~ life, and ~~x~~ all around the city, here is the wall ~~xxxxxx~~ around it, and outside of that, ~~xxxxxx~~ practically all of North Africa had been taken by the ^aVandals. And ~~x~~ the Vandals are plundering and destroying all around, and plundering all this, and here is this one city on the seacoast, with a wall around, and Aug. lying there on his deathbed. And not ~~x~~ long after, a few days after his death, Hippo also was taken. And all of North Africa had fallen to the Vandals. His life went in an apocalyptic day. It ~~xx~~ was a day of turnover such as Europe has never seen before or since. And we will go on further there tomorrow. (Break in record)

And this is when we have the great overturning, the great sweep which made the change from ancient history to the Middle Ages. And, of course, what we are interested in primarily is the ancient history, the ancient world. Simply

because the ancient world and the ancient church connect right on ~~xxxxxxx~~ to the modern church. You might say that the medieval church does, too, but if it does, it is the latter part of the medieval church that connects on, while the latter part of the ancient church connects on. In the Reformation, the church went back to the ancient church to a very large extent. The Roman Church goes back to the Middle Ages, and our great interest in the Middle Ages will be in seeing where many of the practices and viewpoints of the Roman Church originated. We will have a real interest in that. But we have a much greater interest in this latter part of the ancient church, which is tremendously ~~xxxxxxx~~ important for the Roman ~~xxxxxxx~~ Church and also for us today. And which represents the climax of the history of Christianity prior to the engulfing with the great numbers of people coming into the empire, people not ~~in~~ inferior in any way ~~xxx~~ to the people ~~xxx~~ whom they overcame. Perhaps, naturally and in many qualities superior, to the ~~xxxxxxx~~ people who were then living in the Roman Empire. But people ~~xxx~~ without the culture, without the training, ~~xxxxxxx~~ without the background, which the Romans had. And coming in too ~~xxx~~ rapidly to be assimilated. So that they did assimilate this culture, but instead of ~~x~~ being done gradually, it took many centuries to get it. And eventually, ~~xxxxxxx~~ when it was entirely assimilated, it was naturally greatly changed, in the course of taking over. So that the Dark Ages begin, actually, about the middle of the 5th century.

You will find ~~xxx~~ hardly any history book that states that as a fact. But look in the history book, in most any, and see what they have to say about the last half of the 5th century and the 6th and the 7th, and ~~xxxx~~ it will be a ~~xxxx~~ rare one that will have more than a few words to say about those centuries. They are Dark Ages as far as the history ~~xxxxxxx~~ people taking much interest in them is concerned, aside from a few special outstanding things, which formed a background to succeeding events.

Now we are at the present moment, more interested in the ~~onrush~~ of the ~~bar~~barians, for its relationship to the old church, to the ancient church, than we are as a foundation to ~~xxxx~~ what followed. That is, there are many aspects

of it which become important in ~~xxxx~~ relation to what followed, and we will express those as we go on in the Middle Ages. But right now I think stress is what it did to the Roman Empire. The ~~xxxx~~ eastern half of the Roman Empire was affected by it, but not to a great extent, because it so happened that these people came in mostly through Europe, ~~w~~ rather than through Asia. And coming in through Europe, the brunt of their attack came nine tenths of it, against the western half of the empire, and only one-tenth of it against the eastern half of the empire. And so it was not so difficult to protect the eastern empire from being greatly affected by it. It was affected. Some of these armies penetrated portions of it, some of these people went in as servants of the eastern empire, there was a real affect, but it wasn't ~~thex~~ a tenth of the affect of the ~~w~~ western empire. Because the western ~~xxxxxxx~~ half of the ~~w~~ empire was very soon submerged by great multitudes of people, sweeping across, and these people were altogether different from what they ~~d~~ would have been if ~~thex~~ it hadn't been for the missionary labors of Ulfilas. They plundered and pilaged and massacred, but it must be said that on the whole their treatment was far more human~~xxxxxxx~~ than that of the Roman ~~w~~ Empire itself had been, in previous centuries. And while there were outstanding groups of them which were particular(13) and the name Vandals, for ~~xxxx~~ instance, has come to mean ill treatment, I doubt if they were much worse than the great bulk of the Roman armies had been. And many of the others were certainly far more lenient than the Roman Armies had been.

(question) The Visigoths, the Ostragoths, the13½) all of these had become Arian. The only large group which came in, which had not been converted to Christianity was the Franks, and they didn't come until a little bit later. They were complete pagans. They never went to an Arian state, they were converted directly to the orthodox view. So that the Visigoths in the first part of this period swept down into Rumania and Bulgaria what is now those countries, and then where they went down westward into Italy, and Alaric, the king of the Visigoths attacked Rome. And for three days it was plundered, and to have a city plundered by an army for three days is a terrific experience.

But as a rule such plunderings last more than that. For a city like Rome which had not been plundered by an enemy for 800 years, to be plundered, was a terrific experience, and for a city which was the wealthiest city in the world to be plundered. Possibly ~~Constantinople~~ Constantinople was... (end of record)

Record 132

They were the second class, so you can imagine what the first class was, the wealthy people of Rome. And of course there was a lot of poor people in Rome, but there were great numbers of people in Rome who had large incomes, from the various parts of the Empire, and their families had had them for centuries. And the result was that the amount of the fine furnishings and decorations and art works and so on, that their ~~houses~~ houses had had, you would hardly find anything to compare with them, ~~in~~ in such an amount in any large city anywhere today. But Rome was that way at that ~~time~~ time. And for a city like that to be exposed to an ~~army~~ army, like that Russians did when they took Berlin. They just broke in and grabbed anything that they ~~g~~ felt like, was many times to take ~~as~~ as there was in Berlin, and it ~~ix~~ was a terrific experience. And many many ~~people~~ people fled and the refugees came into just about any other part of the world, and made a tremendous impression.

Well, Alaric pulled his army out to the marsh further south, and he died he was planning to go over and conquer North ~~Africa~~ Africa, but he died. And the rest of them came back, and they eventually made their way up north, and the people persuaded them to join together with a couple of other tribes and to drive the Vandals ~~out~~ out of France. And they did it, and they held France, and the Vandals held Spain. ^{Later} later on the Vandals left Spain and took North Africa, and the Visigoths took ~~Spain~~ Spain. The eastern Goths, the Ostragoths, came and they went down in the last half of this century and founded a kingdom in Italy, and held Italy for 50 years. Well, we don't have to get these details in mind. It is the big sweep of it that I am interested in your ~~having~~ having. And idea of what happened.

From this time on, the eastern ~~empire~~ empire continued for another 1,000 years. The Roman Empire lasted until ~~1453~~ 1453, when the Turks took Constantinople.

But it was the eastern half, and it doesn't have so much direct connection with us. Our connection being ~~with~~ with the western half of the empire. The western half was swept over by these ~~pax~~ barbarians to such an extent that there was not another man after Theodocious whom you can call a real emperor in the west. There were some minor figures, who held the imperial power, but before long we find the Goths taking over the power and putting up puppet rulers. One putting up one and another, and finally one putting up his son and called him Romulus Augustus, gave him a new name. Named after the ~~great~~ great founders of the Roman city, Augustus Romulus the great founder of Rome in the first place, ~~Augustine~~ the founder of the Roman Empire, he named his little boy Romulus Augustus, and made him nominally emperor. And then another Germanic chieftan killed this one, and put his son out from being emperor and didn't put anybody in his place. So that is called the end of the Roman Empire in 476. It is a rather ~~a~~ silly date, actually. It didn't make the slightest difference that this young German boy was removed from having the name of emperor, when he actually had never been one. But after that there was never again a man living in Rome ruling the west and calling himself Roman emperor. So that the period was the time of the end of the western Roman Empire.

Though it was the end of the Roman Empire in fact, the eastern empire continued and the western ~~empire~~ part, the idea that the Romans had established that this was an empire, one unti, with one control, was an idea which had become so strongly entrenched in people's minds that it continued for many centuries and the various ~~king~~ chieftains of different areas liked to speak of themselves as the representatives of the emperor of the different areas. And eventually some kings in Germany began to call themselves Roman Emperors, though they were German Emperors, who lived in Germany. Their empire became to ~~be~~ called the Holy Roman Empire, although somebody said that it was neither holy, Roman, nor an empire. But it contiued until ~~81815x~~ 1812. It was not the Roman Empire in any sense, but it presents the continuation of the ~~roman~~ idea of the empire. And this idea was strong all through the Middle Ages. And this idea contributed greatly to the strength of the popes. Who always maintained

that they were the ~~spirit~~ spiritual heads of the ~~the~~ empire. And they living in Rome were the heads of the religious life of the western world and had a right to tell any king if ~~his~~ his life wasn't what it should be that he should step out and let somebody else take his ~~place~~ place. ~~Theoretically~~ Theoretically he had the right, and sometimes ~~he~~ they forced them to do it.

Well, this will do for this brief summary of A, the political ~~situation~~ ~~situation~~ situation in the first half of the 5th century. Now I want briefly to glance at B, Monasticism in the 5th Century. The 5th century is not an important period for monast. Two of the most important ~~periods~~ periods for monast. are the 4th cent. and the 6th cent. The 5th century comes in between these two, and consequently that which happened in the 4th continued in the 5th, and you might say that which happened in the 6th had beginnings in the 5th. But as far as monast. is concerned, it will be enough to state that the movement of monast. which began in the 4th century continued in the 5th, with some variations. But with no ~~great~~ great variations. In the east monast. had begun with hermits going out into the desert. And while there were now ~~large~~ large groups of hermits, together under the direction of ~~superiors~~ superiors, working under the direction of a definite organization, there were still a great many as individuals. And in the ~~east~~ east, the spirit which animated the first ones to get out entirely by themselves and do something new, still continued. And so there was a man there who thought of a brand new idea. His name was Simeon. And Simeon ~~was~~ was a shepherd in the border of Syria and Silicia, and a boy of 13 years. He had heard ~~the~~ the beatitudes read in church and he was greatly affected by them, and he went to a cloister and lay seven days without eating or drinking before the ~~threshold~~ threshold and begged to be admitted as the meanest servant of the house. And he weth in and he became a man who devoted himself to asceticism, went out as a hermit on a mountain with an iron chain on his feet, and he was visited there by admiring curious throngs.

Well, other people had done this sort of thing before. St. Anthony, and Paul of Thebes had lived in the ~~desert~~ desert so long. He managed to think of something brand new. And so in 423 he ~~invented~~ invented a new sort of holiness. He went

forty miles east of Antioch and he put up a high pillar. And he first put up a ~~pkix~~ pillar which was six cubits high. Then he changed it to one which was twelve cubits, ~~x~~ and then one which was thirty cubits. And the final one which some people put up for him was thirty-six cubits high. Sin't a cubit a foot and a hafl. If it is, then it would be about sixty feet high. About as high it ~~wixx~~ would be higher than this building. And on the top of this pillar he spent 26 years. He spent ~~25~~ 36 years altogether on pillars. The last 26 on this one high pillar. The pillar was such that he could never lie down on it, nor sit. He could only stand or lean on a ~~pxix~~ post, or ~~debut~~ devoutly bow. In his last posture he almost touched his ~~ff~~ feet with his head, so flexilbe his back had ~~ben~~ been made, by standing. A spectator once counted in one day, no less than 1240 such kneeling of the saint before the ~~almighty~~ Almighty, and then he gave up counting. He wore a covering of the skins of beasts and a chain about his neck. He stood there for long weary days and weeks and months and years, exposed to the scorching sun, the drenching rain, the biting frost. Living a life of daily death and martyrdom. They called him Simeon Stylites. The ~~xxxx~~ name Stylites, meaning ~~the~~ Simeon on the pillar. And after him there were others who followed in the path that he had laid out. And they had a good many pillar saints.

Simeon did something that was very novel. People ~~x~~ living in their luxury and in their ease would feel assshamed of the fact that it would impossible for them to give up ~~x~~ even some little thing for the sake of Christ, and they would hear of this man who gave up all the comforts of life for Christ, and it seemed so wonderful to them they would ~~xxxxx~~ stream from afar to see him. And thousands of ~~pxix~~ people came to see him. He never suffered any women to come within the allwhich surrounded his pillar. But aside from them, he spoke to all classes, and ~~was~~ friendliness, mildness and love. He used to preach to thousands of people. And he had a tremendous influence in what he preached to the people. He preached repentacne twice a day, he helped the spectators settle controversy, ~~x~~ vindicated the orthodox faith, sometimes even extorted laws from an emperor. The thousands of people calim to be converted to ~~Chnix~~ Christianity through him.

Finally, when he was 69, he died of a long-concealed and loathesome ulcer on his leg. And his body was brought in solemn procession to the great church in ~~Antioch~~ Antioch. There were others who followed ~~him~~ in his footsteps, but of course these would be very few, in comparison to the great number of the monks who lived in the desert, some of them as hermits, but most of them in groups of people in the monasteries, and most of them, some of them were like St. Jerome, highly educated people studying the Bible and doing valuable things, but they were in a great minority. The ~~bulk~~ bulk of them fell into extreme fanaticism, and at times in the ~~great~~ great controversies in the latter part of the century they would come in and crowd into the cities, and their influence was felt very strongly, sometimes even in the way of physical force. ~~But~~

But there was no ~~great~~ change ~~during~~ during this century in monast., aside from this one thing. The introduction of the ~~pillars~~ pillars. Now, in the west, hermits and pillars ~~and~~ saints like this were impossible in the west. The climate is not mild enough that they can hardly do it. In most parts of the west. Only in the desert of Egypt or Syria could this be done actually. To any great extent. And so in the west, it was rather difficult, in fact there is only one example of a ~~pillar~~ pillar saint in the west. That was a man who lived on a pillar in France, for a long time, but one of the bishops ordered him to come down and go into a cloister, which he did. And that, as far as we, know, is the only instance in the west of one who did that. Except that I read the other day that there was a man in Miami, ~~Florida~~ Florida, who has been on a pillar for a week or two, but I don't think that there is any religious purpose in it as far as I know.

Well, in the west, we have noticed how the influence of Ambrose and of Jerome, and of different ones, had led people to take a great interest in going into the monastic life. And Aug. put his influence in this direction. Aug., of course, was very ^{early} anxious to go out with a few friends ~~and~~ and live by themselves ~~and~~ and study and discuss ~~the~~ spiritual problems and life and he spent some years in that activity right after his conversion. And he evidently wanted to do that all his life. He was ~~unable~~ unable to ~~do~~ do that, but all his life he

tried to live in great simplicity. And he was ~~constantly~~ constantly urging people to ~~leave~~ leave the world and live in great simplicity. He never, ~~in the~~ in the latter part of his life, ~~never~~ never would visit a woman unless there were two men with him, and then only when there was a very definite spiritual purpose ~~to~~ to his going, and the place where he lived with other men around him, he allowed no women to come in under any ~~condition~~ condition whatever, and their food was very very simple and plain, not any great amount of it, and he would constantly urge people to forsake the world. And his influence pointed and urged people toward monastic life. (end of record)

Record 133

To make plans to try to improve their condition, and he made out a plan for the nunnery that this sister provided. And these plans Aug. made came to be called the Rome of Augustine, but their number was an actual order of Augustinian, for ~~many~~ many centuries later. It was many centuries later that a group of different monasteries, that had been following his general Rome of Augustine, organized itself into an ~~order~~ order with a head. And it was from this order eventually that ~~was~~ was Martin Luther. But an actual order of monks such as there are dozens of today, did not actually come into existence until the ~~6th~~ 6th century. Not in the 5th century at all. It was not until the middle of the 6th ~~century~~ century that the oldest of the great orders was founded. We will look at that in the next century. But none of the great orders of monks came into existence until the 6th century, more than 500 years after the death of Christ.

Aug. said in one of his writings, he said, I have never known better people than are found among the monks and nuns, nor ~~have~~ have I ever known worse people than I have found among the ~~monks~~ monks and nuns. And that was his statement. And Jerome, and all of ~~Jerome's~~ Jerome's ~~a~~ tremendous emphasis on monasticism, Jerome said exactly the same thing. And Jerome, of course, led these Roman women, these distinguished cultured Roman ~~women~~ women, to give up all their luxury and their cleanliness, and to go into monastic life and Jerome had large group of monks under his general direction, ~~in~~ in Bethlehem,

and he knew many whom he thought very highly of, but he had some pretty tough experiences with some very hypocritical people who got him into very serious difficulties. And so both Aug. and Jerome pointed out this. The great benefits to a person who was thoroughly in his heart determined to seek the Lord which could be found from some aspects of monastic life, but all the great opportunities that it gave some, and which they both in this early day perhaps had a good many experiences with.

But so much for B, the monasticism in this century. Now we look at C, The Life and Influence of St. Augustine. The life and influence of St. Aug. We have already looked at the early life of St. Aug, and I had you read the account of it in Foakes-Jackson, and I assigned him to you the account of a good many sections of the account of Aug.'s Confessions, and of course, there were a lot of small details of his early life which we would not think of spending that much attention on one individual. If it were not for the very great importance of what he did afterwards. I heard, recently, that someone had made an investigation of successful men in America, to try to determine what are the qualities which are common to successful men. And for a time he was baffled, because he said he found that some of them were men of great culture, and some men of none. Some of them were men of great ability in expressing themselves, and some of them were very quiet with little ability to express themselves. Some of them were men who were very abstemious, while others were men who seemed quite extravagant in their personal habits. Some of them, he said, were men of great outstanding intellectual ability, but others seemed to be only mediocre, in intellectual ability. He ~~said~~ said he found that there was such a great variety among men who were successful in the sense in which the world counts success in America today, that for a time he was baffled at finding what ~~was~~ was the common characteristic. And then, he said, he found that there was one quality that every successful person had, they all ~~had~~ had it in common. And that was a entitled persistence. He ~~said~~ said, when they undertook something, they worked and worked hard at it, and they would put in as long a time as was necessary to find the answer to the

problem they dealing with. And they were persistent and energetic. And that was the common quality of all successful people. Now, if you look ~~xxxxxxx~~ back at those days, if there is any man of whom that can be said, it is St. Aug. Of course, Jerome, also. The amount of study, the amount of writing that Jerome did is tremendous. But when you look at St. Aug., the labors that that ~~xxx~~ man accomplished are simply almost beyond belief. The thing that puts me to shame is to see his correspondence, and Calvin is another example. How those, men, I don't see how they could do it, with the activity they had in their churches, and with the constant teaching and writing and all they had, how they could write at great length in so many correspondences, dealing with every sort of subject that people would raise up and ask them about. And they would go into it fully and write at length, on what often seemed to be the most trivial ~~thingsxxxx~~ things. And yet they would bring something out of it, of course. And Aug.'s life, through the latter part of it, was writing actually thousands of letters, and dealing with all sorts of questions that people would bring up. But this was a small part of his activity. It was the way the man was so energetically taking hold of everything that ~~xxx~~ came before him, that he thought was important.

Now, it mentioned how Jerome was busying himself with scholarly work and doing a tremendously valuable task, and ~~it~~ doing a great deal, but I think that he dealt so much with details that he failed to study into the great central problems as Aug. did. Well, I can't help feeling that Aug., himself, if he had done a little less, and ~~a~~ spent a little more time, even than he did, thinking it through, there would be an even greater impact on the world. He would face a problem and he would jump into it with both feet and he would go after it, and he would usually lick the problem, but in some cases I think that if ~~it~~ he had concentrated a little more, or if he had left out one or two of them, and done a more lasting job on ~~xxx~~ one or two of the others. But we want to see something of the activity and influence of this man, but that must be mentioned first, apart from his persistence, his accomplishment would be nothing like what it was, but of course with that was a tremendous

mind, and a very great experience of the grace of God. He felt himself like one who had actually been picked from the fires, a brand picked from the burning, and done by the marvellous providential intervention of God, in ways which he felt he had absolutely no personal credit for whatever. It was the way God had brought these things into his ~~lxxx~~ life, and the way God had presented the Gospel before him, and had led him to know Himself. He was very devoutly conscious of the grace of God, and that colored all his activities.

Now, you have, in your reading that I have assigned you, have gone up to where he was converted. And then he lived for a time there in Milan, off in retirement with some friends, discussing some religious questions. And then he was going back to Africa. And he was ~~xxxx~~ down at the port of Rome when his mother died. And after the death of his mother, Monica, who was buried there, he went to Rome and studied in Rome for another year. And then he left Rome and went back to Africa. And when he got back to Africa, there, Aug. determined to devote himself with some friends to discussion of theological matters and to study them. He evidently held a fair amount of property in Africa, and he sold most of the property and he gave away a good bit of it, but he had a large ~~pra~~ claim with a certain amount of income, and he and some friends settled on it, and started studying and writing. And now, as they continued that for two or three years. But soon his writings began to be known and he began to be widely quoted, and he began to find it was a desirable thing to stay right at home and not go away, and not to do any travelling. And the reason was ~~thatxxxx~~ what happened to St. Ambrose. When the ~~people~~ people called out to Ambrose to be bishop was not isolated, and whether the story of that had an effect in stimulating the same thing ~~x~~ elsewhere or not, or whether it rose spontaneously, the fact was that in Africa at this time, the people in most any town, if they wanted a man for bishop they would seize ahold of him and demand that he become their bishop. And it was just impossible to get ~~x~~ away from them. And Aug. didn't want to be a bishop. He wanted to devote himself to the contemplative life and the writings, and he didn't want to be a bishop. And so he was very careful not to go into a town ~~that~~ that

didn't have a bishop in it. Of course, in those days, all the preaching in North Africa was done by the bishop. There were about five hundred bishops in the ~~the~~ Catholic Church, and perhaps even more in what was called the Donatus. Now there were two denominations of Christians in North Africa at this time. Theologically and doctrinally, their views were absolutely identical. Their differences were over certain questions of church order and ~~discipline~~ discipline, and still more over certain historical things. One of these groups called itself the Donatus, after Donatus their leader of a century before. They had existed for a full century, and was the larger of the two denominations. The other ~~denominations~~ denominations in North Africa, there held the same views, except for these matters of church government and church order that the Donatus did, but they were considered by the rest of ~~Christendom~~ ^{xx(ii) Africa} as the church. And so they called themselves the Catholic Church. The all-embracing church, the church in ~~full~~ fellowship with other churches. And they were slightly smaller ~~than~~ than the Donatus group. Now you remember that Aug. in his early days had become interested in the ~~Manichaeans~~ Manichaeans. The Manichaeans were a group almost as large as either one of them in Africa. They were a very large flourishing group, you might call them a church. They had many points in common with Christian churches, men who had taken over many points of ~~Christian~~ Christian organization, external Christian attitudes, but in their, actually they were not a ^{Christian} ~~Christian~~ group at all. They were not like Mithraism, ~~definitely~~ definitely a pagan group. They were a Gnostic group, it was Gnosticism carried on logically. They were further from Christianity than many of the Gnostic groups, but yet they had much more in common with it than Mithraism.

Aug. had been a member of the ~~Manichaeans~~ Manichaeans for a time, you remember. He had been a catechumen. He had not actually been baptized by the Manichaeans, but he was under instruction with them, he was one who attended their services. And he took an interest for many ~~years~~ years. And not only that, but had ~~many~~ led many friends to become ~~Manichaeans~~ Manichaeans by his interest in it. Well, now, his mother had always wanted him to become a Catholic Christian, and I

western churches. The Novatian church had a long history, and a history in which it held true to the orthodox teaching. But eventually it died out in the Middle Ages.

Now, the Donatus Church was not as large as the Novatian, it was not as widely extended. The Novatian reached to most parts of the Empire, the Donatus were only in Africa. But in Africa, they were the largest there. And ~~the~~ so you had the Donatus, there, and then the other group which called themselves the Catholic in contradistinction to the Donatus group. They were the group who were recognized by the groups in Italy and in Spain, and in Greece and in Constantinople, ~~and~~ and in other places, as the one with whom they had fellowship. And so the Catholic Church, there had about five hundred bishops. Now a bishop was what we would call a minister today. Every town ~~in~~ that had a church in it, the church had a man in charge of it who they called the bishop. And he would be what we would call a minister. Now some of these churches had presbyters in them. Most of them ~~didn't~~ didn't. Originally the presbyter and the bishop were the same, but in the course of years bishop had come to be. ~~Often~~ Often there would be one bishop and a group of presbyters, like in Rome, where there had been one bishop and a large group of presbyters for many years. In these churches ^{if} they had a presbyter, he was an assistant to the ~~the~~ bishop and he would be not what we would call an associate pastor today, hardly even what we would call an assistant pastor today. He would be more like a ~~sextan~~ sexton, he would be a little above a sexton, but definitely below what we would call an assistant pastor. I ~~mean~~ mean just in North Africa at this time. ~~There~~ There were comparatively few presbyters, and they were, well the churches weren't big enough to need more than one man., in most cases, for the direction of the activities. And it was ~~a~~ contrary to custom, in North Africa, for anybody but a bishop to do any ~~of~~ preaching. The presbyters did none at all, at this time.

Well, now, ~~the~~ (question) When it comes to belief, in actual belief, the difference between the Donatus, the Novatians, and the Catholic Churches was practically nil. There was very little difference in the Novatians and the

Donatus/ were stricter ~~xxx~~ on their requirements for the life of the minister and of the church. They were both ~~xxxxxxx~~ somewhat stricter. The Catholic Church was somewhat more lenient. But of course, this matter of requirements can only be a matter of external features, anyway. Sometimes a person who ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ in external features seems to be the most upright, actually in his heart has more spiritual pride and ungodliness than a man who externally doesn't appear as good a man. So it is a difficult problem, to decide and to ~~xxxx~~ claim the Catholic idea that if a man says he is sincerely penitent for his sins, he sincerely turns to God, who are we to ~~xxx~~ doubt of his sincerity. If we have no definite evidence ~~xxxx~~ that he is insincere, we will accept his word. And the ~~xxxxxx~~ attitude of the other groups, that if a man has denied the faith, in order to save his life, he just couldn't stand the thought of ~~xxxx~~ having a red hot iron pressed to his body, and having his legs broken, and he denied the faith, and now he says that he is very very sorry, we should take him back. We shouldn't say, well you're, there is nothing we can do for you, you have denied the faith, you have gone. And so you see, the ~~xxxx~~ difference was the one made a stricter stand on external things, the other more lenience on external things. But as to the real heart of the matter, what is vital, you can't judge that ~~xxx~~ by external things, and actually each area, each minister, each section has to make his judgement upon the basis of personal consideration of the people involved. And in some cases the Donatus or the Novatians were ~~xxxxxxxx~~ doubtless true, and more correct in their judgment than the Catholics. But in other cases, it proved to be the other ~~xx~~ way. It is very very hard to lay down any rule on those matters.

Well, now, in Africa, then, Aug.'s writings were being talked of a good bit, and he received a letter from a wealthy man. In the town of Hippo. And Hippo, was the second most important town in North Africa. Today nobody would even know its name, hardly ~~xxxxxx~~ if it hadn't been for Aug. But at that time Carthage was the great city. But then this city in Nomidia, on the sea coast, Hippo, had been the center of the Nomidian king centuries before, before the Romans conquered it. And so on account of that it was called....(6½)

It was a town of about 40,000 people, and they weren't particularly cultured people, it was not anywhere near as wealthy a town as Carthage, it didn't have the leadership at all that Carthage did. There were other towns nearly as important as Hippo. And Hippo had a bishop in it who was very well liked, and this rich man in Hippo wrote to Aug, and he said, I am thinking seriously of giving up, selling all my property and giving it to the poor, and entering into monastic life. But, he said, if you could come and talk with me and discuss the matter with me some, it would help me make up my mind. And Aug. could never turn down a chance like that. But he hesitated about it. Now, he said, I don't like to go anywhere where I might be dragged away from my quiet life and made into a bishop. But, he said, I don't need to worry about Hippo, because Hippo is a town which has a bishop, this elderly Greek, the bishop of Hippo and well-liked, by everyone. So he went to Hippo, and he talked with the man and the man was greatly interested, and he said, I want to talk further. And he kept him there day after day. And he kept talking further and then the Sunday came they went to church. And Aug. stood there, it was the custom in those days that the minister sat, in front of the platform, and the people stood, and they heard the sermon. And Augustine stood there, and the bishop was sitting up there and giving his sermon, and the bishop said to the people, he said, I am getting along in years, and he said the labors of the work here are getting pretty heavy for me. He said, oh, if only I had a good presbyter to assist me in the work, somebody of ability and understanding who could assist me in the work and he gave on at great length in this sermon to the people.

And all of a sudden all the people turned and said, well what about Aug. there he would make a good presbyter. And Aug. was quite disgusted. He had been very very careful in keeping from going anywhere where he might be called to be bishop, and then they called him to be presbyter. And when he held back, they said, oh, just because it is not to be bishop and just be presbyter, that is no reason for you to hold back. They said, be humble and take the presbyters place. And so Aug. said, well, to Aurelius, let me go home, and let me go

back and let me study. I don't know the Scripture well enough to take it. Let me have three months to study and I will come back and be your presbyter. And so they agreed. So he was called to be presbyter here. Well, ~~xxx~~ he went back, and he studied for three months and he closed up his affairs there, and then he came back to Hippo and he became presbyter. And then the old bishop¹ said, he said, I am getting along in years, I would like to have you do the preaching, for me. Well, it was very contrary to custom, and the other bishops when they heard of it were horrified. To have a presbyter preaching, that would be disgusting. But the bishop insisted, and Aug. went ahead, and the ~~people~~ people soon liked his preaching better than they did the other man. And it succeeded so well that pretty soon the other bishops all over decided that was a good thing to do. To get presbyters and let them ~~do~~ do the preaching and they wouldn't have to do it. And so the custom changed in North Africa. It became necessary to have presbyters do the preaching. Up to that ~~time~~ time it had been forbidden.

Well, he was presbyter. And he said to the bishop, now I want to live a monastic life, and so the bishop agreed that he could buy a bit of land not far from where the bishop lived, and on that he had a house and he had ~~some~~ some friends live with him, and they lived a strict monastic life. And they lived there, ~~and after some time Aug.~~ and immediately Aug. entered into active work and active controversy, and we want to look at some of his activities - in that, but I will just galnce ahead to the external aspects of his life.

He then, after a few ~~years~~ years, the bishop ~~a~~ said, I am getting pretty old and pretty weak, I would like to have you to be associate bishop with me, here. Well, there was no such thing, it was not customary to have an associate bishop. And other ~~bishops~~ bishops protested it, and this man was evidently pretty well liked, and everybody knew how great Aug. was, he was so outstanding, and so he was made coagular bishop, associate bishop. And then within the year the man died, and Aug. was the bishop. And Aug. continued then for over 30 years there as bishop of Hippo. He was bishop of this place, and he preached as ~~xxx~~ a rule every day. He held very frequent services. When he was in town

he usually preached every day, very frequent services, and he was active in the dealing with the people of his community, and he had his monastic section and he would insist anybody who would come and want to join it, he would welcome them in to his house. And if a ~~tax~~ ^{slave} came, he would say then, this ~~tax~~ slave should be freed and he finally persuaded the Roman govt. to make a law that if a slave joined a monastic order that he was automatically freed. And of course that resulted in having some fine men who were slaves who sincerely wanted to become monks, but there were a lot of them who just did it because they wanted their freedom. And of course that brought a lot of unworthy people into the monasteries. And Aug. himself had some very bitter experiences with some of the people.

He had one man who came as a young boy, to this monastery. And he lived there for years, and he was trained by him, and eventually he went off and became bishop of another town and then he proved to be an utter scoundrel and he had been a hypocrite all through. And he had occasional people in his group that proved to be that way. And other people said, you are too lenient, you will take anybody in, and that is what you can expect. And Aug. said, well I take in a lot of people who are no good, yes, but if I try to pick and choose between them I will keep out some who really are good, and he said that the Lord knows who are His own. And so of course there were some scoundrels who came out of his monastery, there were many who came out who became bishops and leaders in many parts of North Africa. And men trained by Aug. included people who were very respected leaders, and Aug.'s view was, give them the training to anybody who will come and get it, and then the Lord will know who His own are and who He will use. And of course in the end it worked out so badly in some places where they didn't have a man of Aug.'s tremendous influence, that in most of them they were very strict in who they would receive. And it became to be that way, but Aug. went quite to the other extreme.

But along with this, he was constantly looking for problems and needs that he could meet. There was in Hippo, here, here was a custom of a great feast for one of the monarchs. And on this feast the people used to

feast and carouse, and brawl all day long. And that had been done for many many years. And Aug. was determined to stop it. And he preached a series of sermons against it, and then when the day came and the people wanted to do what had been their custom for years, Aug. went out ~~with a whip and began~~ where they were and began to ~~x~~ preach. And he preached and preached until they finally just forsook the thing and came in and they spent the rest of the day singing hymns and reading the Scripture with him in the church. And they never had one of these martyr celebrations against in that place. ~~★~~ And he took up ~~and~~ different things like this and he was absolutely fearless in dealing with people, ~~and~~ and his influence was tremendous. xv

Now one of the very first things he was interested in was the Manicheans. And ~~then~~ very soon after he became presbyter, the Manichaean church in Hippo was bigger than either the Catholic church or the Donatus church... (end of record)
Record 135

And Aug. was well-trained in rhetoric, and some people say that he could have proven most anything. But he was so well trained in rhetoric and so able and so very sincere and earnest, that after two days of debate with great crowds listening and everything taken down in shorthand, the Manichaean bishop gave up and left the town and never came back. And eventually the Manicheans were completely wiped out in the town, though the church lasted on for some time after. Aug. wrote many works against the Manicheans, and ~~distributed~~ distributed them through North Africa and ~~through~~ through the rest of the Roman world, and they had a tremendous influence. Well, now we will continue with Aug. next Wednesday morning..... (break in record)

The C, the life and work of St. Aug. And I don't believe I have given any sub-heads under it. And they were not necessary as far as we have gone, but later on we will get to the point where it would help greatly and so I have ~~now~~ material in mind that will need subheads. So, let's call this number 1, external features of his life. I have already discussed that sufficiently. Just for gathering the material around the heading, let's call it external features of his life. You know of his birth at 354, his conversion

at 386, his ordination at 391, and his death in 430. The main thing is that you realize that his life spans the period from the 4th century into the 5th, the greater part of his activity is in the 5th century, which he runs almost a third of a century into the 5th century. For about ten years before the 5th century, he was already a presbyter for half of that time, and a bishop for the rest of it, and his activity was already into being. But the greater part of it, comes in the 5th century.

I did not ask you to learn the date of his birth, but you realize the fact that he was already over 30 when he was converted. At his birth, 386 his conversion, he was already 32 years of age. And it was another five years before he was ordained, so he was already 37 years before he was ordained. Of course, the previous four years before that, he had been studying and completing his preparation in the years from 32 to 37. After he became 37 years of age, he began his life work and did as extensive a life work, and as important a life work in its effect upon the Christian church and on the world as any man in all history. So when somebody tells you that he is already 25 years of age, how am I going to have time for three years of a seminary course, well it is good to repeat the words of President Garfield. Someone asked him at the college he was president of, if they couldn't get through in, they didn't want to take time for a college course, couldn't they get through quicker. And the man was a barber, I think, and Garfield said, well, if you want to grow mushrooms you can do it in a couple of months, but if you want to grow an oak tree it takes a good many years to get it going. And Aug. was 37 before his life work actually began. And the three or four years before that were spent in extensive training and extensive study, though he did not realize it was actually preparation for his work.

But from 391 on, in the next 40 years, he accomplished as much as any man has accomplished in any line of work in the world's history in his life. And he had as great an effect on the Christian Church as any man has had in all of history. And among Christian leaders, Calvin and Luther and Wesley are about the only men I can think of who in volume of

production, ~~xxxxxxx~~ in amounts of accomplishment can be put quite in the class with Aug. ~~xxx~~

So much, then on the external features. We looked into the details of it last time, and I just wanted to mention it to you again. The ~~xxxxx~~ main points. I did mention ~~xxxxxxxxxxx~~ in connection with 430, that it was while the city was already besieged and all the rest of Africa taken by the Vandals, I think that is important to have an idea ~~x~~ of that end of the life of Aug. Africa had just about completely fallen, this city about the only one left. When he died.

Now, number 2, I think we should entitle his controversy with the Manichaeans. Because this was a controversy that ~~w~~ ran through his life. Toward the end of his life he was still writing against the Manich. And it was one which began very early, because for many years he was a listener in the Man, meetings. A catechumen, even, ~~xxxxxxx~~ taking their courses, though never one who actually joined them. And he felt that Manich. was a great enemy of Christianity. And it was. And he felt that the dualism which ~~xxxxx~~ it aught, the two great forces, the forces of good and the force of evil, and the two great forces ~~xxx~~ struggling against each other, and the sin being simply a matter of which side you are on, rather than a matter of actual moral evil, and many of the other teachings of Man. which he felt are very very harmful. And Man. was a tremendous force in the world, a force which persisted way on into the Middle Ages. But I think we can say that the fact of Man. was very broken by the attack of Aug. And that the force would have been two or three times as strong during the next 1,000 years as it was, if it were not for the ~~xxxxx~~ tremendous effort that Aug. made to answer its arguments, to meet its bishops in public debate with shorthand writers present to take everything down, and then ~~x~~ to distribute the accounts of it. To write letters to people who were interested in Manich. and to point out its errors to them. To take the statements of its leaders and to search for precise evidence as to their errors. I think that Aug. ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ rendered a service to the Christian church in the defeat of Manich., a service which would be enough to justify

a man's life, if he had done nothing else, in his life work.

It was the first thing that he undertook, actively. It was his controversy with the Man. It was aside, of course, from the carrying on of his work, the pastoral care, the training of the men who are in his school, and the men who lived in his monastery, the training of these men, the directing of ~~his~~ their lives, the constant sermons, the hearing of the.....~~(IX)~~(9) Aside from that, the first great undertaking which he took up was the defeat of Manich. And it is something in which he was eminently successful. ~~His~~ Some of his anti-Man. writings are still of great interest and value, even today. For some of the Man. viewpoints and attitudes are still found, even though Man. as a movement is completely dead. And some of them are written in such a way that they are still very interesting reading.

Now, the controversy was very active in the first years of his activity in Hippo,,even when he was a presbyter. Before he became a bishop there. And it was a great feature of the first ten years, perhpas. of his work. After that it was something that continued, and it was important even toward the end of his life. But Manich. in the end of his life was ~~about~~ not a third of a factor that it had been when he began his great ministry. We will then say no more about Manich. at this point,we have already, of course,discussed the great Confessions. I believe that we discussed them more under the previous century, because his Confessions, htere again, if he had done nothing else than to write the Confessions he would be remembered as a great figure in Christian history. The ~~picture~~ picture of his life and his experiences, and of his contacts at the time, and the great devotional spirit which it contained has been an inspiration to the world ever since, and there have been many many edition)sof it, and many ^{tr}anlstions into many languages. That is the vital feature of his life and work, I am not giving you the heading, here , having discussed ~~it~~ it under the previous century. And any discussion of St. Aug. certainly ~~is~~ his Confessions are one of the works to mention. ,

They were published when he was about forty, ~~is~~ just about at the turn of the century.

(question) I think that Manich. was pretty largely dead ~~a~~ issue before
(11½) I don't think that they were a ~~great~~ great factor as far as
 Manich. was concerned~~xxxxxxx~~ but there was groups of Man. that lasted on through
 the conquest, and even in the Middle Ages, 800 years later, we find outsprings
 of Man. in southern France, and in Northern Spain. But I don't think that in
 between there was much of a movement. People were pretty well shown the error
 of it. It was not a great factor in the last part of.....(12)

Well, now, we will then not take more time on Manich. and I remind you
 again of the Confessions, here, because in any discussion of his life, they
 deserve great attention. But in our division by ~~a~~ centuries, we put them under
 the previous century.

Well, I will go on to number 3, which I will entitle one of his books,
The City of God. I might have thought of calling number 3 his controversy
 with the pagans. But I think instead of doing that, ^{it} ~~this~~ might for ~~aba~~ balance
 for ~~parrai~~ parallel of terms, controversy with the pagans might have been a
 good title for it. But since in this particular case his ~~activities~~ activities
 center so largely around one great production, and since that production has
 been considered by many as the greatest thing that he ever wrote, all would ~~agree~~
 agree that it is one of the two greatest books that he ~~wex~~ wrote, it like the
 Confessions has been reprinted over and over and translated into many
 languages, and has had a ~~terx~~ tremendous influence on the world. And in some
 ways it has had a greater influence than the ~~Confessions~~ Confessions. I think,
 perhaps, the City of God will ~~w~~ be a good title for it here. The City of God/

Now, in Aug's early years, his contacts with paganism werenot so extensive,
 that is there were more pagans ~~xxx~~ still than in any ~~a~~ other group. But he
 was thrown with Manich. He was thrown with various Christian or semi-Christian
 sects. And it was among these that he was able to find the truth. He never
 seemed to have come himself into the position where he seriously ~~a~~ considered
 paganism as a possible thing for his life. He was, of course, greatly impressed
 by some of the pagan ~~R~~ people. By ~~Cicero~~ Cicero and by Plato and by these men.

He was greatly impressed by them, and in his discussion with paganism he deals with their views and their philosophies very extensively. But paganism as a religion never seemed to him a great ~~int~~ intellectual force like some of these other movements did. And all through his life he was dealing with it, it does not seem to be a major feeling ~~o~~ of his life as some of these other ~~movements~~ movements of the time were. That is, ~~paganism~~ paganism ~~persay~~. But the book, The City of God, was one of his great achievements, one which took a great amount of time and thought.....(end of record)

Record 136

It has been a tremendously influential work. Now, I have already mentioned to you the occasion which led him to write the book. We noticed in our survey of the political history of the world, ~~that~~ how that in 410 the City of Rome was ransacked by the Goths. And this made an impression on the whole world. Jerome over in Bethlehem ~~felt~~ felt that surely the world was ~~so~~ soon to come to an end. When the City of Rome, the Mistress of the world, which for 800 years had never been overcome by a foreign enemy, which had ruled the world so long, was sacked and plundered by an army of barbarians surely this must mean the very end of civilization, the very end of the world, and the Lord would be coming back very soon. That is what Jerome felt, as shown in his ~~letters~~ letters. And this shows to us how this affected not merely the thousands of Romans who fled for their lives, and who lost all their property except what they could carry with them, ~~but~~ not only that, but the affect upon men's minds throughout the world. And pagan leaders throughout the world began to say, this shows you what Christianity does. ~~Here is our great empire~~ Here is our great empire, and now it is ~~wrecked~~ wrecked. Our city is destroyed, and it is due to the weakening affects of Christianity. Some said this. Others said no, that wars and thunders and troubles are a characteristic of human life, but they said that they had been spared from that for centuries because of their sacrifices to the gods, their incense, their prayers to Jupiter and to Venus and to Mars and the ~~different~~ different gods, and now they are ~~being~~ being neglected, their temples are standing nearly idle, there is ~~nobody~~ nobody giving the services,

the gods are angry and they have permitted these things to come upon us. And so there were many people who were wavering in their minds between paganism and Christianity, who ~~found~~ found this a tremendous force to keep them from seriously considering the claims of ~~Christian~~ Christianity.

And Aug. wrote his answer to this, and he said, no the Roman Empire is a great force, but he said that it is a force ^{which} while it had much good on it, it is a force actuated by ~~human~~ human brutality, ~~by~~ by human injustice, by human desire for personal aggrandisement, it is a human thing, and he said that which matters is that which is of God. Our citizenship is in Heaven, he said we are fellow citizens with the apostles, and ~~with~~ with the saints, and the human city isn't the ~~thing~~ thing which matters to us, it is the heavenly city, the City of God. And he wrote this to a friend, and then he became very much stirred up in thinking about it.

Now, then, about this time a Spanish presbyter named Erosius, came to Africa and studied with Aug. and when Aug. asked him if he couldn't ~~write~~ write a history of the world in which he would present the true situation, and this man wrote a history of the world. And it is a history which has much good philosophy in it, ~~but~~ but he didn't ~~know~~ know enough facts of history, he put about two years working on the thing, and it was insufficient to get the sufficient material or to do a proper job of it, and while the book had considerable influence it wasn't Aug.'s style or Aug.'s power, and Aug. realized that it wasn't filling the need. And Aug. felt that he himself must do something to fill this need. And in 413 he began working on a ~~book~~ book on this theme, ~~the city of men and the city of God~~ the city of men and the city of God. He began working on this in 413 and he worked on it in his spare time for the next 13 years. And it is hard to see what Aug. did and to see how he ~~did~~ had any spare time to work on it. And it is a fact that much of the book is rather rambling and there is a great deal of repetition in it, and that is probably due to the fact that rarely could he get a chance to spend a few hours simply pondering over the book and planning and working on it. He had to ~~work~~ work it in intervals, in the midst of not only an extremely busy life, in his parish

there, but constantly called to Carthage for ~~some~~ councils and meetings and other parts of North Africa to deal with problems. And the carrying on a ~~xxx~~ correspondence with people all over the world, dealing with all sorts of questions, and feeling that it was his duty to take an interest in everything that came up that would be ~~a~~ of interest to the Christian world.

Along with this he managed to write this tremendous book. And it is really amazing that he could do it, and amazing that it could take its place as a masterpiece, and yet it is so ~~fine~~ fine that some of us can't help just wishing that it would have been possible for some of these other things to have been done by somebody else, so that he could have put twice as much time on the book, because it would have been even better. But it is doubtful that there was anybody in that day, living at that time, who could have written as good a book on the theme as Aug. did. I say that ~~the~~ very goodness of it makes you wish that it were a lot better, because he had the capacity to make it ~~a~~ better if he had the time to do it. The time to give serious quiet thought to ~~the~~ the problems involved.

Well, now, in this book he has ~~22~~ 22 books. He divides it, as was the custom in those days, into books. And I suppose this division comes originally from the fact that until just about that time things weren't written as books, as we call them, but they were written on scrolls. And they were called books, as you could only get a certain amount on a scroll. And consequently they would write a scroll and they would call it a book, and then a publication of the subject might have a lot of scrolls, and by Aug.'s time they were probably already getting used to book form as we have it, but they still kept the terminology. So he has 22 books. And these books each have chapters in them, of course, and these 22 books deal with the problem is Christianity something that is weakening the Roman Empire? Is it something that is bad because of these terrible ~~tragedies~~ tragedies that are ~~now~~ now occurring? Is paganism true after all? The ~~first ten~~ first ten books are devoted to a rambling ~~criticism~~ criticism of the pagans. ~~Five~~ Five were ~~historical~~ historical and general ~~criticism~~ criticism, and ~~five~~ five to a criticism of their philosophy. And the remaining twelve books

good for pe and the evil force and they are g fighting. And the two co-exist. And sin is simply a matter of doing something that helps the wrong weel, being on the wrong side. And, ~~Augxxxxakxxx~~ of course, the Man. thinks that *everything* physical is persay evil. Creation is a bad thing, physical is evil, and all things solid and material are evil. This latter part of the discussion is completely free. But the ofrmer part, the idea of dualism, some say that he has two opposing kingdoms, the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world, two cities, they are ~~x~~ opposing, when ~~x~~ actually world history is a plan which God has made. ~~B~~ Now, of course, I think that I am not altogether ~~xxxx~~ sure that these ~~xxx~~ criticisms of Aug. are correct. Ot is very hard to draw the line. If you take the view that the world history is simply a picture which God has planned and every aspect of it/ is just the way He wants it to be, you make God the author of sin. And all of our Christian creeds declare ~~thix~~ that God is not the author of sin. And that is one thing Aug. is, I believe, rightly.....(11 $\frac{1}{2}$) He insists that wickedness is in~~x~~ the world because of the will of satan, ~~xxx~~ or the will of man, and not because God has ordained. God deals with wickedness, He deals with sin, He punishes sin, He pounishes us for our sin, He saves us through His grace, but He is not responsible for our sin. And so there is something that is somewhat like a dualism, which is ~~true~~ true, but it is very very far from Manic. dualism, because we believe that God /is supreme, that Satan continues only becaue God permits him to continue, and and that evil though not established by God , not God's will that we should fall into evil or that evil should be done, neverhteless it is something which He uses for His own purposes, and brings goed out of it eventually. We believe that all things come to pass and ~~x~~ are ordained of God. And Aug. did too, very very thoroughly.

So to say that you believe in no dualism whatever puts you in a clearly unscriptural position. On the other hand, if you believe in a dualism where the forces are anywhere near equal in power, it is something that is very definitely anti*Christian. So I doubt if the ~~xx~~ accusation against Aug. on this point is justified, andyet we might with he had made his view on it a little clearer in the City of God, ~~xxxxxxxakxxxx~~

He does make it abundantly clear elsewhere. But in this book sometimes you get a little impression of the two cities as if it was a struggle that just goes on and we know God is going to finish it out some way, but we are not just sure how it is going to work out. That isn't what Aug. believes at all. WE who belong to Christ are on the side that is not only certain to win but God controls all things now, and even the bad things that come into our life are ordained by Him for His own purposes.

Well, this is a warning, but not, I believe, a criticism of the book. The warning against misunderstanding it. What is more serious as a criticism of the book is the fact that he does not make clear in it exactly what he means by this city of God. The city of man is not Rome. It is any human organization which is actuated by sinful and selfish motives. That is the city of man. Now, of ~~any~~ course Rome is the perfect example. And the great power, the great effectiveness of Rome through the ages he explains as to natural virtues which they had, but which were so mixed with evil qualities in their minds and in their viewpoint that it is still the city of man. But the city of man he makes abundantly clear. But what is the City of God? Exactly what is it, Well it is the opposite of the city of man. It is those who believe in Christ and who follow Him through the ages. It is those who are led by the Word, those who love God. But ~~what~~ what is it? In what capacity is it. Is it ~~something~~ something that exists in Heaven...(end of record)

Record 137

And so I do not think that it is Aug.'s idea at all that the city of ~~the~~ Man, Rome with pagan ruling wickedness is going to be replaced by the City of God. Rome with ~~the~~ Christian rulers ruling by....(1 1/2) I don't think that is his idea at all. But that is an idea ~~that~~ nevertheless which we see with great impetus from this book. And so the Middle Ages, this movement which ~~is~~ proceeded toward thinking of the empire as continuing, though the Roman Empire had perished, but ~~continuing~~ continuing as a purified empire, a Christian empire, an empire which is ruled in Rome, but a purified Rome, a Christian Rome, with ~~the~~ Christ's representative as the head of the empire. An idea which never found realization in actual Christian love, but it was just like a realization in externals, was an idea which received considerable impetus from the influence of Aug.'s book. I think it is a by-product of the book which was a harmful

by-product. But it is a by-product which has been ~~tremendously~~ tremendously important in history. I do not say that the idea was created by the book. But I say that it received an impetus and importance and support by the viewpoint generated by this book, the City of God. And it thus had results, they weren't its main results, certainly, but perhaps in some ways it was. Results, I am sure, that Aug. never envisioned. It is a book which is beloved today not only by Roman Catholics but also by Protestants, and we find much in it which is tremendously useful to us. And if we think of the conception as I think Aug. really meant it, I don't think that there is a great deal with which we can differ in what he has to say. On his eschatology, he departed from the common idea of previous years, that the reign of Christ was to be set up after the destruction of evil and the return of Christ. He departed from that idea, and interpreted the millenium as being a picture of the church through this age. ~~And~~ And in that regard his ~~arguments~~ arguments are contained toward the end of the book, and they also had a tremendous influence. I don't think his arguments at this point are particularly good, I don't think it is one of the matters he studied through, but his influence was great in this direction.

Well, now, so much then for ~~number~~ number 3, The City of God.

(question) I doubt if this particular book had anything to do with Calvin's view. Calvin was tremendously influenced by Aug., but I doubt if this particular book was a part of it.

Now, number 4, His controversy with the Donatists. And this is a phase of his life which we do not hear so much today. The controversy with the Manicheans is finished and yet it was the beginning great controversy of his life, and it is something which all approve of, what he did, and Manicheanism continued to some ~~extent~~ extent as a force, though not a great one, and yet enough to make people remember the great interest in what he had done against Manicheanism. The City of God has had an influence ever since. His later ~~controversy~~ controversy with Pelagians is one later subject which came the latter ten years of his life, and is one which has tremendously influenced the whole Christian world ever since, and which had a great influence on all the leaders of the Reformation. ~~But~~

But his controversy with the Donatists, deals with a force which disappeared from history and you find Pelagians today, and you find people with Manichean viewpoints today. You find the philosophy of the City of God. ~~Donatistism~~ Donatism was a movement which perished. And consequently it is something which is to quite a large extent forgotten. Donatism was a movement, not simply a thought, not primarily a thought but a new movement of institutions, of people, of organizations, and consequently a great part of the discussion deals with matters temporary in nature, which have disappeared. I doubt if there is a tenth of the interest today in the controversy with Donatism that there is in the other controversies. And yet his controversy with Donatism occupies perhaps more of his energy than any ~~one~~ of his other controversies. It was certainly not as important in his life as all of them put together, not by any means. But it took up more of his energy, more of his ~~time~~ time and lasted over a much longer time than his controversy over Manicheanism, or of his controversy with Pelagianism, more than his writing of the City of God.

It was in his ~~life~~ life one of the greatest efforts, one of the things that took time and energy over a very long period. And you can't understand Aug. without understanding this. And not only that, his effects of his ~~relation~~ relation with Donatism had a great affect upon the church in succeeding years. And so it is important that we know something about it. And in my ~~personal~~ personal opinion, if the time and energy which Aug. spent on his controversy with Donatism had been taken and been divided among his other controversies, in my personal opinion, ~~it~~ his contribution to the world would have been even greater than it is. And ~~his~~ results of his activities, which I think were harmful rather than helpful in his influence, would have been spared.

So that the controversy with the Donatists is the place where I think he makes some very serious mistakes. And I think that ~~it~~ it was very unfortunate. But we, I think, should have something to say in the understanding of it. Because it took so much of his life, and it.....(8)

Now, Donatism, we have briefly mentioned before. We ~~mentioned~~ mentioned at first now ~~250~~ in 250 the ~~precursor~~ as a precursor of Donatism in 250, 150 years before Aug.

were outside the pale. And some of these men claim that what they did was when the persecutors came and demanded the ~~xx~~ sacred books, and said we will let you go if you give them to us, and if you don't give them to us we will torture you to the point where you will not be able to stand it any longer and you will confess where they are hidden. And give them up and then we will kill you, they turned over certain books and said here are our sacred books. And they were spared the persecution themselves because of having turned over the sacred books, but what they actually turned over were heretical writings, which they figured the Romans wouldn't know the difference. And they had hidden the sacred books carefully where they wouldn't be found, and they had turned over these heretical books, ~~which~~ which the Roman thought were the sacred books

Well, now, they said they had deceived the Romans, but we are not(11 $\frac{1}{2}$)
 We preserved the sacred books, otherwise we would have been forced to give them up. We would have been so persecuted, so tortured, in such heinous and diabolical tortures that human flesh could not have been able to have resisted it, and from some of them they would ~~xxx~~ have learned where the books were hidden. But this way they didn't ~~xxxx~~ go searching for the books any longer, because they thought they had them. And they simply ~~x~~ burned what he gave them.

(question) I think they would have been Scriptures. They might have been hymn books and things like that, but they would have been principally Scriptures, There wouldn't be much else. ~~What?~~

Well, ~~xxxxxx~~ in the persecution it is pretty hard to prove exactly what happened. But it seems that during the persecution there in Carthage, many of the people got a great dislike for an archdeacon named ~~x~~ Cecilian. And ~~xxxx~~ this archdeacon was in Carthage, there, under the direction of the bishop, was opposing two great veneration of the martyrs. Anyone ~~xxx~~ who was put in ~~xxxx~~ prison on the grounds of being a ~~xxxxxx~~ Christian, many people would flock to the prison and bring him food and presents and to ask him to pray for them and take souvenirs from them and so on, and some of these people, they said, were people who were ~~k~~ criminals, people who perhaps had fallen into sin and would have been expelled from the church for their sin, and who would have been caught by the state and punished and they saw a chance to

Well, there was all kinds of details, like in church disagreements so often personal things come up, and they get ~~much~~ magnified and magnified, but when ~~St~~ Aug., nearly 100 years later, became a bishop, there were more Donatist ~~and~~ bishops ~~in~~ in Africa than there were Catholic bishops. And in Hippo itself the Donatist church was ~~not~~ a bigger church than the Catholic church. And the bishop of the Donatist church forbid his members to even sell bread that they baked to the Catholics. And they had the bakeries in town, and so the Catholics had to make their own bread at home, because they couldn't buy any bread because the bakers were Donatists and they didn't sell their bread to the Catholics. And the difference between the two groups as far as doctrine was concerned was nil. Well, not quite nil. It was the treatment of the ~~law~~ law. And the Donatist said, if a man is a sinner he can't ordain somebody else. If a man is a sinner, what good can he do to you. While Aug. said, it is the work ~~of~~ of Christ that counts, not the character of the man who is officiating. A man may be converted by the sermon of a man who proves himself to be a sinner. We are all sinners. ~~not~~ It is the truth that counts, not the character of the man who is imparting it.

So you see, the doctrinal, as far as what we would call the great points of the creed, they were both thoroughly loyal to the great doctrines of the Bible.

(question) The Catholics claim that the Donatists asked Const. to interfere, and prevent them from being disturbed by the Catholics who ~~said~~ said we are the church, and then when Const. decided that they were wrong, then they said, what does the church ~~have~~ have to do with the state, It has nothing, no power over it, and ~~far~~ from that ~~time~~ time on, the Donatists held the principle that the church ~~itself~~ would settle its own affairs, the state had no right to interfere. But the others always ~~said~~ said, well that is not the way you started. You see, the controversy is a very confused controversy, but it was a very vital matter with more Donatist churches in Africa than there were Catholic Churches.

And Aug. set out to prove that the Donatists were ~~wrong~~ wrong and succeeded in giving the death toll to the ~~Donatist~~ Donatist movement. Well, we will look more at that tomorrow, as I am going to have to run. (break in record)

We were talking at the end of the hour about the relation of Aug. with the Donatists. We noticed that ~~he~~ when he went to Hippo as presbyter there, which was

really assistant to the minister who was ~~called~~ called a bishop, at the ~~time~~ time, that the Catholic church, that is the church ~~in the organization which~~ with relationship to each other. It ~~wasn't~~ wasn't an organization, but there was relationships, friendly relationships and communications, throughout the Roman empire. And consequently called the Catholic or all-embracing church. But the Catholic church in Africa was smaller than the Donatist church. And the Manichean church, while not as big as either one of these, was perhaps bigger in certain centers, and was quite active in parts. ~~And~~ And actually in Hippo I believe that the Donatist church was bigger than the Catholic church when Aug. went there, But the Manichean church in Hippo was so ~~powerful~~ powerful and attracting so ~~much~~ much interest that both of them felt very much afraid of its progress. And the ~~Donatist~~ Donatist rejoiced when Aug. vanquished the Manicheans, and they were very very happy about this and joined in, in backing him up and celebrating his victory over the Manicheans, But then he turned against them, and he had debated with the Manichean bishop with shorthand ~~writers~~ writers present to take everything down, and had ~~completely~~ completely vanquished him, and undoubtedly his arguments were far ~~superior~~ superior and he had the truth and the Manicheans had a view that was filled with error, and yet anyone who listened could see that Aug. was a ~~practiced~~ practiced debator, thoroughly trained in rhetoric, a man who probably could have taken the worst side ~~and~~ and won the debate and so that when he turned to the Donatist ~~bishop~~ bishop and ~~said~~ said now we can have a debate with you, the Donatist didn't look on it with any favor at all.

But Aug., before very long, began to turn his attention strongly to the Donatists. Aug., of course, ^{had} ~~and~~ been greatly confused as a young man with the varying views. The Manicheans seemed to be Christians, and they attracted him by much that followed words of Christ and words of the Bible, though they rejected much of the Bible, they still ~~quoted~~ quoted a great deal of it too. They used a lot of Christian terminology, they claimed a lot of Christian virtues, which you didn't find in heathenism in general, and Aug. found himself in ~~early~~ early days very confused to find what was the true church. The church where you would get the truth. What was the right ~~presentation~~ presentation the right teaching. And, of course, his mother had been very unhappy when he seemed to be purely secular in his attitude, and when he started turning his attention toward any

religious group she was/ happy to some extent. But still she was always wanting him to be a Catholic Christian. And that was her rejoicing. She died happy, because he was a Catholic Christian.

Well, all of this predisposed to feel that it was a shameful thing not to have the true Christians be together in one group, working together. And, of course, we must say that when people hold the same view and advance the same teaching, believe in the same Lord, and turn their fire against one another, it is a wicked thing. We must say that. We all believe in the communion of the saints. That is a part of the Apostles Creed, which is quoted by all true Christians. We believe in the Holy Catholic Church. ~~There is no such thing as~~ It is a part of the Apostles Creed, which he means not a visible organization, but that all true Christians throughout the world are members of Christ's body. And therefore it is shameful to see how many groups of Christians are fighting one another over little differences and ~~many~~ matters of forms or ceremonies or interpretations of perhaps points which are not clearly brought out in Scripture. It really is shameful and must be a great grief to the Lord. That is altogether different than saying that people should cooperate with one another when they differ on the great essentials of the Faith. The Lord wants us to be absolutely ~~and~~ fore-square and out-and-out on the great essentials of the Faith, but anyone who is truly standing for the great essentials and standing against error and ~~and~~ apostasy, He wants us to cooperate with them. And to above all consider them as our brothers, in Christ.

Well, it is sometimes ~~and~~ a hard distinction to draw, I am very much irritated at times to find ~~and~~ people, true Christians, who will walk right up to the greatest enemies of the Christian faith and show the ~~friendliest~~ ^{friendliest} attitude toward them and cooperation and then will get bitter in their ~~oppositions~~ ^{preparations} opposition to other ~~Christ~~ Christians who differ with them on ~~and~~ some minor point, of doctrine or of ceremony.

Aug. faced this question, and Aug., believing in the unity of the body of Christ, which every true ~~is~~ Christian must believe in, carried it ~~as~~ a step further to the point where they ought to get at least in the same relationship to each other without organizational differences, aside from those which geographical difference has produced.

(question) I am sure what Aug. meant was that outside of Christ's body there is

no salvation. Outside of the body of C hrist there is no salvation. If a person turns his back on all other C hristians and won't work with any of them, you can question very seriously whether he truly is saved, I don't think we can judge the man. We can say this, that every true C hristian is a member of the body of C hrist. And outside the body of C hrist there is no salvation. Now there is hardly any organization, calling itself ~~it~~ by the name of ~~some~~ C hristian, which actually down to earth believes that there is no salvation outside of ~~that~~ its own organization. The Roman Catholic church certainly does not believe that. They will tell you that there is no salvation outside of the church, but then they will go on to say that there are many within the R oman Catholic church who are lost, and they will say that there are ~~no~~ many outside of the church who belong to the true church, even though they do not know it, And others. When you get down to it, many people talk in such a way to give an idea that is confusing on this, and they may be confused in their own thinking, but there are few whom you would call real C hristians in the history of the Christian church, or few even who have stressed to any great extent the great doctrines of the Bible, who have held that membership in an organization was essential to salvation. ~~That's the way it is~~

A R oman C atholic monseigneur told me in W ashington, ~~two~~ two years ago, he said, if a man knows that the R oman Catholic C hurch is the true church and he refuses to join it, that man cannot be saved. I said I will agree with you 100%. If a man knows that is the true church and refuses to join it, of course he can't be saved. How could he be? A man who knew that it was C hrist's will that he should join a certain body and he wouldn't do it. But if a man doesn't know, or if a man is convinced that it isn't true, why they will not say that he is condemned on that ground. S o that actually, the all C hristians groups, more or less Christian, have, when you get down to their full teaching, they have expressed it in ~~many~~ a way that actually it is not simply membership in an organization which saves them. It is true that one who is a member of an organization in which ~~is~~ he is hearing the truth of C hrist constantly, you have much more reason to think that probably he is a true Christian, ~~more~~ than one who is absolutely by himself somewhere, and certainly than one who is constantly hearing error and unbelief. * But an absolute rule ~~is~~ cannot be made.

on a friendly viewpoint. He said to them, you are Christians, as we are, you believe the same as we do, it is shameful that we should be split apart and not have friendly relationships between ourselves. Now he said, you come in and join with us. And he said, we will try to make as many of your bishops as possible bishops of our church, And he said, where we have two churches, which are about the same size in a town, he said, let's have two bishops be co-agular bishops together. He approached them on the friendliest basis. It was in the early days of the conflict. Now as the controversy went on, and the lines became softer, he said certain things he would not have said in the beginning. These things, which he said later, must be interpreted in the light of what he said in the beginning. And his attitude was not, he never said that the Donatists were lost. He never said that. If he said that outside of the church there is no salvation, that was not to be interpreted in the way to mean that the Donatists were lost. He might think of a particular Donatist, who was very opposing to the catholic church, was lost, he might say that. But his attitude was not that the Donatists were lost, but that it was their duty to be in one church together, and the Donatists said how can we go into a church with people who are under leaders who have been ordained by(4½)

They said one hundred years ago Felix, a bishop in a small town in Africa, was a man who surrendered ~~his faith~~ the Christian books to the pagan persecutors, and he was a man who was called upon to ordain the bishop of Carthage. Now, they said, we can't go into that church, we can't work under that bishop. Well, of course, that bishop was dead long ago. But that bishop ordained the next bishop, and he ordained the next, and he ordained the next, and all went back to Felix who was a.....(5) And therefore none of them were true Christians. Well, Aug. answered. He said in the first place there is no evidence anywhere that Felix was a ,.....(5) You said he was, we have good proof that he wasn't, and we don't believe that Felix was a one. But, he said, even if Felix was, Felix did not select the bishop of Carthage. He was selected by the Christians, the people of the church and the ~~his~~ leaders. They selected him to be the bishop. Felix wasn't the one to select him, and he said, furthermore, the ordination does not lose its validity if the man who does the ordaining is a sinner. He said, an ordination comes from Christ, not from man, and a man

performs the ceremony in connection with the ordination, but if the man is Christ's man to be bishop, whether the man was a sinner doesn't affect it. The attitude at the beginning of Aug. and the Donatists, the attitude of Aug. was much more gracious and friendly than the attitude of the Donatists, which was, we can't work with you, you folks are sinners. Your bishops 100 years ago was ordained by a(6). So we can't work with you. And you people are too lax. A man falls into sin, and he comes back and he says I am penitent, and ~~xxxxxxx~~ you say give us a proof that you are penitent, and in some churches the proof is very severe, and in other churches it is rather mild. But at any rate, after the proof, you accept him back as a member of your church.

Now, they said, you can't do that. If a man is lax, if he has fallen, he is outside the pale. You folks are too lax, we can't work with you. They were the ones who were taking the strict position. Aug. was taking a position that if you had the foundation of the faith, if you stand on the great truths of the Scripture, there is no reason why you ~~xxxxx~~ can't simply come back and work with us, and work together. But of course the Donatists, in order to come back, would ~~xxx~~ actually have to give up their position that Felix was a(7), and ~~xxxxxxx~~ therefore the bishops of Carthage had no authority because ~~they were~~ one of them had been ordained by Felix. They would have to give up that position. And they would have to take a willingness on matters of the restoration of the lax. Not to say, you have got to do what I say, but that the church ~~xxxxxxx~~ as a whole, including them with the others, should decide in a particular case what to do.

Aug. was taking the ^{milder} moderate view in the claim that they should get together. And then when they absolutely refused to get together, then as time went on, Aug. took a more firm view, and said some things which can be interpreted in a way that contradicts his real attitude. He went ~~xxx~~ on, he said, if you are absolutely obdurate, you insist you won't get together with us, you are breaking the rule of Christ, you are dividing it into parts, you are doing a sinful thing, and he said, outside of the church of Christ there is no salvation, and if you are insisting on dividing the church, you are putting yourselves outside of the church of Christ. You see, it was not that he

said in the first place, you folks have to ~~x~~ come in the Catholic Church or you' are not saved not at all. He said, you are Christians, you can come in, you should come in, we should join together, we should all come together. But when they refused, then he went on and came to a rather extreme view, in some of his statements.

(question) That is the difficulty with any man's views. We have to be careful what we say, because we can build things on his ~~statements~~ statements. Because, all of it you see has to be interpreted in the light of context. I have very often had people ~~xx~~ come to me and say, ~~no~~ o, I have heard so and so say such and such a thing. What do you think of a man who would say such a thing. Well, if he is a man ~~xxx~~ of whom I know, his viewpoint is in line with the quotation given me, naturally I am not surprised. I may be shocked, but it is what I expect. But if it sharply contrary to what ~~was~~ my impression of the man as a whole is, I think that at the minute I would say, I don't believe ~~g~~ he said that. Or if he said those words I don't believe he meant them, ~~no~~ in the way you have taken them. ~~I would probably admit that you can give a proper presentation of his view by quoting some of his words. Because they are out of line with the impression he gives in general. Now, after talking I may find that those words do represent his true attitude, and that I have been mistaken as to his viewpoint.~~ ~~I have not spent years studying Aug., and I may be in error. But I have spent a fair amount of time on it, and I am quite sure that on this particular point you can't take that one sentence and deduce from it beyond what I have just stated.~~ ~~But this controversy with the Donatists was a controversy which consumed a tremendous amount of Aug's time. In the earlier years his effort was to get them together. Let's come together, let's discuss the point. Maybe there are some points that we are off on. Maybe there are some points where you are wrong. Let's discuss them; let's find the truth. But when~~

In this particular case I have not spent years studying Aug., and I may be in error. But I have spent a fair amount of time on it, and I am quite sure that on this particular point you can't take that one sentence and deduce from it beyond what I have just stated.

But this controversy with the Donatists was a controversy which consumed a tremendous amount of Aug's time. In the earlier years his effort was to get them together. Let's come together, let's discuss the point. Maybe there are some points that we are off on. Maybe there are some points where you are wrong. Let's discuss them; let's find the truth. But when

it came to a debate, the Donatists were very vvery much afraid of ~~them~~ him beca^use they knew of his ability and power along that line. And the whole thing was complicated by the fact that there were a group of Donatists who were in Africa for abo t a century, which was somewhat like a monastic order. They ca^lled them the Circumcelliones. Now, that is a Latin word, and ~~it~~ they seem to have been like monks, but they didn't stay in one place. They weren't celled up in one place like most of the monks, but they~~xxxxx~~ wandered around. And these men were men who took a very literal insistence on the truth of the whole Bible, but they do not seem to have had much background or study or interpretation. I personally hesitate to be quite as severe on the Circumcelliones as most of our ~~books~~ books are, for the reason that we have nothing written by them that has been preserved. We have very little written by the ~~Donatists~~ Donatists that has been preserved. After the defeat of the Donatists, there ~~was~~ was nobody to ~~pe~~ perpetuate their writings and their material. And everything that we have is from the hands of their oponents. And the Circumcelliones were not educated people who were writing much. What we know is what ~~h~~ we hear about them. ~~En~~

But if you will cut down as much as possible what we know about the Circum. and say, this is probably not true, and this is extreme, and this may be only an individual instance, when you get through with it, you have a great many(12) left, which certainly it was quite right that people should be shocked about. But to how great an extent their shock should be carried over to the Donatists as a whole is hard to say. But ~~these~~ these Circum. wandered about in ~~xxxx~~ rude clothing, saying that they were entirely devoted to Christ, and they were separate from worldly ~~activities~~ activities, people should contribute to their support, and anyone who did not see the truth as they~~n~~ understood it, should be compelled to come in and talk to them. As Christ said, compel them to come in. And these people, ~~z~~ even the Roman soldiers were afraid of them. at times. They never used a sword because ~~Ex~~ Christ said to Peter, put up thy sword. So they never carried ~~swords~~ swords. But they carried heavy clubs. (laughter) And many times people were beaten to death,

they say, by the clubs of the Circum. And people were very badly injured by the clubs. It was said of them, by their enemies, that the Circum. so coveted the crown of martyrdom that sometimes they would go up to a man and say, here, I want to be a martyr for the faith, kill me. And if the man refused to kill him, they would be so angry at him they might even kill him. ~~L~~ (laughter) But they were pretty badly injured. And they say that some of them used to jump off high cliffs, and some of them used to kill themselves in other ways. Now just how far these stories are to be ~~believed~~ believed, as I say, I don't know. We don't have anything that we could call an impartial testimony. But we do have abundant evidence of the fact that people as a whole were terrified of the Circum. I mean, there may have been very many fine people among them, but there were at least enough extreme ones of this kind who caused people as a whole to be terrified of them. And they ~~brought~~ brought a great disrepute upon the name of Donatists. ~~Next~~ Naturally that was the thing that should not be tolerated anywhere, but with the Roman Empire at this time, struggling to maintain its life, they weren't in a position to enforce things as they should have been.

(end of record)

~~Record~~ Record 140

And in the first half of the controversy he was constantly urging them to get together and be friendly and talk things over and see if they could not talk things over and even to the very end he was urging that they offer the Donatist bishops to come into the Catholic Church and still be bishops. You can still be bishops, you can still be head of the church in your area, only be Catholic rather than Donatist. But those who would not come in, in the ~~end~~ end he became ~~very~~ very very severe toward. Very strict in his final attitude ~~toward~~ toward the ~~Donatists~~ Donatists.

(question) Well, it is very hard to draw conclusions, as we have nothing written by the Donatists, except such things as have been copied by others and preserved. And the full account, a Donatist/^{who}would write a history of their movement, we don't have. We have accounts of the debater, in which they told their view and told what they felt ~~was~~ before, but so far as I have gathered,

in all the books that I have seen, speak of the Circum. as Donatists. They speak of them as group^s of Donatists. One book mentioned them as a group of mendicants, sort of monks. And that is the attitude which everyone has taken toward the Circum. They certainly ~~are~~ were so considered at the time, by certain people. Whether the Donatists themselves would have defended the Circum., or would have said acutally they don't belong to us, we don't know. We don't have the evidence. And in view of the ~~many~~ many other good things about the Donatists as a whole, it is hard for me to think that they were a big part of them. But yet I do not know of ~~any~~ any evidence that we have of their repudiating it. If they had said, they have nothing to do with ~~us~~ us, then surely that would have been preserved, too, and we ~~would~~ would find it in the accounts. So that the Circum. were very different from the Donatists as a whole, certainly, but they affected the people's attitude toward them, very much.

Well, we can't go into all the details of the controversy. It lasted many years. But in the end it resulted in a time, about 410, when they had a big meeting in Carthage, at which under the Roman Prefect's direction, and he was to be the judge, there was to be a presentation of the Donatists view, and the Catholics view. And they had about 280 bishops of each. I thin, there were 286 Catholic bishops, ~~and~~ and 279 Donatist bishops, something like that. They had great ~~big~~ crowds of people who ~~came~~ came. Many bishops who came, and they had this long extensive discussion ~~of~~ of the points at issue, and in the end ~~the~~ the Roman Prefect decided that the Donatists were wrong on the points at issue, that ~~if~~ they should be members of the one true church, they were wrong on the points at issue, and they should unite with the others, and if they did not they should lose their property and should be forbidden to hold meetings. That was the Roman Governor's ~~decision~~ decision, and I do not think it was entirely ~~enforced~~ enforced ~~important~~ 'by' any means, but it was enforced in certain areas.

And Aug. had been trying to get these ~~people~~ people to unite peaceably with them, and he seems to have been favorable to the attitude that if they ~~wouldn't~~ wouldn't unite peacefully, if they wouldn't take the attitude of talking all the thingsover and decid^eing what is right, insist on being outside, then

they should they should be forbidden to have church property and to hold services

(question) The Roman Prefect was the Roman Governor Marcellinus, who ~~was~~ presided at the meeting, he was a good friend of Aug.'s and very favorable to Aug., and he gave the decision, and he himself about three years later, was executed by the Romans on the pretext that he hadn't been loyal to the emperor. That had nothing to do with this, however. And then they sent another man ~~in~~ in his place.

(question) Well, this was after many years of arguing and discussion and letters ~~to~~ to the emperor and so on, back and forth, and the position was reached where ~~it~~ doubtless the emperor would have said, well if they won't come and discuss the matter and let us see what the evidence is, I will give the order to take their churches away from them. Doubtless they were under compulsion to come and discuss the matter. But, of course, the writers all say that they were inconsistent in that they ~~had~~ were the ^{main} ones to call ~~the emperor~~ on Constantine to decide in their behalf. Then, when he decided against them, from that time on they seemed consistently to have taken the position that the emperor has nothing to say ~~to~~ about the church. But that was not their original position. And that, of course, was a^N unfortunate ~~is~~ inconsistency. Their view on this point is a view which we hold today, but ~~is~~ very few ~~people~~ people seem to have followed it at the time.

(question)

Well, now, the Donatist ~~controversy~~ controversy, then, was one which ended with the Donatists churches broken, some of them still held, but most of their property taken away from them, the great bulk of the people either staying out altogether, ~~or~~ or coming into the ~~churches~~ catholic churches. And the argument pretty thoroughly discredited it with the great mass of ~~people~~ people by Aug.'s writings and Aug.'s ~~own~~ activities. I think we can safely say that nearly 25% of Aug.'s tremendous fund of energy ^{in these years} went into the Donatist Controversy. And, personally, I regret it very very much. Personally I feel that the fact that within a year after Aug.'s death all of North Africa was swept over by the ~~Vandal~~ Vandals, ~~and~~ holding the Arian view and persecuting Donatists and

Catholics alike, and North Africa is today an area which, of course the Mohammedan invasion swept over everything later on. But I can't help feeling that if Aug. had devoted his energy to trying to advance the great principles of the Christian faith, which the Donatists and the Catholics both held, in such a way as to strengthen the Christian zeal of the members of both groups, that they would both have been able to withstand the Arian oppression later far better, and even to withstand the eventual Mohammedan invasion, in a far different way than they did when so much of his energy had gone into this particular controversy. Not that he didn't write a great many books, on the great Christian doctrines, he did a tremendous amount. He did enough work for two other people, on them alone, apart from the controversies, but the influence of this, to my mind, weakened the Christian church later on. I think that was very very harmful, the result of what he did. And then, of course, another result was that in the course of his opposition to the Donatists he made statements like this one that has been quoted, that outside the church there is no salvation. Statements, which taken in the light of the context, knowing what we know of Aug.'s belief, I think we would all agree with. But a statement which was taken out of context, could easily lead to an attitude which follows with a right to a hierarchical church, with ungodly men at the head of it, that Aug. never possibly would have supported in that way.

So. I think that this controversy with the Donatists forwarded a movement which Aug. fundamentally would never have supported.

Well, now, let us go on from the controversy with the Donatists to number 5, the controversy with the Pelagians.

And the controversy with the Pelagians is one of the outstanding features of Aug.'s life, and it is the controversy which evoked from him those writings which have been most effective in modern times. Because it evoked from him those writings of the grace of God, which stirred the heart of Martin Luther, and which tremendously impressed John Calvin, and which had a great influence, not only in Protestant circles, but in the Roman Catholic Church. It was Aug.'s writing which led to

the movement called Jantzenism, to which place Pascal, the great scientist, and a great Christian, belonged. A movement which was in the Roman Catholic Church in the 17th century, developed a very fine Christian ~~group~~ group which eventually was condemned by the pope and brought to an utter end. But which had a very creditable history, and it is very interesting to see, nowadays, to see occasionally in lists of great Roman Catholics, they will list Pascal, who was one of the greatest scientists in the world's history, and also one of the greatest ~~Christians~~ Christians, they will list him as a Roman Catholic, and as a great scientist. And he belonged to a movement which was condemned by the pope, and eventually utterly destroyed by the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church.) ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

And one of his outstanding writings, is a series of letters attacking the Jesuits in the very strongest of language. But the movement to which he belonged was a movement which swept along with a movement which sprang up as a result of the reading of Aug.'s writings on the grace of God. And these writings, to a very large extent, came as a result of his controversy with the ~~Pelagians~~ Pelagians. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

So, from the viewpoint of Protestant theology, Aug.'s controversy with the Pelagians is more ~~important~~ important than anything we have looked at yet. In actual accomplishment it is not more important than anything we have looked at yet. His Confessions, His City of God, his controversy with the Manichaeans, his general work in the church were all of tremendous importance. But they were forwarding activities which were going along with others doing them, apart from him, and which would have gone along just the same if he hadn't even though he gave very valuable help in them. But in this case, he was the initiator, and the leader in the movement to which all Christians ever since have given a great deal of lip ~~service~~ service. But in the Roman ~~Catholic~~ Catholic Church, Aug. completely won ~~out~~ out against Pelagius, various ~~councils~~ councils ~~through~~ through the ages have nullified many of his statements, while still giving lip service to his name. And many would say it was a return to the great doctrine of Aug.'s which was one of the great moving factors of the Protestant Reformation.

And these doctrines came out in connection with this controversy with the Pelagians.

So number 5, the controversy with the Pelagians. And in connection with the contro. with the ~~x~~ Pelag. I want just to say a brief word, first, about the relationship of Aug. with Jerome. The reason ~~fix~~ I want to say this is because in the contro. with the Pelag., Aug. and Jerome stood shoulder to shoulder. Now, the contro. affected the viewpoint on this, the grace of God, affected Aug. right straight~~down~~ down to the earth. And is so prominent in his case, and so much less prominent in Jerome's that Luther far preferred Aug. to Jerome. But in the actual contro., Jerome stood shoulder to shoulder with ~~xxxxxxxx~~ Aug. Jerome stood shoulder to shoulder with him, and in fact Jerome suffered severe persecution on account~~of~~ of his stand with Aug. in this.

And so, just a word on the relation of the two men. A word which brings great credit to Aug. rather than to Jerome. In 395 Aug. already settled in North Africa, studying and writing, interested in the fame of this great ~~man~~ man and the ~~great~~ great writings of his which were about, wrote a friendly letter which he set off to Bethlehem to Jerome. But they had no decent ~~postal~~ postal service in those days. And in this letter, a very friendly, ~~courteous~~ courteous letter on the whole, telling how much he liked Jerome's works, and asking Jerome ~~if~~ if he had seen any of his, saying he would be much interested in Jerome's ideas about his own writings, in the course of it he ventured ~~to~~ to criticize ~~Jerome's~~ Jerome's interpretation of a passage in Galatians. Where Paul says, he withstood Peter to the faith. Now, Jerome said, two apostles certainly weren't opposing one another. If these two apostles were inspired of God and absolutely free from ~~a~~ error ~~how~~ ^{how could} they oppose one another. ~~It is impossible.~~ It is impossible. Now, of course, I think any correct understanding of what inspiration is, shows that inspiration means that God kept them free from error in what they wrote, not in what they said. And an apostle, you don't get a dozen apostles to agree exactly in everything. Naturally the apostles had differences in opinion on many things. (end of record)

Record 141

And consequently Paul could withstand Peter to the faith, and they could ~~both~~ one of them be greatly in error, the other be right, or they could both be in error on a certain point. Though, fundamentally correct, they could be in error on certain details and after they had argued it over and discussed it together under the leadership of the spirit of God they would both come to the correct view. And when they came to the correct view, whichever one of them God had led to write it down, in a book which would be part of the inspired Scripture, would give the correct view, but along the way one or both of them could have held erroneous views on the matter.

Now, I don't see any other possible fact, when Paul tells ~~xxx~~ us in Gal. 2:11-14, he withstood Peter to the faith. And that is what Aug. thought. But Jerome seems ~~xxx~~ to have ~~a~~ taken the attitude, how could an apostle be wrong, particularly how could Peter be wrong. And so ~~of~~ Jerome ~~is~~ said, ~~xxx~~ Peter and Paul wanted to get the truth across to the people, ~~xxx~~ and so they arranged it all ahead of time. And when the situation came, Peter went over and stopped eating with the Gentiles and went over and ate with the Jews so to give Paul an excuse to get up and talk strongly to him, in order to bring the thing out in ~~xxx~~ clear relief and get the thing through. And actually it was just a little play, the two of them doing that. But Jerome gave that ~~view~~ view, and that is a view which I am sure many Roman Catholic writers hold today. Peter ~~couldn't~~ couldn't have been wrong. And we can't say that Paul was wrong either, especially when it was part of the inspired Scripture that Paul writes telling us about it. So it must be that they were just pretending then. ~~Well, xxxxxxxx,~~

Well, of course, if you got a dozen apostles, and they all agree on every little point, they ~~xxx~~ never had any sharp differences of opinion, they wouldn't be men, they would be machines. God ~~is~~ could have made machines and press a button and certain things would happen. But that is not what He chose to do. He chose living beings. ~~xxx~~ And He ~~xxx~~ led these beings gradually in their thought in their discussion, to correct understanding, and He revealed

certain things directly to them.. But He inspired them in their writing of Scripture, and only in their writing of ~~Scripture~~ Scripture. ~~Andxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ That is all that inspiration refers to.

Well, now, we can't get into any discussion of inspiration here, that is not part of this particular course/ But we can touch upon it as we pass here. And so we see that Aug. in the course of his letter, I don't believe your opinion that this was a pious make-believe, for practical purposes, by ~~Paul~~ Paul and Peter, I think that what Paul ~~says~~ says means what he says. ^Uhat they really disagreed on that point. And Paul is showing that on that point he is right and Peter was wrong. But the unfortunate thing is that the man who took Aug.'s letter was going to Palestine, but he was going to stop in Italy somewhere, and he stopped in Italy and he got held up and delayed, and ~~he~~ he never got to Palestine, so the letter never got there. But this man had some of Aug.'s writings, and everybody was getting interested already in what Aug. had to say on all kinds of subjects, and they said let's have what you have of Aug.'s writings, we would like to see them. And so they made copies of them and they were distributed around Italy, and among them was this letter. And Jerome gets a letter in Bethlehem that this ~~a~~ man Aug. in Africa that Jerome had never heard from, had written what was supposed to be ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ a letter to Jerome, criticizing him for his opinion about Peter and Paul, and the letter was being distributed in Italy and Jerome had never seen the letter, and ~~Jerome~~ Jerome didn't like it. And so when Aug. didn't get any answer, the next year he wrote another letter. And this ~~xxxxxx~~ man, a presbyter named Paulus was on his way to the Holy Land, but he made quite a trip on the ~~way~~ way, and his letter fell into the hands of the Roman clergy who hated Jerome anyway. You remember that ~~Jerome~~ Jerome had shaken off the dust of Rome off his feet. Although today when you go into St. Peter's Church, there is that great beautiful picture of St. Jerome just as you enter. He is one of the ^o greatest saints of the Roman Catholic Church. But he spoke in no uncertain terms of what he thought of the clergy of Rome, when he left.

Well, they got hold of this second letter of ~~W~~ Aug.'s, and they were all

tickled about Aug.'s having defeated Jerome in ~~JEROME~~ Jerome's favorite field of study. So they said. Of course he didn't. Aug. was a much greater thinker than Jerome, but nothing like the scholar/ that Jerome was. Well, ~~xxx~~ when Jerome got this letter, although it had been read by a good many others, but when Jerome heard of this he didn't like it, and he didn't even answer this letter. So Aug. wrote him a third letter. He sent a brief pleasant friendly letter to Jerome, and then in 402, six years after the first letter had been~~xxx~~ sent, Jerome sends an answer. He says, far be it from ~~me~~ ^{me} to/ ^{dare} touch the works of thy ~~hi~~ holiness. I am quite content to care for my own writings without criticizing those of others. For(hard to understand) And so Jerome wrote a rather sarcastic letter to Aug. and Aug. wrote a nice friendly letter trying to get him to be friends with him, and Jerome wrote again and he says... I am an old man in the retirement of myself, I wish you wouldn't bother/ me/ If you are determi/ ned to exercise and parade your learning, seek out a youth-ful oponent. And so Jerome tried to put Aug. off, but Aug. kept after him with friendly letters and with explanations of the fact that he had never intended to publish something first before Jerome got it, but that a miscarriage of his letter on the way, and so on, and ~~xxx~~ actually the letter wasn't an attack on Jerome. He had expressed his disagreement on this point, ~~xxxx~~ in the course of agreeing with other things. And of course when people published the letter naturally they picked on the thing they thought was sensational. That is what they stressed. ~~xxxxxx~~

And so, Aug. kept after him with a friendly attitude and asking forgiveness for these things in so far as Jerome had been offended and saying how utterly ~~xxxxxxx~~ contrary to his intention it was, and after quite a while he succeeded in persuading Jerome that he was sincere in his desire for a friendly attitude. And in the end, Aug. and Jerome became very good friends who were writ/ing letters to each ~~xxxxxxx~~ other, and who were discussing~~xxx~~ the great problems ~~xxxxxxx~~ confronting the Christian church with one another and affecting one another's views in them, and eventually both ~~writingxxxxxxx~~ writing to bring the church as a whole to the opinion which they had come to the conclu-

sion were the correct ones. And Aug. tells us ~~at~~ at the end of his life, how there were one or two points which he were quite convinced Jerome was wrong on and he simply waited until after his death to write anything about them because he didn't see the need of stirring up ~~the~~ discussion of them on these ~~these~~ lesser matter when there were so many great things which they agreed on.

Well, Aug. and Jerome thus became very good friends. And it was ~~xxxixixix~~ helpful with the great Pelagian contro. the fact that they ~~did~~ did stand together, though not very helpful to Jerome, because ~~xxx~~ as a result of it he got his monastery plundered and ~~gxxxixi~~ many of his people badly beaten, himself driven out into the cold night to spend the night out there shivering. And really suffered a good deal of ~~persecutionxxxxxxx~~ personal agreeing misery at an age when he was well over seventy, on account of his ~~aggression~~ with Aug. in the opposition to Pelagianism. Now I hope we would finish Pel today, and we have only three minutes left, so ~~xxx~~ all we can do is start it. And if the assignment which I gave you which was for today, which wouldn't have to be finished until day after tomorrow I think had been to be prepared ~~to~~ for today, I would have asked you, would have had a roll call, and I would have said, who are the three men who were most prominent in connection with the Pel, on the Pel. side in the Pel. contro. Because the section in Hodge, which I assigned you to master on it, begins ~~with~~ with the mention of the three men. And then goes on to discuss their views. And the views are far more important than the men, but we ~~started with~~ ought to know the men. One of the men is Pelagius, the second is Selestius, and the other is Julian. Of these three, Pelagius is the one from whom the name comes, of the contro. Pelagius was probably a Briton. We do not say he was an Englishman because at this time there was neither an England nor an ~~Englishman~~ Englishman. The Angles were still a stribe in north Germany. Well, he was a Briton, coming from the area which now we call England. Now there are those who deny that. They say he came from Brittany in southern France, but it seems very unlikely that they are right. ~~When~~ When you take what ~~xx~~ Jerome says about Pelagius. Jerome says of Pelagius, he is a big fat darksome(10) (laughter) He says

that ~~ix~~ he is bloated with the ~~pkagaxxfxkex~~ pottage of the ~~Set~~ Scotch and the Irish. Now I don't think ~~w~~ he would say that of a man who came from ~~seix~~ southern France. From what Jerome said, we can be very sure of two things that Pelagius was from Briton and that he was a big stout man.

But Pelagius lived for many years in Rome without any criticism so far as we find, being made of his personal life. He was a good man. He was a ~~b~~ man who was very much in error on certain views, and very tenacious in his ~~b~~ views, and would have done a great deal of harm ~~if~~ if Aug. hadn't shown him the error of his views. But the views were originally with him the views of understanding. He was a man who was like Jerome, was tremendously interested in moral ~~impr~~ improvement, he was interested in monasticism as Jerome was, though not quite so fanatically so as Jerome. But he was trying to get people to live better lives. And he got disgusted with ~~peppex~~ people who made excuses, and after all, the Bible says you have not resisted unto ~~his~~ blood striving against sin, the Bible says it is our duty to strive to ~~ix~~ live the kind of lives God wants us to. But the Bible also tells us that when we try we will find that we can't succeed without the grace of God. And that we need the grace of God and it is truly by His grace that we can succeed, but even then we have a duty to use our wills to do our best to live the kind of life that God gives us.

Well, Pelagius found so many people making excuses that they didn't have the power, they just couldn't do it, and Pelagius got pretty disgusted. Because in many cases it was plainly that they just didn't want to. And so Pel. started telling them that they had the power. You can if you will. And then people began quoting the words of Aug. on the grace of God. And Pel said that is all very well, but it is up to you. If you want to live a decent life, you can do it. And so in the end, Pelagius expressed himself in the way that represented human nature as sufficiently good if we will only do what we know we should do. And, of course, Aug. saw much more deeply that human nature is fundamentally wicked, and though we all can do a lot better than we are doing, and we all need to do the best we ~~possib~~ possibly can, yet that

fundamentally every aspect of our nature has been corrupted by the Fall of Adam and by the affect upon us of our environment with others who are wicked, and that we need the grace of God at every stage of our lives, if our lives are to be in any way satisfactory to Him.

Augustine ~~xxxx~~ went back over his life, and he said, how did it ever come that God has saved me. Wonderful grace. And any true Christian ~~xxxx~~ must say that apart ~~fx~~ from the grace of God, I would be nothing. But there were many years when Pelagian was active in Rome, and ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Aug. was active in Africa, ~~xxxx~~ without Aug. realizing, he had probably heard of Pelagius, but not realizing ~~xxxxx~~ anything of his attitude until finally the thing came out in ~~xxxxxxx~~ bold relief and then ~~xxx~~ Pelagius began speaking out strongly and attacking Aug.'s teachings. You have a controversy there, which lasted for a ~~xxxxxxxxxxx~~ number of years, and which clarified for the Christian church the matter of the grace of God. The controversy which brought out the great writing of Aug., ^{which were so important} in connection ~~ix~~ with the Reformation and in the life of most of true Christians ever since.

(end of record)

Record 142

The three men are the so-called leaders of the Pelagian controversy. I did not mention Pelagina, just now, because Pelagian is of course one of the three. And it is the best known of the controversies of Aug. life. Especially among protestants. It is the third great controversy of this life, it does not even ~~xxxxxxx~~ begin until he was 57 years of age. And it is remarkable, that after that time, after the completion of his Manichean controversy and his Donatist controversy that he was able to write the tremendous amount of material, much of it extremely interesting, and all of it very carefully thought about, which he did in connection with his Pelagina controversy. And it was his anti-Pelagian writings particularly which influenced Martin Luther and John Calvin, and Jantzen and other leaders of the ~~xxxx~~ teachings of Aug. in modern days. Some ~~wixgixxxx~~ within the Roman Catholic Church, some of them within the various protestant groups.

But Aug.'s influence has been greater than that of any figure of ancient times, except the apostle Paul. On the protestant world, and his influence has been as great as that of any ancient leader on the Roman Catholic side. But as far as the Roman Catholics are concerned, it is ~~xxxx~~ other parts of his activity, rather than this one, which has influenced the most, though this is in ~~xxxxxxx~~ many ways. But the protestant world has found that his writings on this point ~~xxx~~ do not bring out new things, and new viewpoints, which we hadn't had before, but it develops and makes plainer things which are already found in the The City Of God, and ~~xxxx~~ elsewhere. But ~~xxxx~~ brought them out and defended them against attacks from all sides, and made them a real a vital force.

Now, this controversy did not begin when he first heard of ~~xxxxxxx~~ Pel. because Aug. had heard of Pel. for ~~xxxxxxx~~ many years. Pel was well known in Rome. He was a monk in Rome who was trying hard to lead people to lead better lives. And ~~xxx~~ he was considered as a man of high ~~xxxx~~ quality and fine character. That was the general impression of him. And he was generally well spoken of. But in his thinking ~~xxx~~ he moved in the exact opposite direction of that in which Aug. moved. And ~~xxx~~ Pel. was the first to conceive(5½) This was because there were people in Rome who misunderstood Aug.'s teaching completely. ~~x~~ Aug. stressed the grace of God, the fact that man is in original sin, man is filled with sin even the good things he does are sinful. The desires of his life are headed toward destruction, and it is only the grace of God that can change him and turn him around. And turn him toward that which God ~~xxxxxx~~ desires. And Aug. stressed that so much that some people carried it toward and twisted it around to give it an excuse, the result was that when Pel. would tell them that they ~~xxxxxxx~~ should live better lives, they would say, I can't I am not predestined to live a better life. I can't help myself. God has not chosen to save me. So there is nothing that I can do about it. If God would give me his grace I would live a better life, but it is not my fault He doesn't. Of course that is an utter trap in Aug.'s teaching. Aug. never dreamed of anything ever being

said like that. And when Pel. heard that sort of thing, though, he naturally thought that was the view that Aug. held, or at least he felt that Aug. led to this, and he began to feel quite strongly about it. And so when he began to attack Aug.'s views, and he began to develop his own thinking, and he developed his own thinking, although he was orthodox on the great facts about Christ, he was orthodox on the great doctrines of Christianity, he soon found that it was possibly in his thinking to hold those doctrines and yet from a viewpoint of any practical importance to push them off to the side to where they wouldn't matter.

To him the thing that mattered was, a person should live a good life, and he shouldn't give any excuse for not doing it. He should show the good that is in him, and proceed to live a good life. Well, Aug. said, Adam fell. And the whole race fell in Adam. And we are implicated with him, he represented us, we are guilty on account of his sin, we are born in sin, and as we go on in life, the sinful life which we have brings forth more sin. And there is plenty of sin in every one of us, of overt sin, to account for our condemnation, apart from the sin which we are born with. But the original sin is sufficient until now to account for our condemnation, as Paul describes in the 7th chapter of Romans, that which we want to do we don't do, and that which we don't want to do we do. It is only the grace of God. Well, Pel. said, we need the grace of God. You step out and be a man and do the best you can. And God will give you His grace to help you. The grace of God is the useful thing helping you along the way. But the vital thing is that we get it and show what we are capable of doing. To bring out the good that is in us.

Now, you see, there was a sharp opposition there between the two, in their fundamental views. Now an interesting thing is that the eastern church, which was terrifically concerned with the exact fact of the nature of Christ, did not seem to be the least concerned, with that is most of the eastern church, with the controversy. The great historians of the eastern church scarcely mentioned it in their writings. But in the west it came to be a very

~~important~~ important thing, between 413 and say 426 or 427. During those ~~ya~~ years when the whole west was great agitated over this, and actually it strikes at the very foundation of our religion. Because it is a matter of how religion relates to each one of us. And what it means to us. This is vitally ~~concerned~~ concerned in it.

It came first to the light, the discussion, when there was a Roman woman who was a descendant of three of the great families of ancient Rome, and these great families looked to her to carry on their position and tradition, and she decided to take a vow of virginity. And ~~in~~ to devote her life to the service of Christ, and not to marry. And she was so well known that Jerome and Aug. and all the great leaders ~~wrote~~ wrote her letters, ~~congratulating~~ congratulating her on her decision, and praising her for what she had done. But Pel wrote her a letter, ~~and~~ which he gave copies of ~~to~~ to ~~the~~ others, and ~~he~~ others soon began to sound ridiculous. And in his letter he told her how wonderful it is, what she had done, he said that this shows the good of human nature. That she could turn away from the natural desires of life, and from all that meant so much to her, ~~and~~ and her ancestors, in having posterity and in living a family life, that she could turn away from that and could ~~and~~ devote her whole life to developing those characters which the Lord wanted her to. It showed what wonderful potentialities were in human nature, and she was greatly congratulated. Well, this was like a blow in the face to Aug.'s views and attitudes. And Aug., of course, set to work to answer. But one thing about Aug, he was always ready to answer anything that he thought was wrong.

Once, during his busy life, somebody in Carthage picked up a manuscript which they found on the streets, a manuscript which had in it an account of a new attitude, a new series of religious views, a new heresy. It was called Christian, but it denied most ~~of~~ of the essentials of the Christian faith, and they picked it up and they sent it to Aug., and they said, we don't know what this is. I wonder if you could explain it to us, and tell us whether it is right or wrong. And Aug. wrote a long book, answering this new heresy, which

nobody knew who had written it, or where it had come from. How he was able, in his life, to take ~~xx~~ up practically every problem people would write him about, ~~xxx~~ it is hard to say. But naturally when he ~~w~~ saw what Pel. had done on this, he immediately began to write. to try to bring out clearly what the situation was as he understood it.

Now the thing came into sharper relief by the fact that in 410, as you know, Aleric had sacked Rome. And when he came to Rome, there, as he approached many people naturally fled. ~~N~~ Thousands of them fled in great ~~x~~ numbers, and they came to Africa. And among those who went to Africa at first were Pel. and ~~Sxixx~~ Celestius. Celestius was the Roman advocate who Pel., the monk, had converted. And he had not ~~xxxxx~~ only become a clergy Christian under Pel.'s influence, but he actually and naturally became quite a strong supporter of Pel.'s viewpoints. And he was a well-trained advocate, and good in preventing things, and so he became even more than Pel, and storm center of the controversy.

The two of them were in North Africa in 410, this is before the letter I just mentioned, just before it. They were therein North Africa in 410, and Aug. was at that time very busy with the Donatist controversy. They went to see him, but Aug. was very busy and he didn't see much ~~xxx~~ of them. Pel went to Palestine. ~~xxx~~ And he left Cel. to sow the seed of his views in Africa. And now Cel. comes before the council in Carthage, before the bishop in Carthage, and asked him to ordain him as a presbyter. ~~Neitherxxx~~ Pel. was a monk, and Cel. had become one, but neither of them had been ordained. And so he asked to be ordained as a presbyter. And the bishop, Aurelius, had heard that he was suspected of some bad ideas, and ~~xxxxx~~ therefore he asked a deacon to investigate the matter, as to whether he was worthy of ~~xxx~~ ordination or not. The deacon drew up an indictment and made a list of charges against Cel., as grounds why he could not be ordained. ~~x~~ One was that Cel. said that Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he sinned or not. More important than ~~y~~ that was his claim that Adam's sin did not bring any ~~punishment~~ punishment on his offspring. ~~Adxxxxxxx~~ Adam's sin

affected only himself. Each man has to stand on his own feet before the Lord. No one, subsequently, has been in any way affected by what Adam did. He said that infants ~~xxx~~ are ~~xxx~~ born in just the same condition that ~~the~~ Adam was ~~xxx~~ before his fall. And he said that the race did not die in the sin of Adam, the race does not rise again in the resurrection of Christ, he ~~said~~ the law, no less than the gospel, introduces men into the kingdom of heaven. He said there ~~were~~ were men who lived without sin, even before the ~~the~~ coming of Christ. Not a great many, but a few people, who were good enough to live without sin.

Aug. was not present in this synod, he ~~was~~ belonged in the Midian province of North Africa, not the one around Carthage. But the ~~xxx~~ council decided that ~~the~~ Cel. should not be ordained presbyter, but that in ~~a~~ fact he was not ~~an~~ Christian in his views and they should not enter into fellowship with him. In ~~o~~ther words, they excommunicated him. So he left and went to the east. After leaving behind in Rome, in Sicily, and in North Africa, people whom he had filled with his own ideas. He ~~went~~ went to the east, and there in the east he and Pel. sought ordination there. And there in the east, in Palestine, they found that when they came before the bishop of Jerusalem, and they asked him to be ordained, they found that one of the best pupils, a man from ~~Spain~~ Spain named Europius, whom we mentioned once before as having written a history of the world.....(end of record)

Record 143

.....both in false teaching and that they should not be ordained. And Pel. said, I know just as much as Aug. does, ~~but~~ and this man ~~had~~ had been trained under Aug. and had such a tremendous respect for Aug.'s ideas and thoughts, ~~and~~ that he kept saying, Aug. says this, and Aug. says that, and the bishop forgot, ~~and~~ and the bishop forgot himself and he said,.....($1\frac{1}{2}$) quit talking about him, these men are perfectly all right, and they ordained them.

Now Jerome entered into the discussion. I read you a little last ~~time~~ time what Jerome said. Jerome was not nearly as gentle _{in}

his language as Aug. was. Aug. sometimes got rather heated. But Jerome always spoke out in very lively fashion. I mentioned to you last ~~time~~ time that he said Pel. was a big fat dog from.....And Jerome spoke very strongly against these ~~men~~ men, and the result was that their supporters became so indignant that they attacked Jerome's monastery, and Jerome had to flee out into the night, from the wild plundering that was carried on by these ~~supporters~~ supporters of Pel. Now that, of course, is not Pel.'s attitude. I don't think anybody would accuse Pel. himself of ~~doing~~ doing a thing ~~like that~~ like that. But it is pretty hard to ~~escape~~ escape, as you read from Pel. activities, from the feeling that he did this thing. That though his life in general seemed to have been a life in which there is little that you can seize upon to criticize him in his personal dealings, there is one thing that he did, was to try to advance his views in whatever way he could, even at the expense of using language that other~~people~~ people would take in a different way from that which he meant. And he seems to have done this on an good many different occasions. And he and Cel., they would each of them would be confronted by a council, and they ~~would~~ would hear what the other had said, they would sharply say, I don't ~~believe~~ believe anything like that. And what they believedand they were very shiftless in their dealings with various councils. And they got some of the councils to ~~defend~~ defend them in the strongest language, and even to weep, that men, such godly characters, such fine men, would be subject to such terrible criticism, such a bitter ~~attitude~~ attitude as that which they said Aug. ~~and~~ and his friends had toward them. And in doing that, one time, in a council in Palestine, when it had decided that these two men were absolutely free from anything wrong, and when the account of the proceedings was brought to Aug., Aug. ~~said~~ said, the heresy has not been here approved, the men have been approved for pretending that they don't hold these heretical views. And that is what it amounted to. And they went right on teaching it just the same. And strongly presenting the idea that human nature needs, every man needs to live the ~~best~~ best he can. And if you live

the best you can, God will help you. You will have the grace of God to help you. But every man, if he will use the best ~~that~~ that is in him, he will be all right.

Of course they quited a lot of Scripture, and they claimed to be throughly orthodox on their odctrines on the character of Christ, His person, His relation to God, and all these grea t fundamental doctrines. And it was ~~often~~ often very easy for people to be misled. But Aug. was constantly writing, and constantly presenting the situation, and in the course of time Aug. completely won out. In the end, a council, ~~xxx~~ a general council, which was held in the east, condemned Pel. completely. In the end he was condemnéd in Carthage by two or three councils, one ~~x~~ after the other, representing Africa, he was condemned by the emperor, and he was condemned by the bishop of Rome and ~~xxx~~ everyone who held his views were ~~ordered~~ ordered to leave any official position in the church of Italy. And ~~quite~~ Quite a large number, fifteen or twenty bishops, at least, were put out of their positions in Italy in the end, because of their having ~~w~~ espoused Pel.'s views.

So in the end, Aug. won out completely in the discussion. And in the end Pel. was condemned in east and west alike. But in the course of the discussion, the doctrines of ~~pre~~ predestination, of original sin, and the grace of God, were developed and expounded as they had never been ~~before~~ before. And Aug.'s views were brought out into clear sharp relief in a way which affected many of his contmeporaries. Which to a large extent was forgotten during the Middle Ages, but which became living fire in the teachings of ~~Mr~~ Martin Luther and of John Calvin. And of many other modern groups who study Aug.'s writings.

Now I don't think that it is necessary that we ~~w~~ go into all the details of the controversy. ~~I~~ But one thng that I think is quite important for us to have in mind is the ~~relation~~ relation of Aug. to the church of Rome in connection with it. Maybe I will make that another head.

Number 6. Aug. and the church ^{of} ~~at~~ Rome. Aug. and the church f Rome. Now this is related to this controversy. Let me say first that in all of

Aug.'s writings you would have a ~~xx~~ hard time finding anywhere in anything that suggests that he considered the Church of Rome to be supreme ~~of~~ over the church of Africa. It is interesting, I have a book here by a Roman Catholic on Aug.'s life, in which he mentions something that Aug. did, and he said that he proceeded to western Africa.....(7) Well, I doubt very much if he would find ~~x~~ any evidence that Aug. thought that he was obeying any command of the bishop of Rome. But in connection with the Pelagian controversy, ~~Ag~~ Aug. was anxious to get the support ~~of~~ and the help of all he could. And in connection with this controversy, Pel. had lived many years in Rome. And he had many followers there. And it became particularly important for Aug. to get agreement with his views on the part of the leaders of Rome. And so Aug. wrote to Bishop Innocent I, and he wrote to him and told him about the views of Pel. and he was naturally anxious to get a good reception on the part of him, and so he writes very very modestly in his letter. He says that a council in North Africa has ~~condemned~~ condemned this, had condemned this heretical teaching of Pel., but that there are many in Rome he ~~hears~~ hears, where he lived so long, who favored him for one cause or another, and he asked that the authority of the apostolic seat be added to their own modest stature. Not that the bishop of Rome approved what they had done, but that the authority of the apostolic seat be added to our own modest stature. We have ~~studied~~ studied this with the best that we can, but he said the Lord, by a special favor of his grace, has placed in the apostolic ~~the~~ seat and has given such a character in our days that we should be guilty of negligence if we failed to suggest to thy holiness what seems good for the church. And to ask that your holiness should apply his ~~pastoral~~ pastoral diligence to the get dangers of the(9) members of the church.

Well, now, Innocent of Rome, the bishop of the church, the greatest city in the western part of the empire, and the most famous city in the whole empire, naturally would be very happy when the greatest man in Christendom addressed him in these modest terms, of himself and these praising

~~xxxx~~ terms about Innocence. And he took full ~~advantage~~ advantage of the ~~opportunity~~ opportunity. And he wrote back three replies which breathed the dignity of the sovereign pontif in every line. He said, it is very fine that they have written him, and he points out they are only following the time-honored custom of appealing to Rome. So he says. But it wasn't so time-honored, and it wouldn't have been worth ~~wy~~ quite so much attention and praise to them for the fact of ~~having~~ having done it, as he gives. And he thinks that it is very wonderful that they have consulted him, and gives the importance of the bishop of Rome, and he confirms their decision with great ~~sever~~ ^{pomp and} severity. And he says that Pel.'s book is dangerous and blasphemous, and excommunicates the two leaders of the heresy.

And so now, in the 23rd of September in 417 Aug. preached a sermon in Carthage, and in this sermon in Carthage he was very anxious to get everybody to realize that they shouldn't be misled in their teachings by Pel. and he said two councils ~~of~~ ^{of} the North Africa church had condemned his heresy, and he said, the bishop of Rome has joined with us. The cause ~~is~~ is finished, he said, would that the results and the ~~difficulty~~ difficulty were as soon ~~a~~ ended as the cause. In other words, the matter is settled. Two synods of North Africa have decided and the bishop of ~~Rome~~ Rome has joined with them, and ever since, all through the history of the Middle Ages, it was customary to quote, Romae has spoken, the cause ~~is~~ is finished. As showing that the great Aug. recognized that what the Bishop fo Rome said was the last word in the controversy. Rome has spoken, the cause is finished.

Those words were much quoted by the Rev. FatherJ. Bourke, Ph.D., who wrote a book in 1944 on Aug. He is a Roman Catholic from Milwaukee. In his account of this sermon, admits the fact that those words were not spoken by Aug. He said, telling about Aug.'s letter ~~to~~ to the Bishop Innocent, he said the closing lines of this letter give interesting evidence of Aug.'s attitude toward the authority of the bishop of Rome. Now this is a Roman Catholic writing. Here he quotes from the letter, the kindness of your heart will pardon, we hope, the length of this letter,

which we send to your holiness. For it is not that we are trying to ~~gxf~~ flood your vast river of knowledge with our stream ~~z~~ of information, but in this period of temptation from which we can be free, only by Him who we say lead us not into temptation, we wish only to have your approval in writing of our judgment. He doesn't say that we want you to settle this thing. You with your authority. We want your approval in writing of our judgment, which flows from the same source which yours come more ~~abundant~~ abundantly. And to be consoled by a common participation in one grace.

Now those words are quoted with great joy by this Roman Catholic ~~w~~ writer, here, to show the attitude of Aug. toward the bishop of Rome. But my guess is that if the bishop of New York were to write today in similar language to the bishop of Rome, he would get a pretty hot ~~a~~ criticism. What do you mean, putting yourself on the same level as I am, saying that your knowledge comes from the same source as mine does. Even if you do say I know a lot more than you do, you don't recognize my ~~author~~ authority. What do you mean by asking me to confirm your ~~decision~~ decision? After all it is up to me to decided, you have no right to decide., except subject to my decision. That is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church today. And Aug.'s statements are very very different. He had evidently read Dale Carnegie's book on How To Win Friends And Influence People, and he wrote in terminology which anybody today, including.....realized the most beautiful modesty of ~~z~~ one of the great scholars of the day to write this to a man who was a nobody except for~~the~~ the fact that he happened to occupy a prominent position. But as far as his knowledge was ~~concerned~~ concerned, nobody would have dreamed it as being one-fifth of Aug.'s. But he wrote him in this language, and he got what he wanted. But ~~he~~ what he was after was to put an end to the Pel. misunderstanding and misinterpretation of Christianity. ^And so he wrote, and he got what he wanted, and then he said in his sermon, two African councils have decided this matter.....
(end of record)

Record 144

The cause is finished, but Bourke says, speaking about this sermon, ~~the epigrammatic saying~~ the epigrammatic saying popularly associated with the name of Aug., Rome has spoken the cause is finished, was not actually ~~spoken~~ spoken by Aug. What he really said was, the cause is finished, would that the error ~~were~~ were as speedily finished. He said, this is probably even more striking than the quotation that is usually given. But maybe even more striking, but it doesn't say anything about the authority of Rome.

But, ~~of~~ of course, if that were there was to it, you might say it was a matter of conjecture. But it so happened that even as Aug. was giving this sermon, a ship was on the way to Carthage from Italy, bearing a letter. And this letter ~~came~~ came from the ~~bishop~~ bishop of Rome. Not from Innocent, because Innocent had died, he had been succeeded by a man from the ~~east~~ east named Zosimus. And ~~Zosimus~~ Zosimus became bishop of Rome and ~~Cel.~~ Cel. immediately appealed to him. And Cel. came to him and he said, these Africans are criticizing us, and they persuaded your predecessor to disagree with us, now we have a man of real intellectual understanding as bishop of Rome. Real knowledge of doctrine, he said, and Cel. said, don't ~~you~~ you think that you ought to investigate the matter and see whether Innocent made a mistake in condemning worthy people like Pel and myself/ And Cel. heard them, and the men who criticized them were men he didn't like, the particular men in Rome who had appeared against them ~~were~~ were men he ~~did~~ did not like. And so Zosimus decided that judgment should be reserved, the condemnation that ~~Innocent~~ Innocent made ~~should~~ should^{be}/removed, at least for the time being. Not only that, but he decided that the people ~~who~~ who were criticizing and showing a bitter spirit of ~~criticizing~~ criticizing these fine Christian gentlemen like Pel. and Cel. should be given a word of caution, a word of ~~admonition~~ admonition. They are ~~causing~~ causing difficulty within the church. And he wrote to the African bishops and chided them for their uncharitable haste in listening to accusations about these very splendid men, men, who he

said, were good Catholics, and of unquestionable faith. And Zos. said to ~~xxxxxxx~~ the Africans that as they heard the documents and professions of faith which Pel. sent, and heard Cel. talking, he said we could hardly restrain our tears when we reflected that so holy an admirable a man had been condemned.

And so ~~xxx~~ Pel. and Cel. were ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ acquitted with honor, excommunicated and denounced the particular men who had brought the charges against them, rebuked the African bishops for their unseemly ~~xxxxxxxx~~ condemnation ~~ox~~ of them, and ends his letter to Aug., ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ I admonished Cel. and all the clergy who were present that these ensnaring questions and foolish strifes, which destroy rather than build up, proceed from an idle curiosity. It sounds ~~xxxx~~ almost like language I used to hear in the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. when the organizational leaders were saying let's all get together and raise money and build the organization and forget these silly questions like whether Jesus is God, or whether it is necessary to believe that the Bible is true or not. They didn't use quite those words, but that is the idea of their expressions.

Now, of course, in his case, he is not dealing with doctrines which were so ~~xxx~~ universally accepted as these have been in the Christian church. It was a good deal with the matter of the predestination, and the importance of the grace of God and original sin, which are just as vital, but not quite as clear, not quite as well understood in those days. But Zos. attitude here in the letter, it is very interesting that this letter should be on the boat, on the way to Africa when Aug. preached the sermon, in which he said, two African councils have decided that and the bishop of Rome has agreed with us, now the ~~xxxx~~ cause is finished. Would that the error were so speedily brought to an end. And of course, through their little agent, they lifted out of that sermon the one statement, the cause is finished, two African councils have decided and the bishop of Rome ~~x~~ has agreed - the cause is finished, They said, Rome has spoken, the cause is finished. Well, just as he made the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ sermon, a ~~ix~~ letter was on the way,

giving the opposite conclusion from the bishop of Rome. And so you can ~~imagine~~ imagine ~~that~~ that as soon as he received it Aug. said, I am very sorry, I am entirely wrong in my views, Pel. is a fine Christian man, I ~~recant~~ recant everything I said, and I give up my ideas that there is ~~such~~ such a thing as original sin, or of the grace of God. It is not only helpful, but absolutely necessary for salvation.

Aug. said no such thing. Aug., when he got this letter from Zos., held another council and they had two great councils within the next six months, and they drew up a reply to Zos. But for some reason this reply which they wrote ~~has~~ has not been preserved. They sent a ~~letter~~ letter to the bishop of Rome, and the letter has disappeared. The previous letter, in which he speaks of the great ~~knowledge~~ knowledge of the bishop of Rome is preserved very carefully. But this one has disappeared. But, ~~the~~ ~~historian~~ an African historian at the time ~~said~~ said that the letter contained these words, by the African bishop. "We hereby ordain ^{that} the sentence which Innocent passed on Pel. and Cel. from the chair of the apostle Peter ~~remains~~ ~~remains~~ remains in force, until they make a clear ~~profession~~ profession of the views which Aug. ~~had~~ had been presenting" and it went on to name ~~these~~ these views. So they flatly contradicted the statements of Zos., and took a ~~definite~~ definite stand against him, and now Zos. begins to hear from others, and to find out that thought there were many in Rome who thought that Pel. was a pretty fine man, that when they read Aug.'s arguments, they realized that Aug., after all, was a far great theologian than Pel., and ~~certainly~~ certainly Zos. himself was no theologian at all. And he began to find the attitude of people was not very favorable to what he had done. And Zos took an attitude which seems to suggest that he wanted to give the matter ~~no~~ further ~~consideration~~ consideration. They gathered from his letter that he had ~~completely~~ completely believed everything that Cel. had said, and ~~actually~~ actually that wasn't true. He had told them that he could hardly keep from weeping when he thought of the wonderful men like Cel. and Pel. being criticized. But that wasn't quite ~~true~~ true, he said.

He was still reserving decision. Now Aug. spoke to the emperor. And Aug. said to the emperor, Honorius, ~~was~~ who was in North Italy, he said that Pel. was hurting the Roman Empire by his teachings which interfered with bringing the true Christian message to people and led them to think that human nature was good enough without the grace of God. And so on. It was a very dangerous thing to the empire, it would hurt the Christian church and the whole empire, and shouldn't Honorius do something about it. And Honorius issued the decree in which he ordered that all who would stand by the Pel. view should be exiled from Rome. And ~~that no one~~ no one should be ~~in~~ in Rome in authority who would hold these anti-Christian views. Well, Zos. had said that these men were wonderful Christians, the bishop of Rome. But the emperor had said they are to be exiled and removed from any authority in the Roman Empire. And now Zos. writes a letter strongly taking the same position. And so Zos. now comes out very strongly in condemning Pel. and in excommunicating all those who held his views. But he does it only after the emperor has taken a similar stand, and only after he himself had written ~~that~~ this letter to the African bishops, in which he had reversed the stand of Innocent, and had said that these were such wonderful ~~Christians~~ Christians, it was a terrible thing that they were being criticized.

And this was conveniently/ forgotten during the Middle Ages. But the one sentence which was remembered was, Rome has spoken, the cause is finished. And thus Aug.'s authority was used to advance something that he never thought of advancing. The idea that, as if, you might say, I am sure that Churchill during the war often said to Franklin D. Roosevelt, now of course we are doing the best we can, but if we only had your wisdom and your understanding of things, and your deep appreciation of the important things involved how much better we could go forward. And Rossevelt would ~~be~~ ^{be} so happy that he would simply send a few more million dollars from us. But if somebody were to quote those statements to show that the British Empire had ever recognized any superiority of the president of the United States,

I am sure that ~~there~~ they would be hotly repudiated immediately. And Winston Churchill would be the first man to repudiate him. ?And that would ~~seem~~ seem to be the nature of Aug.'s letter.

(question)

Well, it's been very interesting, this relation to Rome, here. An important church like Rome, naturally everybody is ~~glad~~ glad to have them on their side. ~~But~~ But there is certainly no evidence to think that Aug. ever thought of ~~that~~ their ever having superior authority over the council of the bishops of Africa.

Now, number 7, Aug.'s last days. Aug. was completely victorious in the Pel. controversy. That doesn't mean to say that the church ~~was~~ as a whole adopted his views. They did, in lip service, adopt his views. The other views were completely condemned, but in the next few years men rose up who were unwilling to take the strong views of Aug. and the Roman Catholic Church has a ~~view~~ whole, in the course of the next century or two, came to a view about halfway between Aug. and Pel. Sometimes it is called semi-Pelagianism, sometimes it is called semi-Augustinianism. But ~~there~~ there was much controversy, but never again in the next few centuries, at least, was anybody ~~really~~ openly advance the ~~view~~ views of Pel. and the ~~the~~ Council of Ephesus ~~had~~ condemned these ~~view~~ views in 431, which is ~~now~~ considered ~~as~~ as the third great ecumenical council. But we talk about that now, we will talk about it later, more at length.

But Aug. was completely victorious it seemed, then. But his views were much too thorough-going for the mass of the church to accept them, unless they were to give up much that was contrary ~~to~~ to them in the general development, the way much of the church was developing. And so the Roman Church through the Middle Ages gave lip service to Aug. But actually largely held to about halfway between him and Pel.

Now, at this point, his last days, I will have to discuss with you after the spring vacation. And then we will ~~go~~ go on to discuss the Christological controversies at this time, and then on into the Middle Ages.
(end of record)

Record 145

The last time we were together I don't believe we had quite finished Aug.'s life. We spoke about number 6, Aug. and the church of Rome. You don't need to know a great deal about this particular feature. There are a few things, though, that ~~are~~ are quite important in connection ~~with~~ with it. Because, after all, Aug. ~~is~~ is one of the leading saints and greatest doctors of the Church of Rome.

(question)

The relationship to the church of ~~Rome~~ Rome is very important, but there are very few points. But I think we went into them fully enough. Then, I believe, we began to speak about number 7, ~~Aug.'s~~ Aug.'s later life. Aug.'s last days. His last days represented a continuation of all his ~~previous~~ previous activities. He was ~~still~~ still busy ~~with~~ with them, to a slight extent, with the Donatists, for there were still groups of them which were meeting by themselves, or which were refusing to come into the large whole church ^{body} body, and he would occasionally meet with them and try to get them to debate with him. But most ~~of~~ of these were simply holding out by themselves and trying to maintain their existence. He had some disputes with the ~~Manichaeans~~ Manichaeans, who remained, but he had pretty well destroyed the backbone of the ~~Man.~~ Man. movement. Though there were ~~some~~ traces of it which ~~continued~~ continued for many centuries. Arianism was beginning to be a little more of a factor than it had, because of the Germanic tribes which were around in different directions, which had been ~~converted~~ converted to Arianism, and he wrote a very fine treatise against Arianism. He had ~~some~~ difficulties with his local establishment. He had sort of a combination school and monastery, with ~~which~~ which his assistants worked and lived, and he had insisted, when they come in, that all of them agree that they would give up all earthly property and own nothing of their own, and simply live there and devote themselves entirely to the Lord's service. And one of them died, and when he died they found that he bequeathed quite a large sum of money and an estate somewhere to someone. That was a great shock to Aug. And so he made inquiries about

the rest of them, and ~~z~~ he found that the rest of them all had property too. And he was very much upset about it, and he made a public statement about it, in which he told them how badly that he felt. He found they all did, and so he publicly declared that he would not hold them any longer to their promise, ~~and~~ to be in poverty and have no property of their own, and it was rather an unsatisfactory episode. The fact of the matter is that Aug. had a very great admiration of the ideal of simply giving up everything for Christ, and he carried it out himself after he became thoroughly devoted to the Lord. He carried it out completely in his own life. And he was very tolerant of others, and would take their word very readily. And so while in his school he trained many men who became bishops and leaders of different sections of Africa, he was very very tolerant and easy-going with any one who seemed to make a good profession of being in agreement with his ideas. And they were a good many hypocrites among them. And also people who were in strong agreement with his general points, but who ~~were~~ found some of his particular points rather difficult and simply kept ~~quiet~~ quiet about them. And it made a rather disagreeable episode toward the end of his life.

He joined, eventually with Jerome, in his judgment of monastic life. Jerome said, I have never found better men than in monasteries or worse men. And Aug. somewhat joined with ~~that~~ that. I think that it is true, that the monastic life for the person who is thoroughly devoted to the Lord may be a wonderful opportunity to carry on a simple life of devotion to Christ, without distraction of worldly things, but that for the ~~person~~ person who is not already thoroughly devoted, it may have exactly the opposite effect. It may stimulate the cravings and needs which would ordinarily be easily satisfied, but which were completely devoid of satisfaction, and they would become stronger than they would normally be, for this person. And it ~~may~~ may stimulate the worst features of one's character, instead of the better ones. It is ~~a~~ a movement which has good points ^{and} ~~and~~ bad points to it. And Aug., like Jerome, was greatly attracted by its good points, and greatly shocked to see the bad points.

One great activity of the latter part of Aug.'s life was his writings of what he called his retractions. And this was a very laudable activity on his part. He took up all his works, and set to work to try to make a statement so people would know how much he still held to of what he had written, and what there was that he had written that he thought was better not written. And so he went right through all of his writings, and he would ~~take~~ take each one of them, and he would mention it, and he would say, these things I think are excellent, this particular point I was wrong in. And he went ~~through~~ through ~~a~~ everything and he called this book the retractions. It really was a survey of his writings. In order to ~~show~~ show what his ideas were at the end of his life. A very fine idea.

I know a very great scholar in America today who has, I think, a very laudable ~~feature~~ feature, that instead of ~~doing~~ doing like many do, waiting until they have the last word on something ~~before~~ before they write, and writing comparatively little, the minute he has an idea he rushed to the printer. ~~And~~ And he has a ~~good~~ good mind, he is a great scholar, and the result is that even his half-baked ideas that he puts out, when they first occur to him, often stimulate others. And do a great deal of good. And then when others develop from them he will develop them further. And he is a very useful ~~scholar~~ scholar. But the result of his quickness ~~to~~ to write anything that he thinks at the time is, that about ~~in~~ two thirds of what he has written he would utterly repudiate today. And if you are quoting from this particular man, you have to know also if this is the first article or the last article he wrote on the particular subject. Because his articles are constantly contradicting one another. Well, there are very few who do that nearly so much.

But in the case of Aug., there is a pretty good unity among his works. So there isn't really a great deal that he has to retract. It is largely a matter of details here and there. But, of course, it is very useful to us to have a list of all his writings. It is helpful to know what are the changes made. Because in these ~~ancient~~ ancient writers, there were often things

written later by other people ~~w~~ that they claim were by them, and we have sometimes questions as to the authorship~~pxp~~ of some books. So Aug.'s retraction~~a~~ is an important part of his literary activity.

Now, I am not ~~gix~~ going to take the time with you to go into the details at all of how the Vandals came to come to Africa. It is a long story. And I don't think that it is necessary that we go into the ~~detailsixwfx~~ details of it. But ~~perkpax~~ perhaps we can notice just the main thing of it. That it was the result of a series of events in which men in Africa did certain things, and some of them were men in whom Aug. had put a good deal of trust. And as a result of certain political mixup and misunderstandings and so on, the Vandals were invited into Africa by the man who had been the Roman leader of Africa. He thought the Roman Government was turning against him, and he invited the Vandals in to help him. And they organized a big ~~expeditionx~~ expedition. I think he married the daughter of the Vandal king of ~~Ex~~ Spain, and they organized a big expedition to come. And when they had it all organized, they made peace with the Roman authorities and wrote them that they didn't need to come, that everything was settled. Well, of course, they were already to come, now, and they disregarded what he said, and they came ahead. So they landed in Western Africa, the whole Vandal tribe, migrated from Spain, after two or three decades in which they had ruled Spain. They migrated to Western Africa, and began coming eastward ~~throughx~~ through North Africa. And this count, who was the head of the Roman government in Africa, who had invited them there, tried to meet them with a force and stop them, but he was utterly inadequate to the purpose. They were pretty strong and well equipped, and well prepared. And the result was that in the last three ~~yearx~~ or four years of Aug.'s life the Vandals were spreading more and more over Africa.

And ~~w~~ so, when Aug. was still living, the Vandals had taken every city of North Africa, except two, Carthage and Hippo. Hippo, of course, was the city where Aug. lived. And these two cities had big fortifications around them. And so all the territory around had been ~~xxx~~ seized by the Vandals.

And whether the Vandals deserved the name of utter destructiveness as a group, which they have received since, it is hard to say. Since we know that ~~whxxx~~ ~~thxxx~~ one of the Vandals was a great Roman leader, ~~fiftyxxxyearsxxxbeforexxxthixxxx~~ thirty years before this time, there must have been some very fine people among them. But certainly this particular ~~xxxxxxx~~ expedition, at least, was characterized by utter destructiveness. Whether it was the natural attitude of these people, or whether it was the fact that they had become pretty much aroused over the situation into ~~ix~~ which they had come there, and there were particular reasons which made them especially destructive at the time, I don't know. But the ~~xxxxxxx~~ name "Vandal" has come into ~~our~~ our language for ruthless, senseless destruction, from the ways in which these Vandals acted, ~~xxxx~~ at this time in North Africa. And they destroyed and pillaged and wrecked everything very badly. And so it is a very dramatic picture to think of Aug. on his deathbed, in Hippo, there, with the walls around the city, that is the city was against the shore, and then the wall protecting the landward side~~x~~ of the city from attack. And just beyond the wall the Vandals wrecking, destroying, and pillaging, and committing all sorts of atrocities and crimes. And this continued for several months, while the city wall was strong enough for the fortresses, there, to withstand ^{attack} ~~xxxxxx~~ on the particular city. And as we see how the great work that Aug. did in North Africa was completely destroyed by the Vandal's attack, followed, of course, eventually with the Mohammedans coming. And ~~x~~ we see how this happened. To my mind it makes me go back over his life and wish that some of his activities had been different. He, of course, felt that in doing away with the Man. views he was doing a great thing. I don't think that ~~x~~ there was any question that he was. And his writings against Man. have been ~~x~~ a tremendous influence throughout the Roman Empire. The same with his writings against ~~Paganix~~ Paganism. And with the many features of his influence. And of course his literary activity ~~xxxxix~~ continued long after his death, all through the Roman Empire, and it was studied, and ~~had~~ has been studied right up to this day and has ~~ix~~ had a tremendous influence.

Some of his writings, like the City of God, and the Confessions have gone through many ~~editions~~ editions and translated into many ~~different~~ different languages. But in North Africa, where his heart was particularly, and where his work was not devoted to the city of Hippo ~~entirely~~ entirely, but spread over the whole of the large section, and ~~he~~ he was interested in the ~~developments~~ developments in all the cities, a very large part of his activity was devoted to trying to persuade the Donatists that they should give up their particular points of difference, and should come in and join with the Catholics, or eventually trying, when that didn't work, to prove to them that they ~~were~~ were wrong. And they must ~~give it up~~ give it up, and ~~eventually~~ eventually leading the imperialist order that they had got to give it up. And come in and join the Catholic church.

And as you think of this, and how an effort to build a big church in North Africa, which succeeded, and by the end of his life it was one big church, came to absolutely nothing when the Vandals were spreading across North Africa. And North Africa today is a place where you have amazingly beautiful churches, with practically no Christianity. As you think of that you think how that if the energy that he put in his writings of the Donatists, had been expended instead in trying to advance that which would strengthen the Christian life of both the Catholics and the Donatists, and which would stimulate the Christians further and give them zeal, and which would lead them to become more thoroughly and truly Christian, that while there might still have been the ~~two~~ two big churches in the city, instead of one, which was a great sorrow to him, yet when the Vandals came, you might have had that Christian zeal among the ~~people~~ people, that would have resulted in winning great numbers of the Vandals, and in perpetuating the strong Christian church/ today.~~(end of record)~~ (end of record)

Record 146

I don't think that we can ~~criticized~~ criticized Aug. particularly. The concept was one that ~~he~~ he was absolutely ~~unknown~~ unknown in his day. Of having differences in groups of Christians. All agreeing in the great essential

doctrines, but not necessarily an organic ~~unit~~ unit. There is a unity of all the people of Christ, and if we are truly His we must ~~feel~~ feel a great unity with all other true Christians. And it had not been thought of, then, that there could be this unity without ~~actual~~ actual unity of organization. But while the Donatists ~~it~~ differed sharply from the Catholics in ~~their~~ their ~~greater~~ greater idea ~~of~~ of strictness in treatment of the law, and while they put a greater importance on the personal character of the Christian ministry, as far as the effectiveness of their work is concerned, then the Catholics ~~did~~ did, as far as all the Christian doctrines was concerned, they were absolutely the same in them. There wasn't the least bit of modernism or apostasy among them. They were truly a Christian group, and under the circumstances to show them ~~where~~ where they are in error is good, but to insist ~~that~~ that they must come to unity on these lesser points is something which in this particular case did not lead to any good, but did lead to, well I can't say that it directly did harm, because Aug. did do a tremendous amount in strengthening the character of Christian people. He did a ~~tremendous~~ tremendous amount, more than almost any other two men ~~have~~ have done, aside from a few great leaders in Christian history.

But yet, when you think of his ability, and you think of all the ~~time~~ time and energy that he spent on this Donatist controversy, you just can't help ~~think~~ thinking that if that energy had been spent in this other way, that the effects would have been much more lasting. And much greater, much more to the glory of God.

Well, during his last month, Aug. lay in bed and he had the ~~penitential~~ penitential psalm written in large letters on the wall and on the ceiling, so that he could lay there in bed and see this large writing of the penitential psalm and repeat it over and over. The penitential psalm. As he prayed to God, acknowledging his ~~sin~~ sin and ~~shortcomings~~ shortcomings, and ~~praying~~ praying God to forgive him for his sins, and(3) more and more on Christ as Saviour, and he died a few days before the Vandals succeeded in, reaching the wall and capturing Hippo. Most of the people of Hippo escaped

to sea, ~~but~~ so that there was not ~~as~~ much loss of life in the conquest of Hippo. But the town was utterly wrecked by the Vandals, and left just in utter ruins. They say that within the last century there has been a mohammedan feast, or a mohammedan celebration, once a year at this spot, this ruin in North Africa. And ~~xxx~~ someone asked them why they hold this observance there, and somebody said, oh, there is a great Christian saint who is buried here. And it is a tradition which has come down. How it began we don't know. And evidently the place where Aug. was continued to be venerated, and even passed over into Mohammedanism. To venerate this place.

But though Aug.'s influence has remained very great in the rest of the Christian ~~xxx~~ world, North Africa ceased to be Christian center at all. Not ~~imex~~ immediately after his death, but the Vandals cut it down and then of course the Mohammedans came in later on.

Well, now, we ~~we~~ go on to D. C was the life and ~~xxxx~~ works of Aug. D is the Christological controversies. Now the Christological controversies is a subject on which, including tomorrow's lesson, I have given you four assignments. Two in Foakes-Jackson, and two in Hodge. It is a subject which, to get all the details of the events in connection with it, it would take us a very long time. To get a full examination of all the details of the doctrinal disputes would take a very ~~imex~~ long time. But the main essentials of it are not so difficult, and they are very important. Because here was a movement of discussions, a movement which had great heated controversies ~~imeximex~~ involved in it, and ~~xxxxxxxx~~ tremendously stirred the whole Roman world. ^{but} a movement which resulted in a decision which has been accepted by practically all the Christian church since. And the conclusions regarding the Christological controversies, which was reached in 451 A.D. is accepted by all ~~imex~~ important Protestant bodies. At least all important protestant bodies in their ~~form~~ formation had declared their acceptance of ~~them~~ the conclusions of the Council of Chalcedon. The same has been done by the Roman Catholic Church and by the Greek ~~xxx~~ Orthodox Church. And so it is a long controversy which reached a definite

~~xxxx~~ result. And a result which has been accepted by the Christian Church.

And in order to understand, ~~then~~ fully, ~~what~~ what the Christian attitude is as accepted by the overwhelming mass of professing Christians through the ages, including almost ~~all~~ all of the fundamental Christians in the last four hundred years, or we will say of Christians professing the great doctrines regarding the truth of their attitude on these points and the method of salvation., and so on. In order to understand it properly, it is very helpful to know something of the ~~historical~~ historical development. If we were a month earlier in the semester than we are, I would want to take about two or three weeks on the christ. controversies. Since, however, we have a great deal yet to cover, we want to get to 1500 before the end of the year, why I think that I shall depend on your study of these four assignments to cover most of the details and shall expect that you will get them well in mind from that. I do want, however, to review the main things.'

(question) That is a very good question. And you will ~~notice~~ notice that Foakes-Jackson has a very ~~clear~~ clear attitude on this. On the one hand you find him full of statements about the correctness of the conclusions reached, and how erroneous were these different sects, and all that, and then along with it you find a constant smear. There is sort of a smearing attitude of the whole business. I think Foakes-Jackson is sort of a transitional figure. He had the background of English orthodoxy, and in his background he has an understanding of these doctrinal points, and the recognition of the great work that was done. And then he also is combining with that the attitude which you find among the theologians of Union Seminary more recently, which was smearing the whole ~~business~~ business, this idea of thinking that a man was partly God. They represent the whole thing as sort of a joke. And he doesn't go that far at all. If he did I wouldn't recommend his book. But you have little sentences here and there, which reflect that ~~is~~ very definitely. And it is a rather queer attitude in its way. Particularly on points like this. ~~xxxxxxx~~

But as to the eventual attitude of the individual, in the eastern church, it would take a good deal of investigation to make a decision, to know whether actually they accepted, the majority, whether they accepted Chalcedon or not. It is easy to make a case with the views that he presents. Because as he shows you have the Nestorian controversy, with the ~~Alexandrians~~ Alexandrians carrying their points, and half ~~of~~ of them disagreeing. And then you have the Utician controversy, with the Alexandrians battered down. And the result is that every main group there has gotten a pretty bad defeat in the thing, and of course, you have a continued Nestorian church, and continued Monophysite church, and there were ~~xxx~~ various sects that continued ~~xxxxx~~ in disagreement. And you add them all up, would they make three-fourths of the eastern church, or would they make a fifth of it. Well, I don't think we have statistics. ~~xxxxxxx~~ I don't think we know.

But we have this fact. That the eastern church, the farthest that continued to be ^{considered} officially as being named church accepted the conclusions of Chalcedon, and does to this day. And so these various sects, in the end, proved to be small sects. Well now, whether at that time they were actually the majority or not, I don't know, but it seems rather unlikely. My guess is that they were rather ~~xxxxxxx~~ restricted. But it would take a ~~big~~ great deal more study of the eastern church than I have ever given. And we have all we can do to understand the western church., and to look into the eastern church to get its main points, ~~xxxxx~~ its essentials, but beyond that it is so remote from our lives here, even though it is ~~xxxxx~~ extremely interesting, that it is more a work for a specialist than for one who is interested in church history.

But the Council of Chalcedon, at the end of the christ. controversies, ~~xxxxxxx~~ made a statement which always impressed me as remarkable in the large negative aspect of it. I doubt if there are many ~~theologians~~ theologians who would express it quite the way that I have been inclined for many years to express it. But the way that it seems to me is, that if you take the simple statements of the Scripture, about Christ, and look at these

simple statements, you will find it clearly taught that Jesus was God. You will find it clearly taught that Jesus was man. He was not a sort of a partial God, He was not a something different from God, He was God/ in every full sense of the word. But similarly, He was just not something different from man. He was fully man in all sense like as we are, yet without sin. He was man in every ~~w~~ sense of the ~~Word~~ Word. He was one person. He wasn't two people. But this one person has two natures. He is fully God and He is// fully man, in every way. ~~And~~ And yet these two natures are not separate. They are not ~~mixed~~ mixed, but they are not divided. Now, how can that be?

Well, the essential things of life are all great mysteries. We can't understand them. We can't understand our own being. I like the way that Hodge begins his discussion of it, with showing how the mind and the body of a man, you can cut off any part of your body and your mind still exists. You can cut off the whole body and your mind still exists. ~~Despite~~ Despite the theories of the behaviourists. We all feel when we think about it, but that is the fact, that our mind is not dependent on ~~the~~ the body for its existence. The body is different from the mind. Very different from the mind. The two are distinct, and yet the two are interrelated. They affect each other tremendously. It is a mystery, how can it be that we cannot understand it. When the materialists try to explain it by saying that there isn't any such thing as mind, we get into, in my opinion, the most ~~hopeless~~ hopeless absurdity. There is quite a school of linguistics, now, trying to explain linguistics with the idea that there is no such thing as thought or consciousness or meaning. And it gets, to my mind, into utter absurdity.

We have these facts, they are observable, clear facts, but to understand them we can't do it. There is much in the universe, in our ~~most~~ most fundamental experiences, that we don't have the background or the meaning to understand them. But if that is the case in our ordinary lives, why is it remarkable that it should be the case ~~with~~ with the Master of the ~~universe~~ universe. The Saviour of all, the Lord Jesus Christ. We take ~~what~~ what is in the Scripture as what we stand upon. And we know it is true. And how it fits

together we don't know. We cannot understand with out finite minds. But we can see how attempts to fit it together don't work. And to my mind that is what these christ. controversies did. ~~I don't see~~ I don't see so much progress in understanding of it, as I see ~~progress~~ progress in casting aside human attempts to explain the facts by twisting them. It seems to me the same thing is true of the matter of God's full ordination. God has established all things that come to past. He has forordained everything. It is all determined and part of His holy will. That is clearly taught in the Scripture. On the other hand, it is equally, ~~clearly~~ clearly taught in the Scripture that we have definite power of choice. That we have not only a duty but a right to make decisions. That is matters what we think and what we decided. And that the results are different than if we decided differently. The two are clearly taught in Scripture.....(end of record)

Record 147

And also the fact that God had established and ordained all things. Both are ~~clearly~~ clearly taught, now you can't fit them together. And when you try to ~~twist~~ twist one a little in order to fit it into the other, and twist the other a little in order to fit it into the one, you soon get something in relation to either one that is not true to Scripture, and not true to human observation in life. They are both facts. Now that doesn't mean that a paradox is true, and that which ~~it~~ appears to be.....is actual fact. ^{It} doesn't mean that ~~at~~ all. It simply means that we can't understand these ~~the~~ great mysteries. And at best, the thing that we must do is to take what the facts are and ~~stand~~ stand upon them. But even in the physical world that is true. What is light. There are some who will say that light is a wave, like a wave of the sea. And you can explian much about the study of light ~~it~~ on the theory that it is like waves. But you come flat into some phenomena of light that it doesn't explain at all. Then some will say that light is a great many little particles that go shooting out. And there is much that you can ~~explian~~ explain on the particle theory of light. But there is much that won't explain at all. It won't ~~explain~~ explain how ~~it~~ light will refract and

and will turn from a lense. It doesn't explain it at all. You have to have the wave theory to explain that. Now, these two theories seem contradictory, they are different, but the truth is that we don't know. But we can observe many things about light, and we can understand them, and we can do much with light, and we use the two theories and they are both helpful/ Though how they fit together nobody knows. And if that is ~~xxxx~~ true of things in the physical world, certainly it is not strange ~~o~~ if it is true of things in the great ~~spiritual~~ spiritual world, the central basis of the universe.

And so here the Bible tells us that Christ is God, and He is just as true God as God the Father. He is the God of the universe, and there is only one God, in Three Persons. And He is one Person. But He is truly ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{man, just} as truly man as any one of us. Tempted in all things like as we are, subject to the ~~xxxxxxx~~ infirmities and weaknesses of human life. Experienced just as we experience them. He was fully man. Thought ^{West} ~~xxxxxxx~~ ~~(xxxxxxx)~~ now the ~~best~~ in these controversies was not ~~particular~~ particularly devoted to little metaphysical distinctions in trying to explain them. The ~~xxxxxxx~~ ^{(xxxxxxx) Westerners} were more practical. They were interested in how people are saved, they were interested in how Christianity is applied. But when it came to these great mysteries, on the whole they were ready to take what the Scripture says and stand on it. And they found these/ facts and they stood upon them. And the great writing, ~~xxxxxxx~~ Against Praxeus, and I assigned you to read some of it last fall, by Tertullian, expressed the things/ about as well as it has ever been expressed. Jesus is fully God and He is fully man.

But in the ~~xxxx~~ east the metaphysical thought of the east was trying to explain how it could be. And the christ. controversies consisted of an explanation given. No, that is not ~~xxxxxxx~~ true. Another explanation, no that's not true. ~~xxxxxxx~~ Another one, no that's not true. And when we get through we deny all the explanations and we come back to the ~~simple~~ simple Scriptural teaching that He is fully God and He is fully man.'

(question) Yes, what He became at the incarnation He remained. So that the christ. controversies are very important, and I wish we had a month to

spend on them. But I think that if you will carefully study the assignments which I have given you, that you will get what we would get in a month's study of it. And we will go on to other things that are not as well written up in books as these are. These two statements of it, particularly Hodge's, statements of it, even if you skip the Latin in Hodge, you still have a very good statement of the whole situation.

But under the christ. controversy we should, of course, have three heads. Number one, Apolonarianism, ~~two~~ two, Nestorianism, and three, Eutychianism. And you all, of course, know now what those titles come from. ~~That~~ That they are from the names of the leaders of these three views. The first one ~~w~~ is the name of the man who originated the view, ~~Apolonarius~~ Apolonarius. A great ~~godly~~ godly Christian leader, who in the time when Julian the apostate was trying to rule the Christians out of the learned world and deny the right to teach the classics, Apolonarius/ set to work to write new classics. He set to work to provide ~~Christian~~ Christian writings that would do for study by Christians. He was a staunch follower of Athanasius. A thorough believer in the trinity. In the fully ~~deity~~ deity of Christ. And ~~his~~ his aberration here did not incite the great controversy that was incited by the two later because this was the time of the Arian controversy. And all the leaders of the orthodox view thought ~~very~~ very highly of Apol/ But Apol. faced the ~~christ.~~ christ. controversy sooner than anybody else did. He was dealing with the Arian controversy, and he saw the ~~difficulty~~ difficulty in the second question of the person of Christ, and he tried to solve it by a theory. And the theory was not a good theory. He said, man has three parts, body mind and spirit. He said, Jesus Christ is a human body, ~~a~~ a human mind, ~~but~~ but God, the second Person of ~~the~~ the Trinity takes the place of the human spirit. And that was his theory. And of course that makes Jesus no man, at all. He is just a man in appearance, because/ the spirit, the ~~actuating~~ actuating force, is not a man but is God.

And in trying to solve the problem he ~~wrecked~~ wrecked the whole business. And his ~~friends~~ friends were quick to see it. And in the councils of Constantin-

ople, ~~the~~ the second ecumenical council in 381, ~~which~~ the council which gave the death blow to Arianism, in that council a statement was adopted condemning the Apol. view. It had already been condemned by various smaller councils before, but the ecum. council, the second one, definitely took a stand against it. And it was never a factor, after that, of any importance. It was the well-meant attempt of a good godly man to ~~explain~~ explain a great mystery. But a theory, which if it had been pushed, would have done endless harm, because, of course, it does not recognize the true facts, and it denies the true humanity of Christ.

(question) Yes, that God did ~~suffer~~ suffer. It ~~would~~ would have to. Because Christ, certainly if His spirit didn't suffer on the cross it wasn't much of a suffering. It would ~~hold~~ hold the same thing. I don't think you can deny that God did ~~suffer~~ suffer on the cross. But to understand that as a true statement, it is difficult. But certainly God the Father suffered in the suffering of His Son. And certainly God suffered for man, there is no question of that. But of course it is the human nature that did the suffering, more than anything.

(question) The essential of Apol. view was that man is made ~~up~~ up of three parts. Body soul and ~~spirit~~ spirit. That in Jesus Christ the spirit, the human spirit, was not there, but was replaced by ~~the~~ the second Person of the Trinity. That God, the Second Person of the Trinity was the spirit which was united with the ~~body~~ human body and human soul of Jesus ~~Christ~~ Christ. That is the theory which he advanced, but nobody, to speak of, has held that view since the Council of Constantine.

(question) Well, I have assigned you Hodges discussion, and also Foakes-Jackson on this. Foakes-J. goes into a little more detail of the discussion. Hodge goes more into the meaning of it, ~~than~~ and into the exact view.

But I think that ~~the~~ the simple way I have just expressed it gives a pretty definite idea of what he believed. Body soul and spirit. Jesus, a human body, a human soul, but the divine spirit taking the place of the human ~~spirit~~ spirit. Well, now, this view was condemned by the Council at

Constantinople, and so we come to number two. Nestorianism. It differs from Apol. in that Nest. was not, you might say, the ~~founder~~ founder of a view, nor was he particularly nearly so strong in holding it as many others were, but he was the conspicuous man who ~~was~~ was accused of it. So in a way it is too bad to call t Nest. He ~~seems~~ seems to have been a v ery fine man in many ways. ~~And~~ And many of his enemies seem to have taken this excuse for attacking him. ~~But~~ But there is much which is not very pleasant reading in the way they treated Nest. But the ~~aside~~ aside from that altogether, the view which Nest. was supposed to hold, and which was held by many people and followed to some extent by him, is a view which is just as unsatisfactory as Apol.'s view. It had a very definite good point which it was trying to get. But in seeking this point it goes to an extreme. It is stressing the humanity, the true humanity, of Christ, and Nest. didn't see how God could suffer on the corss. And so he says that the divine nature/ doesn't suffer, it is ~~entirely~~ entirely separate, the human nature is all that suffers. ~~Where~~ Where it came into relief was in the word, some of the people began calling Mary the "mother" of God. And Nest. said she is not the mother of God, she is only the mother of the human nature. And so it is utterly wrong to call her the mother of God. Well, in a sense it is wrong to call her the mother of God, and yet in another ~~sense~~ sense it is perfectly all right. Because Jesus Christ is one ~~p~~ Person, and not two. And Jesus Christ is God.

~~And~~ And so there is a sense in which Mary can be called the mother of God, but in my opinion there is much more ~~harm~~ harm that can come from the term than good. Because certainly God is far greater than Mary in every possible conceivable way. ~~And~~ And certainly Jesus Christ is far greater than Mary. But the error of the view was in really making Jesus two persons, even if you only call it two natures. It divides Him up into two distinct Persons, of whom this applies to this person, and this to the other person. Call it natures ~~if~~ if you want, but really it divides the ~~pr~~ personality of ~~Christ~~ Christ. And it gives a false view of Him, a flase idea.

Well, it is true, He has two natures. They are distinct from each other.

They are not mixed. There is no question. But neither can they be divided. He is one Person. And Nest. represented an attempt to solve the problem, which was not ~~xxxxxxx~~ a satisfactory attempt, and which can lead into very unfortunate attitudes and misunderstandings toward Christ....(end of record)
Record 148.

Now it is very interesting that this is the first view condemned as ~~xxx~~ heretical, but not condemned as non-Christian. The first view of this type which produced a continuing separate body. Apol. died when it was condemned by the council. Of course the various Gnostic sects and the Manich. were outside of Christianity, and the Novatians and the Donatists were true Christians, simply separated over a difference over ~~xxxx~~ discipline, not a doctrine. But the Nest. continued as a sect, and as a large and important sect. & They did not continue in the Roman Empire to any extent, but it became the form of Christianity in ~~xxxxxxx~~ Persia, the only form which the emperor would tolerate in Persia. In Persia he felt that the orthodox Christianity was too much like the Christianity in the Roman Empire, and he would not permit it, but the Nest. ~~xxxx~~ were permitted by him to continue. And the result was that a very large Nest. church developed in Persia, which sent missionaries on into India, and even as far as ~~xxxx~~ China. And by the 12th century A.D. there were large Nest. churches in China and in India. And Persia, and all through that area ~~xxxx~~. The Nest. movement died out in China completely, but there have been found traces of it, monuments to the Nest. churches which were there eight centuries ago, in China. And so Nest. continued as a vital movement, and particularly a missionary movement toward the east for many centuries. But it was cut out of the Roman Empire entirely.

(question) We don't know much about it. When Foakes-Jackson says that it is one of the largest groups of Christians in the world at that time, we would say geographically. But whether it was numerically we don't have evidence on which to know. And we have very little evidence of it. We don't know much about it. I think many theories might be advanced, and we might be

able to guess the turth, but I am not sure.

Well, our time seems to be up for today, we will continue here.....

(break in record)

And we noticed that number one is Apol. And we sat what that was.

It really comes before our present period. Chronologically we should have discussed it under the previous century, but since it is s o tightly bound with the events of this century, and also since it did not excite so much discussion or feeling before, as these others did, but still was an important introduction to them, I chose to dicuss it here. Number two we discussed, Nest. And we have noticed that Nest. is not really ~~the~~ personally the ~~embodiment~~ ^{It} embodiment of this viewpoint. ~~He~~ is more or less an accident that his name comes to be used for it. He was a man who had his faults, but who also had his good points. And he was a man who had taken very harsh ground toward those who disagreed w~~o~~th him, and calling on the ~~emperor~~ emperor to destroy all heresies, and it is ironic that he himself should have been condemned for heresy and should have been exiled, and should have suffered the way he did.

The view ~~which~~ which some of his followers held, and which he may have held, at least his language suggested that at some ~~places~~ places, was a ~~view~~ view, which of course, is not a correct ~~interpretation~~ interpretation of the Person of Christ, and it is hard to think of one of our western churches as being divided over this particular point, ~~the~~ the way that the eastern churches were. Our frame of mind is somewhat different, but a real service could be done to the Christian church in the hammering out of this matter, the discussion and the controversy, and ~~bringing~~ bringing us to a clearer realization of the importance of recognizing the two natures of Christ, but also of recognizing that you cannot, you must be very careful, not to think of eitner nature as ~~different~~ if it was a separate person. That there is one Person of Christ, ~~the~~ the wo natures are not mixed. They are ~~not~~ not confused. They are absolutely separate, and yet they are not spear~~ted~~ted from each other at all. They work together in harmony, in one Person.

Well, Nest. was settled at the third ecum. council, the Council of Ephesus. 431 A.D. A ~~xxx~~ council at which, like the first and the second, no papal delegate~~s~~ resided. No pope was even present. No pope had anything to do with the calling of the council. The statment is made today in popular Roman Catholic journals that every ecum. council has been called by a pope, has been presided over by a pope, and has accepted the decisions which the pope made. And this, of ~~xxx~~ course, ~~xxxxxxx~~ was utter nonsense. Because there is absolutely nothing ~~xxx~~ to it. The first, second or third ~~x~~ ecum. council had no popes.

Now the third, Eutychianism. And Eut. is as poor a name for ~~xxx~~ this as Nest. is for the second, in fact it is a porrer name. For the reason that while Nest. was a great archbishop of Constaninople, the man who thought of himself as one of the three or four leading Christian officials in the world, Eut. is simply the archbishop of a monastery in the Constaninople area. But the reason that he comes to be the symbol for this is that this was hostile territory to him, and he up in that territory was the outstanding figure for the view which was chara~~x~~cteristic of the leaders in Alexandria. You see the difference. Previous one we have the archbishop of Const. giving his name to it, and it was the Alexandrian who opposed him and who opposed him rightly, as far as doctrinal points were concerned. Now we have the Alex. who opposed Nest., opposed this ~~artificial~~ artificial separation of the two natures of Christ. We have them carrying their view to an extreme which produces a fusion or a mingling of the two natures into one, and which makes Christ no longer on who is a true and full and complete man who can be tempted in all things like as we are, and Who can truly be our brother, and who also is fully God, and fully carries out and bears the power of God in His actions and in His honor. He mingles the two, and you have ~~xxxxxxx~~ neither one. And the Alex. who opposed the errors of the leaders of Const. themselves went too far in the direction in which they were going, and stultified the doctrine of the Person of Christ. And it is rather peculiar that instead of it being named after one of the great Alex. leaders, it is named after a man up in

the ~~z~~ Const. territory who took this view and stood strongly against the leaders in Const. and himself became the ~~xxxxxx~~ center of attention up there. And so it was called after him, Eut. ~~xxxxxx~~ Possibly it is a ~~xxxxxx~~ better ~~xxxxxx~~ name for it to call it Monafisitism, because Mono. is a word which doesn't merely give the name of somebody who happens to be connected with it, but tells what the thing is. As you all know, Mono- one, one nature. ~~xxxxxx~~ And so Mono. is just as often applied to it as Eut. is, and it being such a very important matter in the history of Christian theology, you should be familiar with both names. But I think Mono. is the better name of the two.

Well, now, ~~this~~ ^{these} controversy^{ies} incited very sharp attention. Of course some of the attention of the controversy was due to the political involvements, and to the personalities who got mixed up in them. And those who felt that their leader had been condemned, ~~in~~ that Nest, had been condemned, and that they had suffered for their adoration on the two natures, those who recognized there had been an error and had corrected their views were perhaps very glad to find out opportunity to say that those who had been opposing them on this themselves were going into a great error in the opposite direction. And to attack them very strongly.

You read about the so-called Laprosinian, the.....(11) some are called. Councils which were ~~xxxxxx~~ held at Ephesus in 449, which took the decision in favor of Mono., but it was not recognized as a true ecum. council. The emperor had favored the Mono. view, but the emperor died in 450. And his sister, who succeeded him in power, favored the orthodox view in this, and she had called a new council, in 451, and the bishop of Rome said that there was no need of a council, and he wrote a letter to the bishop of Const. in which he said, ~~xxxxxx~~ what is there any need of a council for. This matter is perfectly clear in ~~xxxxxx~~ Scripture. It is perfectly clear that Christ is fully God and fully man, and he went on and he described in much the same terminology which we have in decision of the council of Chalcedon. The statement that I asked you to study particularly is almost drawn from the words of this very unusual bishop of Rome. And Leo, the bishop of Rome,

didn't see why they ~~a~~ needed a council. Here is a statement, here is the fact, why not take it. And the fact which he gave was clearly presented, and a true picture of what the Scriptural teaching is. But the people in the east weren't ready to take Leo's word. They did, however, go so far toward honoring him that the easterners being divided ~~between~~ between the great power of Const. and the great power of Alex., and so evenly divided, it was pretty hard to say which was predominant. And here being the great power on the side, the power of Rome. Each of them was trying to get Rome on their side. And in the end they were willing to have the representatives of Bishop Leo preside at the council. And so, although Leo strongly ~~opposed~~ opposed the calling of the council, they did call the council, and the council met at Chalcedon, not far from Const. And there, at this council, ~~Leo's~~ Leo's delegates presided. And in the council they read the statement which Leo had given in his letter, and they said, that is an excellent statement, and they adopted a creed which included ~~almost~~ almost verbatim the statement which Leo had made. And so the statement in the council of Chalcedon is an excellent statement, and the council of Chalcedon is certainly next only to the council of Nicea, in its importance, as an ecum. council. The second and the third are of less importance. And the later ones, much ~~less~~ less important. But the first is of tremendous importance, every Christian should be familiar with the Council of Nicea. And I think every ~~3~~ Christian should be familiar with the Council of Chalcedon. Because at the council of Chalcedon that adopted the well-balanced, carefully-written statement about the nature of Christ, which has been considered by practically all Christian groups since that time, and by all major protestant denominations, that this statement represented a fine and clear and excellent statement of the truth about Christ. ~~That~~ That He is fully God and He is fully man. That He has a divine nature, not in any way impaired, not in any way reduced. It is a full and true divine nature. He also has a full, ~~x~~ complete human nature, not in any way altered or corrupted or changed. He is human in every way, like as we are, subject to temptation.....(end of record)

Record 149

And it is a good detailed presentation. I think it would be excellent if every one of you would memorize it. ^{If} /You think it is~~s~~ a little long, You might memorize the statement from ~~Anglican~~ ^{The Westminster} Confession instead if you prefer, if you don't ~~memorize~~ memorize them both. The statement in the Westminster Confession presents much the same thing as this. And not in so much detail. But they are both very excellent statements. Certainly everyone should be familiar with them. Because there are all sorts of ~~difficulties~~ difficulties that come into your churches today from somebody who comes up with a brilliant theory to understand Christ better, and you find that it is just some form of one of these old heresies. And it may at first sight seem like a beautiful ~~explanation~~ explanation ~~of~~ that helps you better to understand the Scripture. And if you carry it out in its implications, you ~~gi~~ find that it leads you on into misunderstanding, and misinterpretation, and does great harm. And if you can immediately put your finger on it, and ~~ax~~ say that sounds like a beautiful new theory, but actually that theory was thought out by people back in 400 A.D., and some of them thought that was a beautiful theory to explain it, but the whole Christian church in that day met together and was represented in a council and ~~the~~ discussed the matter, and they gave this statement of the council of Chalcedon, a statement which definitely rejects that idea. And if you are in a presbyterian body, ~~xxxxxxx~~ or in any one of the many ther bodies which have used the Westminster Confession, as it is, or with some slight ~~ni~~ modifications, as their form of creedal statement, you can say, furthermore the Westminster divines, meeting in London in the early 17th century, studying this matter, agrees exactly with the statment of the Council of Chalcedon and expressed it more briefly as follows. And it is a thing which every Christian ~~n~~ worker, every Christian leader, should have in mind. x

(question) The wprd "begotten," unfortunately, is a word which has been used in a variety of senses. As the Arians said, there was a time when Christ was not, when God the Father created Him. That is definitely wrong, and

contrary to the Scriptures. Personally I think that the interpretation of John 3:16, which takes "only begotten" ~~and~~ as meaning unique, one class, monogenes, rather than one begetting. I think is a better interpretation of it. And if you do, I would take the begotten there as meaning as being in existence. Now, of course, the word begotten suggests the interpretation which Origin ~~a~~ gave, in order to account for the word. He said, there is an eternal process, whereby the Father is always begetting the Son. It never started, it never finished. Well, if you take it that way, the process ~~a~~ really only means a ~~realiz~~ relationship, that Jesus is always God, and Jesus is always the Son. But I don't think the word is very good to express that. It means that some ~~axep~~ people will think that the Son originates from the Father, of which there is, of course, no Biblical evidence whatever. The Son was as long as there was a ~~Ry~~ Father. So that I don't like that particular word.

Well, now, ~~thex~~ this Council of Chalcedon, then, in 451, put an end officialy to this controversy. And the whole of the church, which was in communion together adopted the decision of the council of Chalcedon. That is to say, all the western churches ~~exceptzthe~~ accepted it, the leadership of the eastern church accepted it, the church at Const., at Antioch, and the greater part of the east, accepted it. But in Alex. there were very large groups who refused to accept it, and there were some groups ~~ix~~ in other sections, just ~~k~~ as there had been a Nest. church founded through the disagreement with the Council of Ephesus, or perhaps/^{more} through the following personally of the leaders of Nest. Whichever it was, there was the Nest. church founded, which became a strong church in the Persian section, and stretching on through India and China. There was now a church founded right in the Empire. The Mono. Church. The.....(5½) church of today. The Church of Egypt which has continued through the ages, though under Mohammedan overlords and oppression. This coptic ~~ch~~ church still holds mono. views. And Mono. system continued in groups which were outside of the body of the church, which was in communion with one another. And so there

were large Mono. groups, but they did not form one church. They split up into a lot of little sections and segments, holding various varieties of the Mono. view. ~~xxxxxxxstandardviewx~~ While the standard view that denies the Mono. altogether, that there is one single nature, and insists that there are the two natures of Christ, was the official view of the entire western church and of that portion of the eastern church which was connected with the emperors, ~~x~~ and which ~~x~~ was in communion with the western church, and has been the ^{official} view of all the ~~official~~ great protestant bodies.

(question) But during the Middle Ages practically all of these churches became corrupt. And this corruption which proceeded, it is an interesting thing that the Roman Church and the Greek Orthodox Church were separated through the Middle Ages quite definitely. They were apart from one another, while greatly ~~influenced~~ influenced by one another. But the corruption proceeded in much the same direction in both of them. And also in most of these other churches. The corruption, then, was not somebody spreading views over ~~xxxx~~ others, but a natural tendency, or perhaps a tendency hastened by Satan's activities, a tendency to put your mind on physical specific things, on forms and ceremonies, instead of ~~x~~ on the belief and on the doctrine. To put your emphasis on the baptism or the communion ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ or some form of right of ceremony, instead of putting it on the relationship to Christ, which it only symbolizes. And so the belief in transubstantiation, the belief in worship of ~~xxxx~~ saints, the use of images, all these things spread among all these churches, and ~~xx~~ protestant bodies doing missionary work in Armenia and in Egypt, and in many of these other sections where there is no church which has continued through, have often found in many portions of those churches are so shot through with these corruptions that it often seems best to start right from scratch. Although doubtless they have influenced in turn the bodies which they are.....(8½) Some they have influenced and turned further away from it, some others have been entirely. But these corruptions have come in.

(question) I would think that, I am not very keen myself on the attitude

that ~~ANDREW~~ Jackson takes that this is the Antiochian view, and this is the Alexandrian view. It seems to me that we have the Scriptural teachings, then there is what he calls the western view. I think the western view here is simply seeing what the Scripture says and standing on it. ~~A~~ I don't like to call it the western view. It is simply taking the Scriptural view in a simple way, without trying to work out some of the details of it. But it is true of the Antiochians and of the ~~OTHER~~ Alexandrians and all the people there that they had a tendency to try to get off on these details and get them all worked out. And try to get a ~~logical~~ logical understanding of that which we don't have the mental power or the data to have a logical ~~understanding~~ understanding that is necessary. And my guess would be that a man like ~~Cyrol~~ Cyrol of Alexandria would probably be pretty close to the correct Scriptural viewpoint. But he was giving his emphasis to attacking the errors in the view which there were quite a number in ~~Antioch~~ Antioch who were opposing ~~the~~ the view which went too far in that direction. Well, then, as he fought against this error and pushed against it, he doesn't have much opportunity or need of ~~stressing~~ stressing the fact that we shouldn't go too far in the direction that he is going. Whether he would have stressed it or not I ~~don't~~ don't know. He died before there ~~was~~ was any chance to find out. But sometimes it is like pulling on a rope, where you have a tug of war. And if one side gives way, the other goes way further than it had dreamed of. I have found that in churches in this country. ~~_____~~

I know of a church that had a minister who was an autocrat. And he was a very able man, but he just declared absolutely everything that should be done, and the people did what he said, and ~~that~~ that was that. Well, there were groups of people who left the church, and this group that left the church were so disgusted with his autocratic way of absolute control that they established a new church in which they set up a board of elders who ruled the church and the minister was a hired servant. And the minister would come to the meeting of the elders, if they happened to invite him. In other words, he had no power whatever in the church. The elders ruled the church.

And so you have that extreme in that church. Then I know of ~~xxxx~~ a man who was called to ~~the~~ be the minister and he went and they were fine Christian people, and he did good service there, but the work was so hampered by their type of work that he became thoroughly disgusted by it, and when he left he went to the other extreme. And though he was not the least bit autocratic in type himself, he was convinced that the ~~xxx~~^{root} of all difficulty in the church was having the laymen think that they should control the church, And he was determined that when he took a call to another church it should be specified in the call that whatever he laid down as minister the church should do.

It is a human tendency to go from one extreme to the other. ~~xxx~~ And it is a warning to all of us, I think. When you are in controversy or in discussion, or ~~in~~ in excitement about some feature of ~~xxxxxxxx~~ doctrine, some feature of government, some ~~in~~ important matter in life. Whatever it is, it will be necessary that you stress and push and work to get your point across. You will have to do it. And that is right. But while you are doing it, pause once in a while and think. Now suppose I went out completely, will it be like a tug of war. ~~xxxx~~ Will we just go to the other direction, and do something that is worse than the thing we are fighting now. It is well to stop and watch and in your emphasis to put in guarding statements. And to try to make sure that when you go against error you don't do the opposite.

Now, Cyril died before Mono. became an issue. Whether Cyril would have fallen into that error or not we do not ~~xxxx~~ know. We have no cause to think that he would. But his successor, Dioscورا, who had stood with him and fought valiantly against that error, his whole stress was against this error, and ^{once} that error was defeated he then took the other extreme. And probably Cyril wouldn't and perhaps ~~xx~~ Cyril made a mistake in judgment in not pausing from time to time to warn Dioscورا/ of the fact that while we are against this error we must be careful not to go in the opposite extreme. At any rate, after the condemnation of Nest. it is most likely that the Alexandrians really went ~~xxx~~ further in error than the Nest. did. ~~xxxx~~ Though it was in the opposite direction. That would seem to be the case. And

they certainly became very enthusiastic about their viewpoint.

(question)(end of record)

Record # 150

But at least it would seem that after the condemnation of Nest. most of his followers in the Antioch region recognized the error of the view for which he was condemned, ~~though they might not have recognized~~ even though they might not have all recognized that Nest. ~~was~~ was deserving of much a condemnatin.

Well, now, Eut., then, or Mono. ends the christ. controversies as they existed in the ~~4th~~ 4th century. Although the Eut. movement continued a long time thereafter. Now, I am going, at this point, to make a fourth point, to briefly mention developments of the next two centuries. Under this heading: ~~Monothelism~~ Monothelism. And that does not properly belong in this century, it doesn't belong in this century at all. But it is the continuation of the christ. controversies, and I think it is well to mention it here. The study of the Monothelite controversy, with all its details and ramifications, which ran for about two centuries, and occasioned two councils, would be a matter which would take us a very very long time, and we are not going to look at in detail. There are one or two ~~bits~~ vital things that we are going to talk about, we will notice when we come to them. But I want you to see it in its relation to the controversy as a whole. I think that is what is vital for us. Now, all of you know what monophysitism means, if you know Greek you know what it means, and if you didn't know Greek you would have known from my explanation a few minutes ago. And knowing what monophysitism means, you have no difficulty in knowing what monothelism means. At least if you know what the greek word Thelos is. You know what it is. It is the theory of one will. And it is the attempt of the emperors and some of the leaders in the church of Constan. to win back the monophysites, into the church. To win back some of these who had left the church, and ~~was~~ to satisfy opinion ~~in~~ in the church of people who were strongly influenced by Monophysitism. And an attempt to reach a compromise ~~position~~ position. Now, as between two views, very often there is a

middle ground that is ~~the~~ the right ground. If you go too far to the east, you will never reach Florida. If you go too far west you will never reach ~~the~~ Florida, but you will get halfway inbetween, you get the middle ground, and you will get ~~to~~ to Florida. But if somebody says we are going to Florida and starts south, and somebody else starts north, you don't get a middle ground between ~~the~~ the two of them for it. In other ~~words~~ words, a middle ground between two policies is very often a good thing, but there are places where it is a bad thing. Between right and wrong there can be no middle ~~ground~~ ground. Between truth and error there can be no middle ground. But between two ways of doing a thing, there is often a middle ground that is often better than either one of them. Now, in this case, it was a question of ~~does~~ does Christ have two ~~natures~~ natures or one. Is He fully God and fully man, or is He a mixture some way. Well, there is no middle ground. And to say, no He doesn't have just one nature, He is not monophysite, He has two natures, but just one of these natures is ~~incomplete~~ incomplete, so that in the most important point He is only one of them is an attempt to compromise. Which actually is not the truth, and simply leads to confusion and misunderstanding. And is harmful rather than helpful.

But that was the Monothelite ~~attempt~~ attempt. They said, let us agree that Christ has two natures. And then all the westerners, and all the ~~people~~ people who ~~opposed~~ opposed monophysitism should be satisfied. But let us ~~on~~ on the other hand say that He has two natures, but He has only real one, one operation. Then the people who believe in one nature will see that the most important part of the nature there is only one anyway. ~~So~~ So they will be satisfied, and everyone will then be satisfied. And very often on this sort of a compromise, instead of pleasing everybody, it pleases ~~nobody~~ nobody. Well, in this particular case, some of the leaders in the church in Const. and some of the emperors put their strong support in bac of this views, and tried to enforce it. The view that Christ had only one will, though He had two natures.

Well, what kind of a human nature do you have if there is no human will.

How can you be tempted if there is ~~no~~ no human will to be tempted. Certainly a divine will cannot be tempted. How can He be tempted in all things like as we are and have sympathy with us and understanding of our difficulties if He does not have a human will. And so those who took the simple statement of the Scripture could not fail to see that this attempt at a compromise was not a compromise, but a confusion. And monothelism, it was attempted to send it as an acceptable view for the whole church, and the fifth ecumenical council, which met a century ~~is~~ later, condemned this attempt. Then it was attempted over again in another form, ~~and~~ and the sixth ecum. council condemned that. And so that is the next two ecum. councils. ~~Neither~~ Neither of them anywhere near as important as the first four, because they were both held at Const. and as you see they were dealing with a continuation of the Monophysite error, a tale of it, a compromise view of point. And the fifth ecum. council I think you should note the date ~~is~~ in your books, that ~~is~~ it is 553, and the sixth is 608. You see that is going ahead a good long distance from our present point. They are the second and third council of Const.

(question) The sixth ~~was~~ council condemned the Monothelism. And the fifth council ~~condemned~~ condemned an attempt to establish Monothelism. So you see it was the same thing. The fifth is usually spoken of as having condemned the three chapters, and that is a discussion which we won't take the time to go into. There were three chapters put out ~~which~~ to try to solve the controversy. Giving the monothelite view, and the three chapters were condemned. I think it is sufficient for you to remember that ~~the~~(8) of monothelism was condemned in the fifth, and mono. as a whole was condemned in the sixth.

(question) Both were held at Const.

Now, the christ. ~~the~~ controversies are so important that I want you to understand them. It would be worth a great deal of time for us to go into them. ~~Particularly~~ Particularly the ones through the first three phases. And the detailed history of them is very complicated and very interesting, and that would be worth a great deal of time. But we have much more to cover

that is also important, and so I hope that you will get particularly well in the material assigned for this in Hodge, which gives a very good treatment of it. So I won't take time to further repeat it and go over it in class, and we'll go on to section E.

And section E we will call the Roman Church in the first half of the fifth century. Now we have already said considerable about the Roman church in the first half of the fifth century. And so about all we need to do here is to, we have a few things to add, but the most important things we have already dealt with. Not all of it, of course. but the greater part of it. And as to the Roman Church in the first quarter of the fifth century, you are all aware of the fact that it did not have any bishop who was particularly important. We are all aware of that. You know of Innocent and ^{Zosimus} ~~Dixit~~. You are aware of them because of our dealings with Aug.'s relationship to them. And you remember how Innocent condemned Pel. and Aug. said Rome has ~~xxx~~ spoken, everybody should listen. And Zosimus said Pel is a good man and nobody should criticize him, and Aug. said that the bishop made a serious error. And the first one is quoted and remembered through the Middle Ages. But actually Aug. was glad to have the help of the Roman bishop against Pel. He wanted all the ~~ship~~ help he could get. And if the Roman bishop expresses himself in great terms of tremendous power and authority, Aug. is ~~xxxx~~ concerned with the ~~bi~~ vital matter of the error of Pel. and there is no need of contradicting the Roman bishop on his rather exalted views of his own importance. But when the Roman ~~Bishop~~ bishop takes a position against ~~Pax~~ Aug. in favor of Pel., then Aug. doesn't ~~hes~~ hesitate to say what he thinks. And it is interesting that Zosimus also had a situation right where an African ^{presbyter} ~~bishop~~ was removed ~~from his bishopric by the Africans~~ by a friend of Aug., was removed for serious offences from his position, he was given a trial by the Africans, and they decided that he was guilty and he was not worthy of his position any more, and he was on trial. And he, then, appealed to Pope Zosimus in 418, and to Pope Celestine in 424, and he appealed to these men and asked them to reestablish him. And ~~they~~ he went to Rome and

he talked to them, and he was a nice fellow and the bishop of Rome said you have been mistreated, and it wasn't right, and he wrote a letter. And he said to the people, ~~the Council of Nicea has~~ ~~xxxxxxx(12)~~ declared that the bishop of Rome is supreme over all churches, and I want to tell you that you should reestablish this good man whom you have falsely condemned. And the people wrote back and they said, from Carthage, you are not quoting the ~~bishops~~ council of Nicea at all, it never passed any such statement. This is a minor council, the Council ~~if~~ of(13), which passed the statement, which is not recognized. And when they said that the bishop of Rome had to recognize that they ~~th~~ were right on that, so he didn't argue about it. He just let it drop.

(question) And Zosimus quit quoting the Council of Nicea, because he had been misquoting it, but he went on saying, I am the leader of the church and I say you must reestablish this man. And they wrote back and said, the gift of the Holy Ghost is needful for passing a just judgment, and He is not lacking to any province that He can inspire a whole ~~pr~~ province just as well as a single bishop. And under ^his leadership we have condemned a man and what right have you got to interfere. And then Pope Celestine, in 424, ~~axix~~ the man talked with him and Celestine said, my you are a good man, it is awful to think that the Africans have mistreated you, and he wrote ~~th~~ to them and told them that they should give him a new trial and ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ he sent a legate down there to ~~xxxx~~ listen. ~~And~~ And a council was held in Carthage in 424 which wrote a letter, and this letter is quoted in Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. III, pages 294 to 295, and in this letter the Council of Carthage representing the gathering of the bishops of the church of North Africa goes to Pope Celestine first and said that the man had asked a new trial and.....(end of record)

Record 151

.....this man into the fellowship of the Africans, because he has appealed to the pope, and been received into the fellowship by him. But this thing ought not to have been done. The man himself at last had ~~ack~~nowledged his crime. The ~~ppx~~ pope ought not so readily to give audience to those who come from

Africa to Rome. The ~~one~~ pope should not receive the excommunicated into his church communion. Whether they be bishops or priests. The assumption of the appeal to Rome is a trespass to the rights of the African church. ~~And what~~
~~exists~~.....(more quotation)

Well, that was a statement which if any branch of the Roman Catholic Church today had written, it would find itself in a very very strong controversy. The attitude of the Roman Catholic ~~Church~~ Church today is that the Pope has final right and authority over all members of the Roman Catholic Church. But the African Church, with St. Aug. as its leading character, definitely rejected any such action on the part of the pope.

(question) The letter was written to pope Celestine.

Well, now, we come to a man who became bishop of Rome who is one of the great characters of the ancient church. He is a man who is able to ~~rank~~ rank with the great figures. He is not as great as Aug., ~~he~~ he is not as great as Jerome, ~~but he might be compared with Ambrose.~~ but he might be compared with Ambrose. Of course he is not a figure in a class with Aug. and Jerome. But he is head and shoulders above anybody else who ~~occupied the position of the bishop of Rome prior to 550 A.D.~~ occupied the position of the bishop of Rome prior to 550 ~~A.D.~~ A.D. He is the one great figure who was bishop of Rome in ancient times. ~~He~~ He took the name of Leo, the lion. And this man Leo I is ~~often called Leo the Great.~~ often called Leo the Great. ~~And in comparison with any other bishop of the ancient Roman church, he was great indeed. He was an able man. He was a man who had a great influence in the church. And Leo was bishop of Rome, or pope, as the term was used for many bishops at the time. He was bishop of Rome from 440 to 461. And when he became bishop, Aug. had been dead ten years, and the African Church was then entirely under control of the Vandals, and so oppressed and persecuted there was no longer any power to do anything.~~ And in comparison with any other bishop of the ancient Roman church, he was great indeed. He was an able man. He was a man who had a great influence in the church. And Leo was bishop of Rome, or pope, as the term was used for many bishops at the time. He was bishop of Rome from 440 to 461. And when he became bishop, Aug. had been dead ten years, and the African Church was then entirely under control of the Vandals, and so oppressed and persecuted there was no longer any power to do anything.

And the poor miserable people in Africa under Vandal supremacy looking anywhere for help that they could get, wrote to Pope Leo and said, we would like you to give us some aid and help in our situation. And Leo wrote and

siad, I am glad that you at last recognize the great supremacy of the bishop of Rome. And you recognize my leadership, and so on. And he went ahead and took the strongest position that a bishop ~~xxxxxxx~~, and he sent them some charity for their difficulty situation. And they were so bad off they were only too glad to receive it, and they thanked him for it.

And so, Schaff said that Leo is the first bishop of Rome who succeeded in extending the authority of Rome into another continent than Europe. ^{had} Many ~~have~~ tried to do it, as you have noticed, but none had succeeded. But now the church of North Africa under the Vandal control was in such a situation that they were very glad to get any help that they could, to ~~xxxx~~ relieve themselves in any way they could get it. And no great figure like ~~Agus~~ Aug. was still there. And so he established a complete control over the African Church, which, however didn't amount to much, because the African church was so completely under the Vandal mistreatment and for ~~xxxxx~~ before many centuries was overrun by the Mohammedans. And became just a very small persecuted group.

But Leo was a man who had a very great feeling of his own ~~xxx~~ personal unworthiness and of his personal sin and need of a Saviour, but who combined with it a tremendous idea of the position of the bishop of Rome, as the leading city of the world. The city which was not only the great conqueror of the world, but also the city in which the greatest of the apostles had died. And so Leo felt very unworthy to become the bishop of Rome, ~~xxxx~~ but he felt that he was taking a ~~xxxxxxxx~~ position which was the greatest position in the Christian world. And this one of the great men of the time ~~xxxx~~ having such an idea of the position, gave the position an exaltation, ~~xi~~ such as it had never had before. And Leo had more idea ~~x~~ and understanding of doctrine than any bishop of ~~xxxx~~ Rome ever before. There had been, you've noticed, ~~xxxxxxxthebishopofRomexxxx~~ that the bishop of Rome is just as apt to be on the wrong side as ~~i~~ on the right side of a controversy. Leo was a man of clear discernment, clear understanding, who studied this matter of the Person of Christ, and ~~xxxx~~ expressed it in his letter ~~xi~~ to the archbishop of Constantinople very very clearly. So well, that his statement

was taken almost verbatim into the ~~confess~~ confession of the Council of ~~Chalcedon~~ Chalcedon, and it was accepted by the Christian church ever since.

It would be strange indeed if a great city like Rome did not have occasionally a great man, as head of the church in the area. And the whole Christian world acknowledges ~~that~~ the debt they owe to this bishop of the City of Rome in writing this excellent statement, which was adopted by the Council of Chalcedon. But it is ~~un~~ unfortunate that along with that went such an idea of the right and power of the bishop of Rome, that his activity and his ability conduced and laid a foundation for the ~~exalted~~ exalted claim of the church in the Middle Ages.

Well, we will continue there Friday morning.....(break in record)

.....underneath were accompanied by the two apostles in the sky. Now that is Raphael's beautiful picture. It is well worth seeing. But my personal guess is what actually happened is that Leo ~~went~~ went out and went to the camp which showed considerable courage, because this wild heathen marauder might very well have held the bishop for ransom, or he might have tortured him, you can't tell what he might have done. But very often a man who goes with courage into a difficult situation, ~~xx~~ very often he is able to accomplish what a man of trepidation and hesitation could never begin to do. And Leo was such a man, of tremendous character. And then he got there, and he evidently knew how to appeal to them, what to say, how to do it. Just how he did it we don't know. Perhaps it ~~x~~ was some appeal to his superstition. Perhaps some appeal to his fear. Perhaps he pointed out that Adula, forty years before, had plundered Rome and that within a month after he was dead. Perhaps he said that there was a curse on ~~anyone~~ anyone who would plunder Rome. What he said we don't know. How he did it. But he had real courage and real force of character that enabled him to do this. And it ~~contributed~~ contributed to the attitude of the Romans to becoming more and more to recognize the bishop of Rome as /the outstanding character in the city. The highest official in the city, and of course this easily became to be the case since the emperor, Constantine,

had moved his headquarters to Constantinople. And ~~it was~~ sometimes there was a western emperor, ~~and~~ somewhere else in Italy, and sometimes there was a representative. But Rome was no longer the real seat of the emperor. And yet it was the most ancient and powerful city in the western world.

Well, now, they make much of this. But three years later there is not so much said about the fact. Three years later the Vandals came, ^{Genseric} ~~xxxxxx(11)~~ led his army north from Africa, attacked Italy, and he did plunder Rome. Now there is not so much said about that. This is a great dramatic deliverance from Adula, and was a tremendous service to the city. And yet even there Leo seems to ~~be~~ have been of service. Schaff says that Leo obtained from Genseric the promise that he would spare the city the inflictions of murder and fire. He went to Genseric, who had plundered all of North Africa, and he tried to get him not to plunder Rome, and evidently failed. But he did succeed in getting him to promise that they would not murder the people, and they wouldn't burn the buildings. Well, it was a terrible thing to be plundered, but not nearly as terrible if they ~~had~~ had done what they might very well have done, had doubtless done in many African cities, set fire to the buildings, and ruthlessly murdered the people. ~~And~~ And so he did a great service there, most likely. We don't know much about it. The other was such a spectacular thing, that it is what is stressed, and there is not much said about this.

But Genseric subjected the city of Rome to a fourteen-day pilage. And for fourteen days his followers went through the buildings of Rome carrying off whatever they could lay their hands on, that seemed attractive to them, and the enormous spoils they carried down to Africa where they had settled. And this was a terrific disaster to Rome, though of course nothing like it would have been if they had actually burned the buildings and murdered the people.

Rome for seven centuries, till 410 A.D. had never been entered by an enemy horde. And I don't suppose that there is a city in continental Europe today of which it could be said that for seven centuries it had not been pilaged or mauerauded by anyone. I don't suppose that there is any one. But Rome had not been for ~~seven~~ seven centuries, until 410. But at 410 to have

this great destruction and invasion by Alaric, and again now by Genseric in 455. And then the fact that Adula was kept from the city and seems more or less to have ~~disappeared~~ disappeared. And yet, of course, if Adula and the wild savages had destroyed them it would have been a far worse destruction, doubtless, than what Genseric did. After ~~the~~ Genseric departed, Leo was able to organize people to alleviate the destitution and the suffering and to restore the churches. And ~~in~~ all of this, of course, contributed to the great fame which he had, which he fully deserved, but also to the prestige and standing of ~~his position~~ his position of bishop of Rome. And it seems strange, when we realize it, that for 150 years after his death, no other man of real ability occupied the seat of bishop of Rome.

Now there is one other thing which I perhaps should ~~not~~ mention about Leo. And that is that there was a bishop in France named ~~Hilary~~ Hilary of Arles. And Hilary of Arles was a very able bishop ~~there~~ there in France, and a man who had a great idea of his power and authority in a certain section of France, and of his responsibility.....(end of record)

Record 152

....and he ordered him removed. And this man went down to see Leo and asked Leo to have him ~~restored~~ restored, and Leo gave an order to tell the bishop to restore him and Hilary paid no attention to the order, and Hilary declared that ~~Hilary~~ Leo had no authority to interfere at all, and Hilary declared that the man ~~should~~ should not be restored to the bishopric. Hilary walked down to Rome to see Leo to try to persuade Leo not to interfere in the thing, and Leo in anger seized Hilary and put him in ~~prison~~ prison. ~~And~~ And Hilary escaped from prison and made his way back to Arles, and so ~~far~~ far as we know there was no reconciliation ever between the two men. But it was a case where Leo tried to establish his authority over another area ~~and~~ and failed. But Hilary was recognized as a great saint, and in the Roman Calendar he himself, along with Leo, are two of the great saints in the Roman Catholic Church. No man today in ~~the~~ the Roman Catholic Church ~~was~~ who

resisted the pope's authority in this way could be celebrated as a saint. He would be cast out of the church altogether. It shows how Leo's great pretensions while they were recognized in some quarters, were far from recognized in others, and those in Rome who claimed these pretensions were so far from feeling confident of them that they did not altogether turn against the man who denied them completely. As they would today.

(question) Yes, the bishop that he tried to ~~reestablish~~ reestablish, there was sort of a shifting position there, and how it finally ended up I don't know. The thing that history books are most concerned with is the relation between Hilary and Leo. And of course on that, too, it is hard to get precise facts, because the writing of it since has been colored by people's own attitudes. This we know, that Hilary and Leo had a strong disagreement, that Hilary refused to recognize Leo's power. And as we ~~ax~~ also know that Hilary is recognized as a great saint in the Roman Catholic Church. Now some one may say, later on Hilary acknowledged the Pope's authority, surrendered to it and submitted to it. But the interesting thing is that if anybody wants to say that, they have absolutely no ancient evidence ~~x~~ on which to base it. There is no ancient statement to that effect. The last fifteen years of Hilary's life we just have nothing said about.

(question)

Well, now, at this point I want to make a sharp change in our church history. It is like the illustration I ~~mentioned~~ mentioned yesterday, the crossing of the Atlantic Ocean, and coming into North America. There is maybe a little question where the Atlantic ends and where North ~~America~~ America begins. You come in from Boston, you draw a line south from Boston and you will be quite a long distance out in the ocean. You come into Long Island, you see Long Island, and you think that you have reached North America, and yet you go on for over one hundred miles before you reach New York, on the ocean liner. Are you still in the Atlantic, or are you already in North America. There may be a little question as to where the point of transition is, but the difference between, there are bays and inlets from the ocean, and

there are parts of the land that reach out. But yet there is a fairly narrow area compared to the whole of the ~~xxxxxx~~ ocean and all of the land. ~~xxxxxxx~~ It is that way with the time before and after. So much so that I am going to call everything that we have done this year part one of church ~~xx~~ history, and entitled what we do the rest of what we do this year part two. And the two parts are just as different as the Atlantic ~~xxxxxxx~~ Ocean and North America. From viewpoint of church history or of any history, there is a change which doesn't take place exactly at 450, but which is taking place ~~before~~ before and after, but I think you can very easily say that 450 would be like the ~~xx~~ coast, with some things reaching back and some things reaching forward. ~~xxxxxxx~~ It is the place between ancient church history and medieval ~~xxxxxx~~ church history. Or between ancient and medieval history. Unfortunately most history books do not place it right there. Some will say it is 800. Some will will say it is 600. I think they are showing very poor ~~xx~~ judgment when they base it at one of these later dates. But it ~~xx~~ doesn't matter particularly. What they do is to simply ignore the next ~~xxxx~~ couple hundred years. Because actually, these events that occur between 450 and 600 or 800 are a ~~part~~ part of the beginning of the great Middle Ages. Except for the monothelite ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ controversy. I looked ahead to that because that is the continuation of the end of the christological controversies.

And now the difference between these two periods. The ~~xx~~ period we have looked at, now, running to 451. This period of 350 years of church history, or ~~xx~~ 320 years after the death of Christ. The first hundred years of which we know little. So really it is about 200 years. 200 or 250 years. We have spent a lot of ~~xxx~~ time on it. It is a very important section of church history. Then, as far as we protestants are concerned, you could almost skip from there right over to 1500. Because most everything that is vital to us comes after 1500. Or else before 450. As far as we are concerned, the developments in between from 450 to 1500, most of them are developments in a ~~xx~~ direction from which we have ~~xxxxxx~~ completely retreated. And developments which affect us only as we see them represented in the Roman Catholic Church.

And that same thing is true of history in general. Modern history, its roots do not go back much further than 1500. There are roots in art and literature and so on, but I would say that 98% of that which influences us in ~~or~~ our daily lives has come since 1500.

So that for our purpose here, it is not necessary that we look at the 1000 years with ~~anything~~ anything like the detail ~~with~~ with which we have looked at this 250 years. Not with anything like it. It is vital that we have an idea of the events in that period. It is vital, because there are certain things which are important in our modern age which reflect back to it. It is vital because so much of the Roman Catholic goes back to it. It is vital because it is the break, it is the transition. Personally I feel that this transition that this break was unnecessary. I feel that the whole Middle Ages was unnecessary. I think that it is the fault of the Christian church. That the Christian church, while the men were doing a very great service in their careful study of theology, in their extension of the church, in their development of the church like they were doing, it was a ~~g~~ very great service. Yet, I feel that if the emphasis had been put on the central features of the teaching of Christ, on the importance of individual acceptance of Christ, and the ~~relation~~ relation of the individual to Him, and the way that it should show forth in ~~h~~ his life, and in his activity. I feel that the Middle Ages might, perhaps, have been skipped altogether. I don't know. Various books give various attempts to account for ~~the~~ the fact that we had the Middle Ages. And some will point to weakness in defying the Roman Empire and so on. Well, those features were always present. They continued over a long time. Some of the ~~features~~ features that they will mention started 400 years before the beginning of the Middle Ages. I think ~~actually~~ actually there is only one thing that accounts for the Middle Ages, and that is the incoming of the barbarians. It is a great migration which accounts for it. ~~y~~

Well, now, some history books will say, how many were these barbarians who came in. And they will try to figure, and when they figure it is not such a tremendous number, when you think of the west Goths coming down ~~there~~

~~through~~ through the eastern part of the empire, they came into Italy, under Alleric, and they marched down through Italy. They went back from Italy up into France. And then they were driven from France down into Spain, and then they settled in Spain. Well, you don't take terrific tremendous numbers of people and do all that wandering around. And the fact of the matter probably is that the groups that came in were fairly large, but they were not tremendously large. They probably were small in proportion to the population which they conquered. And with which they eventually mixed. Their influence upon the population was perfectly ~~ter~~ tremendous. But their numbers were not so. And then Robinson in his History of Western Europe says, during the previous four centuries, hundreds of thousands of barbarians had been peacefully received into the Roman Empire and had become citizens of it. The fact is that for the previous four hundred years, there had been a gradual infiltration, or for perhaps 600 years. And these people, ~~xxxx~~ from outside the Empire coming into the Empire, and they ~~were~~ were brought in and given, originally they were part of the Roman army. And ~~f~~ gradually they would drift from it out into civil life. They took ~~on~~ on Roman customs, Roman life, and settled down and became citizens in every way. And now you have simply a large group of them coming in, not subject to Roman power, becoming supreme, and plundering and pilaging. And the result of their activity was that the ~~great~~ civilization of the ancient world was to a large extent forgotten. And what the Christian Church had already begun to do was for people to turn against the world and go off into the desert, and live a life of devotion. Or to go into the monasteries and there to live a life of devotion and study, and to have little respect for the world outside.

Now most of your history books will tell you that it is a wonderful thing that through the Middle Ages learning was kept ~~alive~~ alive in the monasteries. But in the monasteries they preserved something of the civilization of the Roman Empire, they kept alive learning, they kept ~~alive~~ alive the knowledge of Christianity. Now all that is true. But one cannot help but think, just as ~~xxxx~~ I said, if Aug. instead of being quite so intent on bringing the

Donatists into the one big church, had given that energy into trying to train the Catholics and the Donatists to be better Christians so that they might meet the Vandals, in a stronger way and have a greater personal ~~influx~~ influence upon them, who knows whether the Vandals might not have been converted and a Christian ~~king~~ kingdom of North Africa been established which might have been able to last through the ages.

Well, similarly, if this great monastic movement, which was well under way in the latter part of the time before the beginning of the Middle Ages, had been able to ~~return~~ be turned back and the people who were going out of the world to try to escape from the wickedness of the world by going into the desert or into the monasteries, had instead been brought into schools and trained them to go out into the world to preach the gospel and to reach people with the truth, who knows but what these groups of ~~people~~ people who came in, most of whom were already converted to Arianism, might have been led to take a peaceful Christian attitude, which would have resulted in the events which have come since 1500 A.D., largely coming right after 450. And the whole ~~period~~ period of the Middle Ages would be skipped, as far as history is concerned. Personally I think that it was entirely possible that ~~this~~ might have happened. I see no reason why it shouldn't have.

But the fact is, of course, that it did not. The fact is that this world is Satan's ~~world~~ world, and Satan is the prince of this world. And that no matter how fine and splendid the thing that you seem to be developing, you must not be surprised when ~~Satan~~ Satan enters in, in some subtle undermining way, and tries to turn it in a different direction from that in which you are leading it. It is the situation ~~of~~ of the world in which Satan is in control, and which it is the Lord's will not to enable to ~~Christianize~~ Christianize the world, but rather to have us witness to the truth and gather out of the world ~~such~~ such as shall be saved. And to that extent, you might say ~~that~~ it affects the monastic idea, we gather them out of the world. But we feel that if we gather them out of the world it is to send them back into the world to lead others out. Rather than putting them off

by themselves somewhere.

Well, under these circumstances, then, I do not think that I have divided the year wrongly in taking this much of the year on part one, and having only the week that is left to deal with 1000 years of ~~the~~ Christian history. I don't feel that is the case. If we had an additional semester, I would not spend the whole additional semester on the Middle Ages. I might spend another third of it on the Middle Ages, but I certainly wouldn't spend ~~tw~~ two-thirds of it on getting more time for the period since 1500.....(end of record)

Record 153

And we will have to move a bit rapidly to get an idea. There is no point in trying to have you get this clear understanding of all details, they are interesting and you could spend your lifetime studying the Middle Ages. It is an extremely fascinating study, but it is not ~~pr~~ particularly important for us. But I think it is important for us to get its main trends, its principal features. And even if you had a whole course on medieval history, my guess is that you might be a little bit hazy in your ~~xxxxxxxx~~ clear apprehension of its clear features. And the relations of the main features to one another. ~~So if you have had it, I think the rest of this semester could be very profitable to you, and if you have had none, I hope to give you the main features clearly enough~~ ^{features} ~~so that the mass of detail won't confuse you on it. We will not have time to study individuals as much as we have had in the past, and I don't like to do that, because history is, in my mind, the study of individuals.~~

(question) Well, I am going to give you the general ideas in the lectures, and I can give you any number of references that you want on a particular section ~~or~~ or phase. But I don't know of any particular book that gives just a general idea of the whole thing. I will give you the political summary and I could give you a suggestion for any notes you take on particular things you would like to study. But for the general summary of the political situation, that is what I am going to take up as ~~I~~ number I now.

Under part II, 451 to 1500 A.D., ~~xxxx~~ number I is a survey of the political history. Under that A is the great migration. And it is the great migrations which produce the Middle Ages. It was not produced because blood of an inferior kind was brought in. That is not the fact. The Roman blood is in no way superior to Germanic blood, and the Roman blood at that time was abundantly mixed with Germanic blood, ~~x~~ for Germanic peoples had been coming in in great numbers. But there was a coming in of a great number of people without Roman civilization. And without any power to hold them under until they would acquire Roman civilization. That is what it was. It resulted in disorganization, in a complete disorganization. You had in ancient times, different groups in different places with ~~xxx~~ their own cities, their own towns and their own establishments. And then the Romans conquered them all. And ~~xxxxxxx~~ now ~~xxx~~ for centuries you had ~~x~~ had a Roman Empire stretching almost from India to ^{Ireland} ~~xxxxx~~. And you had this whole area under Roman control so that you could travel freely throughout the empire, there had come to be a general unity of culture and viewpoint, and of commerce, and a large measure of freedom throughout the empire. And now this empire, the ~~x~~ western portion of this empire, is forged across by group after group, ~~xxx~~ marauding, pilaging, establishing themselves somewhere, moving to ~~xxxxx~~ another place, and the whole of the ordinary political situation is ~~xxxxx~~ disrupted. And the result is that education and general culture ~~xxxx~~ dropped back a thousand years. Not that the people were in any way inferior, but that people who were untrained secured the power without difficulty, and without any organized plan or system. They seized things, they secured the power. Gradually as they settled down they came under the influence of the Roman civilization, but they had destroyed a great deal of it by this time.

Well now, these migrations began, we notice, with the coming of the Visigoths from the west. It begins about 380 actually. But it is about 450 that it reaches the point where ~~ix~~ the Middle Ages can be said really to have started. We have had these migrations, we've had these marchings

and counter marchings, and conquests and all that between 380 and 450.

By 450 the thing was pretty well under way. Now, these migrations came into the Roman Empire, into all sections of it. One section into which they came was ~~Brittany~~ Britain. Britain was the center of the high civilization. Constantine was declared emperor in Britain. ~~Brittany~~ Britain had been converted to Christianity fairly early, we don't know just when. We have comparatively little remains of those early times. But shortly after 400 A.D. the Roman soldiers withdrew from Britain. And they told the people in Britain, we have not sufficient force now to protect Rome and also protect you, so we are going to have to leave. And the people of Britain had been held for 400 years, nearly, under the Roman power, had been forced to be peaceful, there was no fighting in sections among themselves, they had not learned war, they had forgotten about war. The Roman soldiers had protected them. Some of them, of course, went into the Army, but most of them didn't. And now they were left. And the Romans had been protecting them from the wild tribes to the north, and the Romans had built a wall just north of the southern third of Scotland. They had built this wall to keep the Highlanders out, and the people there who the Romans had held out for 400 years began to make excursions, and some of the Britains thought that some of these Germanic tribes could give them some protection. Whether they actually invited them in, or what we don't know. (6/2)