

### ARTICLE III.

## THE OLDEST CHRISTIAN SERMON.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REV. HENRY HAYMAN, D. D., EX-HEAD-MASTER OF RUGBY SCHOOL.

DISTINGUISHED authority has pronounced in favor of regarding the fragment known as the Second Epistle of Clemens Romanus in the light of a sermon ; but its incomplete form must always leave its character in this respect open to doubt. The discourse to which I now refer, recorded in its entirety in the oldest Church Historian, comes to us with a clear certificate of its character in the occasion which drew it forth. We have it set in the circumstances of its origin. Those circumstances are of picturesque historical interest. It is a voice from the pulpit of faith victorious over persecution. It has no formal "text," in the modern sense, on which it dilates. But it has the concluding "ascription," stamped thus early, and as we know indelibly, on the homiletic exercises of the church. It is certainly the oldest Christian homily thus historically attested and extant entire — a composition, from this unique character attaching to it, of the highest interest, and of a date mounting up probably to 313 A.D., therefore Ante-Nicene. The fierce paroxysm of persecution had spent itself. The Master seemed to have rebuked the raging storm and men felt "a great calm," marking an epoch in the history of the Church. The occasion was that of the re-dedication of the metropolitan church of Tyre under Paulinus its bishop, a personal friend of the historian who records it, and who is with high probability supposed to have been the preacher ; viz., Eusebius himself. The epoch is that of the peace restored to the Church after the fearful Diocletian persecution terminating in the death of Galerius ; but it also included a truce

<sup>1</sup>Euseb. E. H., Book x. chap. 4, § 465 foll.

to the intellectual restlessness which had marked the previous time, if we may rely upon a rather obscure expression of the historian.<sup>1</sup> With a description of the universal jubilee of the Christian world at such a newly-found respite, the portion of the Ecclesiastical History with which I have now to do opens. In the third chapter of his tenth book Eusebius describes the outburst of festive thanksgiving attending the celebration of services of rededication. Many church fabrics appear to have been destroyed in the persecution, and to have been, only now that peace seemed to be assured, replaced by new ones. So it was at Tyre, and thus the church rebuilt there in 313 A.D. represents one we know not how much older. We know Phœnicia, and Tyre in particular, as seats of early evangelization; see Acts xi. 19; xxi. 3-4, and many presume that church fabrics existed there as soon as anywhere. We know that Saint Paul (1 Cor. xi. 22) contrasts the private "houses to eat and to drink in" with "the Church of God," using the latter therefore probably in the local and structural sense. Moreover the narrative of Saint John and the young Christian turned bandit extracted from Clemens Alexandrinus by Eusebius, E. H. iii. 23, § 114, 33-4, makes the Apostle start off in quest of his lost convert "from the spot where he stood, *from the church.*" The scene of this was Ephesus.<sup>2</sup> One may add, the tenor of the argument of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians Ep. 1, certainly implies fixed and distinct buildings for Christian worship. Urging the Corinthians to "do all things in order," he points out that God has ordained "both where and by what agency offerings, etc., are to be ministered." His language indeed is borrowed from the appointments of the Jewish covenant, but in following this out he insists on a place, as well as persons, as being specially appointed; and cites Jerusalem and the

<sup>1</sup> Τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης ἐκ τε τῶν ξεωθέν ὀχληρῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ διάνοιαν is the whole phrase. Euseb. x. 461, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Ἡλαιων ὡσπερ εἶχεν αὐτόθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας is the phrase *l. c.*

altar therein with an earnestness which would be wholly pointless if there existed no such thing as a Christian sanctuary among the usages of the Church. These testimonies leave no reasonable doubt that wherever any apostle or apostolic man had founded a church in the personal sense, there probably, by the end at any rate of the first century, a material consecrated fabric existed.<sup>1</sup> Now we learn from the sermon in Eusebius that the new church stood on the area of the old one considerably enlarged, and was on a scale of magnificence which eclipsed the latter. External outlying members as porticoes, baptistery, and other offices may possibly have been novel accessories; but the whole case of the argument seems to imply that in its cardinal features the interior space for worship, as it met the eyes of the congregation, did no more than, with ampler proportions and richer details, reproduce the former edifice. For the preacher takes those cardinal features one by one and weaves them into a spiritual allegory, which would have been rhetorically hardly possible, if they had not been previously familiar in their general appearance and uses for worship. He appeals to those features as before the eyes of his auditory while he speaks. He, further, takes the chief ministerial functions of the worship which they were there to share, and traces a similar spiritual parallel to it in the actions which he ascribes to the Great High Priest in the Spiritual temple of living souls. Since therefore the worship was without doubt in unbroken continuity with that which preceded it, we may surely infer that the structural details which formed the frame in which it was set, were in similar unbroken continuity with those of the older shrine. We reach here a strong presumption that the edifice rebuilt by Paulinus was true to the lines of an earlier one which might carry us back to the former half of the third century or even earlier still. Enthusiastic devotion, no longer repressed, broke forth now in

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Rom. Ep. 1 ad Cor. c. xl.-xli.

spontaneous opulence of resource, amplitude of plan, and exuberance of decoration. The sermon is entitled a Πανηγυρικός, probably in the etymological sense of an address to a whole multitude assembled on a great occasion ;<sup>1</sup> but it is no less a " Panegyric " in the secondary and prevalent sense, alike upon Paulinus himself, who seems to have raised the money and thrown himself into the work with the spirit of an ancient edile and a modern church-restorer combined, and upon the edifice itself which it inaugurated, and of which the preacher flings a panoramic view before us as he proceeds. The extent to which the structure embodies and illustrates the ritual and doctrine of this period—one when the church was tested and purified by persecution but not yet debased by worldly alloy—gives the preacher's description an unique interest ; which rises yet higher as we note the fact, that the general aspect and plan of the Eusebian church closely reflected that, so far as we know it, of the Herodian Temple in Jerusalem, from which resemblance a high antiquity may probably be inferred for that aspect and plan. They may be more warrantably presumed to have grown out of those which they superseded, when we find that they follow, as it were by the geographical affinity of Phoenice for Palestine, the lines of the oldest earthly type of all revealed worship—that of " His Temple " to which, accomplishing prophecy, " the Lord " himself " came."

For, the Herodian Temple is believed to have had its Holy of Holies at the *western* extremity ; and similarly the church described in this discourse by Eusebius did not in modern phrase " orientate," but had precisely the reverse position. Its successive parts are enumerated, beginning at its eastern extremity, where stood the great porch which admitted the congregation and " fronted the rising sun ;" having, moreover, an inner porch holding " a

<sup>1</sup> Compare the expression towards the end of the sermon,—Τῆς παρουσίας πανηγύρεως ταύτης καὶ τῆς φαιδράς ταύτης καὶ λαμπροτάτης ἡμέρας τὸν αἴτιον καὶ πανηγυριάρχην, 480, 26-7.

triplet of gates under one façade to meet his rays" (Eusebius E. H. x. 4, § 472, 50 and 473, 29). The principal parts next to this porch or porches are (1) a four-square eastward court with porticoes running round it (*ib.*, 473, 9 foll.); (2) a "royal house"<sup>1</sup> = nave, in richer style (*ib.* 40 foll.); a chancel (*νεώς*) with thrones, benches, and the altar (*θνσιαστήριον*) "in the midst" (*ib.* 474, 11 foll.). These parts are supposed to succeed each other in an order beginning from the east; the last of the three, therefore, viz., the chancel, lies furthest westward. If we suppose the extreme western extremity of apsidal form, it would probably contain the higher "thrones," *i. e.*, those of the presbytery, with that of the bishop himself midmost of all. On this apsidal arrangement I shall have something further to say. I now observe that this summary of parts offers a corresponding sequence to those ascribed to the Herodian Temple. It may suffice to refer to the article "Temple" in the Dictionary of the Bible (ed. 1, vol. iii. p. 1462 a), as showing an "eastern porch" and "court of the women" (*ib.* b), lying east of the court of the Temple itself, "within" which latter "towards the *westward* stood the Temple itself" (p. 1463 a), while a glance at the plan shows the Holy of Holies as the *westernmost* extremity of the building. Thus there was in the Herodian Temple (which, as regards the actual shrine, reproduced the arrangements of that of Zorobabel, as did this latter probably that of Solomon; see the same article) an historical precedent for the similar arrangements of the earliest Christian churches, especially in the neighborhood of Palestine itself. How lasting was the veneration felt by the early Christian for the Old Testament is notably attested by this very sermon,<sup>2</sup> in which the quotations from it are four or five for one from the New. It seems then reasonable to assume that the arrangements of structure under

<sup>1</sup> Βασιλειῶς οἶκος, thus perhaps=*basilica* of later church nomenclature.

<sup>2</sup> Thus the efforts of Paulinus are compared to those of Bezaleel and others of the O. T. worthies.

the Old Covenant would be followed, whenever not distinctly set aside by the requirements of the New. It is confirmatory of the above view that the same aspect is ascribed by the church historian, Socrates, to the principal church at Antioch as prevailing when he wrote (fifth century). In a chapter devoted to "diversity of church practices" (Eccl. Hist. v. 22) he notes that that church "had its position the reverse of that which was usual, (*ἀντίστροφον*), for the altar looks not eastward but westward." At Antioch as well as Tyre we are on the footsteps of St. Paul, and we know very early of close intercourse between the Antiochene and Jerusalem churches (Acts xv., xvi.), in which he took a leading part. If then the cathedrals of Tyre and Antioch repeat each other's aspects, while *both* reflect that of the Jerusalem Temple, the inference surely is that their arrangement was probably primitive and "Orientation" subsequently introduced. The key to the whole idea is probably to be found in an expression which Eusebius ascribes to one of the "martyrs of Palestine" (Euseb. xi. 430, 17 foll.) who, when questioned about his country, replied that it was "the Heavenly Jerusalem," and "lay towards the actual east and the rising sun;" with which we may compare the description of the Tyrian church as cited above. But the *older* architectural expression of this idea was, I take it, the eastward porch where the people entered; the *later* expression of it, the eastward apse where the bishop sat, in short it seems highly probable that "orientation" itself was not primitive. But this by the way.

The latter part of the sermon is my chief concern at present. It is far from being an easy piece of Greek, especially as we have not, as the congregation had, the church before our eyes to assist the interpretation; but, on the contrary, have to make out the detail of that interior from the description of the preacher; and, reversing the order of his conceptions, from the position ascribed to the allegorical High Priest to reconstruct the position of his

representative, the actual celebrant. His leading idea is that the material shrine typifies the Spiritual Temple of Living Stones, which again he seems to parallel with the scene of the Divine Presence and worship in the Heavenly Sanctuary, as expressed, for instance, in Rev. ii. foll. That Spiritual Temple had been by persecution ravaged and overthrown but was now restored and its Living Stones selected and arranged (Eccl. Hist. x. 4, § 476, 30 and 479, 2-6). He goes on to parallel each feature of the structure which the congregation saw around them with a corresponding feature to be realized in the Spiritual Temple. "What occasion is there," he says, "minutely to pursue the detail of the consummate architectural arrangement, when the witness of eyesight supersedes that received through the ears (*ib.* 474, 8)?" It is therefore the Spiritual Temple on which he proceeds to dwell.

It is upon the following passage (*ib.* 479, 9 foll.) that I would fix attention: "And in this [spiritual] temple too are thrones, benches and *sedilia* numberless; viz., all the souls in which rest the gifts of the Divine Spirit, just as was beheld of old by the company of the Holy Apostles to whom 'appeared distributed tongues as it were of fire and it sat upon each of them.' But in the supreme one of all a Christ entire, one may say Himself is enthroned, and in those who are secondary in degree to it, in proportion as each contains a share of the power of Christ and the Holy Ghost. The benches, too, would be angels' souls and those of some committed to each of them for guidance and guardianship.' But what else should the altar be—grand, awful, and unique<sup>3</sup>—than the pure inmost shrine<sup>2</sup> of the soul of the universal

<sup>1</sup> An evident allusion to St. Matt. xviii. 10. "In heaven their [children's] angels do always behold the face," etc.

<sup>2</sup> The epithet in the original here given to the altar is *μονογενής*, lit. "only begotten," the surpassing force of which it is not easy to reproduce in English, as applied to a thing.

<sup>3</sup> Literally "Holy of Holies."

priest? *Standing beside which on the right* the Great Highpriest of all, Jesus himself, the only-begotten of God, receiving with joyful look and uplifted hands the offering made by all of perfumed incense, and the prayer-transmitted<sup>1</sup> sacrifices, bloodless and immaterial, transmits them<sup>2</sup> to the Heavenly Father and God of all, first himself adoring and ascribing solitary to the Father the honor due, and next interceding that He will remain gracious and forever propitious to all of us also." Let us set the members of this rhetorical parallel in correspondence.

THE FURNITURE OF THE MATERIAL  
CHURCH.

THE SPIRITUAL COUNTERPART.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>1. The supreme [throne] of all, <i>i. e.</i>, the bishop's.</p> <p>2. Those which are secondary<sup>3</sup> in degree to it, <i>i. e.</i>, the presbyters' thrones.</p> <p>3. The benches, probably for the deacons, choir, and other attendants.</p> <p>4. The altar.</p> | <p>1. An entire Christ.</p> <p>2. A partial Christ, in proportion as each [presbyter] shares in His and the Holy Spirit's power.</p> <p>3. Angels and the souls which they have in charge.</p> <p>4. The pure inmost shrine of the soul of [Christ] the universal priest.</p> |
|---|---|

The eye seems here working from the extreme west eastward. In that extreme west next the wall 1. the bishop's throne would be, occupying the position analogous to the Holy Table in a modern "orientating" church. 2. The presbyteral thrones would probably form a crescent line following the curve of the apse right and left of 1. In 3 we have the further plans, corresponding to *sedilia* and choir stalls, in a modern chancel. In 4 note that "the altar" is described (as stated above) as being "in the midst." The easiest interpretation of this is, to my mind, between the clergy and the people, or near the junction of chancel and nave, but within the former. Then

<sup>1</sup> *Τὰς δὲ εὐχῶν ἀνάμικτος καὶ ἀήλως θυσίας*, E. H. §479, 25.

<sup>2</sup> *Παραπέμπεται*.

<sup>3</sup> The Greek word is *δευτερείουσιον*. Similarly Constantine calls the presbyters "those of the second (*δευτέρου*) throne."

comes the important passage, "standing beside which" on the right, the Great High Priest of all" performs His highest function of "presenting" or "transmitting" the sacrifice, with adoration and intercession. The parallel here demands that in the highest function of the material altar (*θυσιαστήριον*) the ministering priest (*ιερεὺς*) stood before the altar on the right. But this highest function would undoubtedly include the consecration of the Eucharist, whatever else it may have included. What then is the position "on the right" to be determined by? Possibly by reference to the bishop, who sat in the extreme west, therefore facing eastward. His right would therefore be the south side. But it might be conversely, looking from the east westward; and the expression cited above from Socrates, of the Antiochene church, that "its altar looks westward,"<sup>2</sup> seems to me to favor this. When an altar "looks westward," its right must be to the north side. To this I incline, not only as justified by the statement of Socrates, but as confirmed by what we know of the Jewish ritual, in which the Levite who ministered was directed to "kill it (the victim) on the side of the altar northward before the Lord" (Levit. i. 11). We are also told by Josephus that the approach to the altar for the ministrants was on the south side, leading up by a gentle slope (*De Bello Jud.* v. 3, § 6). The side for approaching being on the south, that for officiating would more naturally be on the opposite. But between the south and the north the choice would seem absolutely to lie for the position of the celebrant. It is also naturally justified by the consideration that, by not turning his back on either clergy westward or the people eastward, the celebrant would be more obviously ministering on behalf of all. Thus I hold it established that, in the only Ante-Nicene example extant, and extant in such ample detail as this, the position

<sup>1</sup> Ὡς παρεστὸς ἐπὶ δεξιά, where ὦ must refer to *θυσιαστήριον* or its correspondent, *ἁγίων ἁγίων*.

<sup>2</sup> Πρὸς δύσιν ὄμῃ.

of the celebrant in consecrating was on the north side, and that the "Eastward Position" cannot therefore be deemed primitive and catholic. It is remarkable that the amplest detail should be found in the one instance which is the oldest on record. We may search church history for ages downward since, without finding any thing that comes near it for fulness and precision. In all the controversy which I have seen on this much controverted subject, this crucial instance has been perseveringly overlooked. Of course, it should be added that, if in the Tyrian church which "looked westward" the celebrant stood on the north side, the corresponding position in an "orientating" church would be on the south.

Chrysostom (*Homily de coemeteris et cruce*, last par.) speaks of the celebrant as "standing *before* the table;" — the very words of the rubric before our Prayer of Consecration. Unless the usage in Chrysostom's time had widely diverged from that in Eusebius', "standing *before* the table" would not mean standing with his back to the people in the nave; and in our rubric may probably bear a similar meaning to that which it has in Chrysostom. I wish to add a few words on the apsidal arrangement, which I have presumed for the west end, with the bishop's throne in the middle. I would cite Eusebius again (*ib.* 470, 24-5) for the governing idea, who says, "He [Paulinus, the bishop, who may have been his own architect,] looking with the purified Spirit's eye to the chief Master, as finding there his archetype and model, has completed the representative forms of all that he sees Him doing, moulding his work to the closest approximation it was possible for him to achieve," and again, "so far as the seen may approach the unseen, he has constructed this magnificent shrine of God Most High to resemble in character the model of that grander one." It is clear that these words relate to some inspired archetype believed to exist (patent to the eyes of the church). I know

<sup>1</sup> Όταν ἐστήκη πρὸ τῆς τραπέζης ὁ ἱερεὺς, are the words.

not where to find any authority for such an one save in the Apocalypse. Let us see if that book yields any basis for that belief. The preacher had before cited the parallel of the "type shown" to Moses "in the Mount;" and further adds, "Such is the mighty temple which the potent all-creative Word hath reared for Himself in the whole habitable sphere beneath the sun—yea, Himself having completed this spiritual image on earth, a counterpart of the Heavenly vault (lit. apse) beyond—that realm supercelestial, the prototypes yonder of those here, the Jerusalem which is above, the Mount Sinai of the highest heaven." The "mighty temple in the habitable sphere beneath the sun" is not material but spiritual, built of "Living Stones." Between it and the church fabric before their eyes he has been tracing parallels hitherto. He now recognizes that spiritual temple on earth as having its own correspondence with the heavenly temple of the Divine Presence above. The words last cited directly assert a spiritual archetype of Divine authority. Unless they are empty bombast, there must be some inspired basis for the idea which they convey. Let us see what the Apocalypse furnishes by way of such basis.

The heavenly Sanctuary there displayed has for its grand central object a "Throne" and "One that sat on it (Rev. iv. 2; vii. 15; xvi. 17). "Round about" this are seen twenty-four other thrones; "evidently," says Dean Alford, in his commentary, "smaller and probably lower than *the* Throne." On these as many crowned elders or presbyters are seated (iv. 6), "the assessors of the enthroned One," says the same commentator. From various objects being spoken of as "*before* the Throne," (iv. 5, 6; vii. 9, 15; viii. 3; xiv. 3, 5). We may infer a Presence fronting towards the seer's gaze. But if "round about" as applied to the minor thrones be understood as of a *complete* circle some of these would be between the seer, supposed outside it, and the Throne itself, which seems out of keeping with the relations of the scene. On the other hand, we

can hardly understand "round about" of a mere *straight line* of thrones with *the* Throne as midmost point. But if we assume a half circle or any smaller arc, we seem to harmonize the whole by supposing *the* Throne at the bisection of such arc. The occupants of the minor thrones, crescentwise disposed on either side of it, would then be able to give to their adoration to Him on *the* Throne a suitable direction, without far departing from their places as assessors, or breaking their own line of position. Thus conceived, their rays of worship would easily converge towards Him. Further, Eusebius, a little earlier than the last cited passage (§474, 11 foll.) says, that the chancel (*νεώς*) was "furnished with thrones at the highest level (*ἄνωτάτῳ*) for the dignity of the presiding clergy (*προέδρων*), as well as with benches in order along its whole arca." Thus a position of superiority or pre-eminence must be assigned to these, and if we suppose them disposed in the crescent of the apse, as suggested above, with the bishop's throne midmost, this pre-eminence must be assigned to these, and if we suppose them disposed in the crescent of the apse, as suggested above, with the bishops' throne midmost, this pre-eminence would be entirely gained; while the bishop's would still be "the supreme one of all" and theirs "secondary in degree to it." Further, still, we know from Bingham II. xix, § 6, that, in the early church, "the manner of their (the presbyters') sitting was on each hand of the bishop in the form or figure of a semicircle; which is described by the author of the constitutions under the name of Clemens Romanus, Gregory Nazianzen, and others; whence, as the bishop's throne is called the middle throne, or the middle seat, by Theodoret and the constitutions; so for the same reason Ignatius and the Constitutions term the presbyters the spiritual crown or circle of the presbytery and the crown of the church." These authorities range from the early second to the fifth century and therefore cover the date of the Tyrian church-dedication and

sermon. We know, moreover, that this arrangement of a half-circle of seats was the precise form followed in the Jewish Sanhedrim (Dict. of the Bible, s. v.). Now "the Sanhedrim of the Apostles" is the very expression used by Ignatius in another place (*ad Magnes.* 6), in describing the relative place of the presbyters to that of the bishop, who "presides in the place of God." These expressions of Ignatius, whose date is not later than 117 A.D., not only confirm the parallel drawn between the presbyters' place in the Tyrian church and that of those in the Apocalyptic vision, but fortify the probability urged above, that that church fabric represents the leading ideas of an older one, of an antiquity not to be precisely fixed, perhaps apostolic. It should be added that as in that vision the "altar" stands "before the Throne," so in the Eusebian description great prominence is given to it. It is described by epithets of the most impressive reverence, one indeed borrowed from the eternal Son himself. It stands "in the midst," an expression explained above, and the whole area which contains it and the "thrones" is spoken of as partitioned off from the body of the building or *basilica*, by "an open screenwork of wood carved with marvellous delicacy," exactly analogous to our chancel screens. Nor need we hesitate at regarding the "base multitude whom no man could number," as represented in the Christian congregation. Thus a church interior with its clergy and faithful laity engaged in their highest act of devotion images at once the whole church catholic and militant here on earth, and also the heavenly church invisible, the sanctuary which God's own presence illuminates with a radiance of glory in an atmosphere of praise. In the Apocalypse the space of the celestial shrine appears filled, with no place empty. "A Lamb as it had been slain" appears upon the altar, and the "vast multitude" have "washed their robes and made them white" in the blood of His sacrifice. But "Himself the victim and Himself the priest," He is spoken of by the Eusebian preacher

in the latter character that of "the Great High Priest."

Thus we seem to have reached the archetype to which that preacher appeals, and here we see the source of that tradition which regards the chancel as the special "Holy of Holies" in a Christian church, which gave rise to the custom of always erecting the chancel first,<sup>1</sup> and which is confirmed by the fact that of our liturgy in the English tongue the Service for Holy Communion, which is in fact *the liturgy par excellence*, was the first part put forth.\* The notion is not mediæval nor distinctively Jewish, but definitely scriptural, embodied in the visions of the seer of Patmos, and probably early realized in those "seven churches of Asia" to which the Apocalyptic letters are addressed. Yet it is in accordance with the spirit and not remote from the letter of the older sacred ideas which ruled the constituent members of the Jerusalem Temple. And thus, although that Temple, from Solomon to Herod, although synagogue and Sanhedrim and Roman Basilica, may all have exerted an influence on church architecture reacting on Christian worship, that which principally inspired its genius and furnished its mould is the "Pattern shewed in the Mount," the Court of Heaven and the Eternal Presence with its surroundings as portrayed in the vision of him who saw them "in the Spirit on the Lord's Day;" and Christian worship, however feeble and humble in execution, will, so long as it is true to its first conception, point upwards to that archetype still.

A few incidental points of high interest, to be gathered from various passages of the sermon, claim our notice before concluding these remarks. To the Saviour the title or epithet *αὐτόθεος*, "actual God," is ascribed, and worship is directed—valuable as an Ante-Nicene testimony, and the

<sup>1</sup> Thus the substructions of Ely Cathedral are said to show the lines of an earlier and smaller chancel projected and begun, but abandoned and superseded by the present larger plan.

\* Ἄλλ' οἷα τοῦ καθόλου Θεοῦ παῖδα γνήσιον καὶ αὐτόθεον προσκυνεῖσθαι, καὶ εἰκότως, § 468, 22-3.

more so if proceeding, as is probable, from the lips and pen of Eusebius himself, amidst a large concourse of clergy<sup>1</sup> and in the presence of Paulinus the Bishop, who was afterwards reckoned as a partisan of Arius. More remarkable perhaps is the title *θεόπαις*, a compound which, according to classical analogy, should mean not *θεοῦ παιῖς* but *θεοσ παιῖς*, or taking *παιῖς*=*υἰός*, "God the Son;" comp. *ἄνδρόπαις* "man-boy," Aeschyl. *Sept. c. Theb.* 515.

A clear testimony to the administration of Holy Baptism by sprinkling, as recognized and ordinary, is found in the mention of certain external chambers as "for those who need the purification and sprinkling-vessels or sprinkling-agency through water and the Holy Ghost." For the word here used to become denominative of the vessels or arrangements made for baptism shows that the usage was well established at the period. This is the oldest authority in favor of that usage as normal and general, although in Cyprian we find evidence of it as applied to clinics who were "non loti sed perfusi." And Bingham, who cites Cyprian at length, wholly omits this testimony. The words through "water and the Holy Ghost" can leave no doubt that baptism is intended, and as the arrangements described are those of the cathedral church, a standard usage in favor of sprinkling is implied in the ordinary public baptisms of the church. The sermon contains two other references to baptism, as "the stream of the divine regeneration of the bath, or washing, of salvation," and as the means whereby "souls, like gold, are purified from pollution in the divine bath," "reproducing

<sup>1</sup> Ὡς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳς ἀθροίσματι πλείστον ἐπιπαρόντων ἐπισκόπων, § 465, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Τοῖς ἐτι καθάρσεως καὶ περιρραντηρίων τῶν δι' ἰδατος καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐγχρηζουσιν, § 474, 26-7. We find the term in Herodot. 1. 51, where Croesus at the Delphic shrine *περιρραντήρια δύο ἀνέθηκε χρυσίον τε καὶ ἀργύρεον*, where vessels are plainly meant.

<sup>3</sup> Cyprian Ep. 76, al. 69 ad Magnum.

<sup>4</sup> Τὸ νάμα τῆς θείας τοῦ σωτηρίου λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, § 472, 18-9, and *ψυχὰς θεῖω λουτρῷ χρυσοῦ δίκην ἀποσμηχθείσας* § 478, 28. The last two words of the

either the literal language or the spirit and purport of St. Paul and St. Peter.

The whole begins with a formal address to the clergy under the title of "priests," *ἱερείς*, as wearing the "garment down to the feet," ascribed to the Head of the Church in Apocalyptic vision, as having the heavenly crown of glory and the unction of inspiration, and the sacerdotal dress of the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> It is evident that they were all present in the robes of their holy office, and a clear attestation to a distinctive vestment of the priesthood is thus given. The bishop is next personally included, compared to Solomon, Zorobald and Bezaleel, to Aaron and Melchisedek, but nowhere, in the actual sermon, is mentioned by name. We find in this context the actual word for the "dedication"<sup>2</sup> of a sanctuary, with which the bishop is said to be "privileged." The laity are then expressly included as "nurslings of the holy flock of Christ,"<sup>3</sup> and towards the close are specified as consisting of "men together with children and women, small and great." In an intermediate passage the lay congregation are classified as neophytes, catechumens, and faithful; and the vergers' function, in keeping the entrance and guiding those entering, is distinctly specified. The triplet of arches under one façade symbolizes the Father in its larger and central arch, the Son and Holy Ghost in its lateral arches. The fence of outer wall is faith. The magnificent aspect of the whole pile, as calculated not only to receive the devout, but to arrest and attract the passer by, is specially noticed. The terrible havoc of the older building and its site cumbered with its ruin is repeatedly touched upon, and former passage are those of St. Paul in Tit. iii. 5; comp. also with both 1 Pet. iii. 21.

<sup>1</sup> Ὡ φίλοι Θεοῦ καὶ ἱερεῖς, οἱ τὸν ἅγιον ποδήρη, καὶ τὸν οὐράνιον τῆς δόξης στέφανον, τό τε χρίσμα τὸ ἐνθεον, καὶ τὴν ἱερατικὴν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος στολὴν περιβεβλημένοι, § 465, 10-12. Comp. Rev. i. 13, ἐνδεδυμένον ποδήρη.

<sup>2</sup> Σεμνολόγημα, § 465, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀγέλης χριστοῦ θρέμματι, *ib.* 24.

adorned with various citations from the Psalms, *e. g.*, with the "wild boar out of the wood," the "axes and hammers" breaking the carved-work, etc. The destruction of the church-books is particularly noticed, and the wrath of the persecutor as vented on "the very stones of the houses of prayer."<sup>1</sup> The style of the composition is fatiguing to the reader, being involved in long coils of rhetoric and larded with long and cumbrous phrases from the LXX. On one occasion the preacher runs for an entire closely printed octavo page without a period; and this passage, as is not unnatural, consists chiefly of vehement denunciations of the persecutors. But taken as a whole, it is well worth minute and careful study, and might well be made the basis of a course of lectures for theological students, touching Christian antiquities both of doctrine and ritual at so many vital points, as it does. At the same time, as a contemporary record by one who occupied a prominent position, as commemorating a great popular gathering, as marking the crisis of transition from persecution to unmolested security and expressing an outbreak of devotional feeling in gratitude for it, it is one of the most remarkable passages in the record of Church History. It has, as has been said, no text, but the text might well have been, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

<sup>1</sup> Προσευκτηρίων, rare word, § 467, 31.