

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

Early Christianity and the Family

by Frederick William Kroencke

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Philosophy
of the University of Cincinnati

Cincinnati, Ohio, 1927

UMI Number: DP16720

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform DP16720
Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

FOREWORD.

It is not the object to present an exhaustive treatise of the Greek, the Roman, and the early Christian family respectively, but the purpose is rather to emphasize those factors in the life of the family that particularly demonstrate the extraordinary influence which Christianity has exerted on the basic unit of civilization. To that end the unfortunate and often deplorable conditions as they prevailed in the Greek and Roman family of the Pagan world will be presented and contrasted with the resultant changes effected in the early Christian family by the dissemination and application of different fundamental principles, the teachings of Christianity.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	<u>III</u>
 Chapter	
<u>I</u> <u>The Basis of Early Christianity</u>	1
Jesus, the Founder of Christianity	1
Paul, a Faithful Disciple of Jesus	1
The Christianity of the Church Fathers	11
 <u>II</u> <u>Marriage and Marriage Customs</u>	 16
The Greek Betrothal and Nuptials	16
The Greek View of Marriage	17
The Roman Sponsalia and Wedding Ceremony	20
The Roman Conception of Marriage	22
Christ and Paul on Marriage	26
Views of the Church Fathers on Marriage	27
The Respective Merits of Virginity and Marriage	 33
The Regulation of Marriage and Marriage Customs by the Early Church	 42
The Influence of Christianity on Marriage Legislation in Rome	 46

Chapter	Page
<u>III</u> <u>Early Christianity and Divorce</u>	49
The Need for the Permanency of the Family49
Divorce in the Historic Period of Greece50
Disruption of the Family in Rome53
Jesus on Divorce56
The Early Church and Divorce57
The Church's Attitude on Divorce Reflected in Imperial Legislation58
<u>IV</u> <u>The Form of the Family</u>	60
The Physiological Basis of the Marital Union60
The Attitude of Greece and Rome toward Monogamy60
Christianity and Monogamy61
<u>V</u> <u>Household Organization</u>	63
The Type of Organization63
The Powers of the Governing Head63
Membership in the Family64
The Relation of the Family to the State65
The Changes under Christianity in the Organization of the Family66
The Limitation of Patria Potestas by Christian Emperors69
Slavery in the Pre-Christian Period70
The Influence of Stoicism on Roman Legislation concerning Slavery70
Christianity and Slavery71
Legislation on Slavery under the Influence of the Church72

VII

Chapter	Page
<u>VI</u> <u>The Status of the Husband</u>	74
The Obligations and Privileges of the Husband and Father in the Greek and Roman Home	74
The Headship of the Husband and Father in the Christian Home	76
<u>VII</u> <u>The Status of the Wife</u>	79
The Obligations and Privileges of the Greek and Roman Wife and Mother	79
The Reason for the Difference in the Attitude toward the Wife in Greece and Rome	81
The Extension of the Wife's Privileges under the Influence of the Church	81
The Legislation of Christian Emperors con- cerning the Status of the Wife	83
The Reason for the Difference, with respect to Privileges, between Husband and Wife under the Church	84
<u>VIII</u> <u>The Status of the Child</u>	87
The Duties and Rights of the Child in Greek and Roman Life	87
The Influence of Stoicism on Child Legislation	90
The Duties and Rights of the Child under the Church	90
The Laws on Child Welfare Passed by Christian Emperors under the influence of the Church	92
<u>IX</u> <u>The Leading Functions of the Family</u>	94
The Essential Functions in the Greek and Roman Family Circle	94
The Foremost Function of a Normal Christian Family	96

Chapter	Page
<u>X</u> <u>The Economic Life of the Family</u>	97
The Effect of Slavery on the Economic Life of the Greek and Roman Family	97
The Position of the Church on the Problem of Labor	101
The Marked Changes in the Views of Fathers and Mothers on Labor under the Influence of the Church	102
<u>XI</u> <u>The Moral Life of the Family</u>	104
The Influence of the Immoral Gods of the Grecian and Roman Religion on the Moral Life of the Family	104
The Chastity of the Greek Wife	105
The Immoral Husband in Greece	107
The Roman Husband and Wife as Moral Lepers	109
The Christian Spouse under the Single Standard	110
A Contrast between Stoic and Christian Influence on the Moral Life of the Family	
<u>XII</u> <u>The Social Life of the Family</u>	112
The Greek World a Man's World	112
The Social Position of the Women of Greece under Christianity	112
The Unlimited Social Freedom between the Sexes in Rome	115
The Transformation of the Social Life of the Roman Family by the Church	116
The New Attitude toward Man, Especially toward the Poor	118

Chapter	Page
<u>XIII</u> <u>The Educational Life of the Family</u>	121
Greek, Roman, and Christian Ideals of Education in Contrast with one another121
The Difference in the Training and Education of the Greek Boy and Girl122
The Advantages and Disadvantages of the Son and Daughter under Rome's Utilitarian Ideal124
The Church's Foremost Educational Principle .	.127
The New Subject Matter129
The Demand for Universal Education by the Church130
The New Agency in Education130
The Influence of a Christian Mother in the Home131
The Nurture and Discipline of the Child in the Christian Home133
<u>XIV</u> <u>The Religious Life of the Family</u>	135
The Greek and Roman Family as a Religious Organization135
The Special Ceremonies of the Greek and Roman Domestic Cult136
The Outstanding Characteristics of Ancient Family Worship140
The Chief Purpose and Criterion of the Domestic Religion142
The Foremost Means Employed to Secure the Favor of the Gods144
The Idea of Ritualism in Antiquity145
The Devices of Superstition as a Part of Ancient Family Worship147

Chapter	Page
The Characteristics of Christianity as a unique Religion, Especially its Monotheism and Lofty Moral Principles . . .	148
The Chief End and Aim of Christianity . . .	153
The Spiritual Means Employed by Christianity to Realize its High Purpose	157
The Changes Effected in the Life of the Family in General by the Christian Religion .	159
The Transformation of the Religious Life of the Family by the Early Christian Church. .	159
<i>Bibliography</i>	163

I

THE BASIS OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

The Christian religion was a new, a unique spiritual force in the life of Greece and Rome. To be more specific, Christianity, as established by Christ, transformed the ancient peoples about the Mediterranean Sea, in particular, the primary unit of all civilization, the family. In other words, the source upon which the Church drew in order to exert its remarkable influence upon the home, during the early Christian era, was that type of Christianity which was based on the utterances of Jesus or, better, on the Gospels of the New Testament.

But was the Christianity of Christ, or of the Gospels, in truth, that new and unique force which proved to be so active in Greek and Roman life? Was not rather the Christianity of Paul, a Christianity based, not so much on the Gospels, as upon pre-Christian Judaism and pre-Christian mystery religion, the chief cause of the changes which were experienced in many circles during the Empire? Were, in fact, Paul and the Church Fathers, who followed him in the work of evangelization, actually adherents of Jesus? Accordingly, Christianity either only amalgamated with and interpenetrated Pagan civilization or, on the contrary, it without any such modification, eventually revolutionized this decaying culture. In the first place, then, an examination of the faith of Paul, principally as to the person and the work of Christ, will find him either in agreement or disagreement with Christ on these questions and, furthermore, a study of the source of his faith, whether Christian, Jewish, or Pagan, will likewise determine the problem as to which type of Christianity was influential in Greek and Roman life.

Paul was in no sense a second founder of Christianity; Instead, he was always and only a faithful disciple of Jesus, for he believed, as regards the person of Christ, that He was not only a mere man, but above all the

Son of God. Christ Himself certainly claimed to be the Son of God. He designated Himself, in the interview with Nicodemus, as the only-begotten Son of God. He permitted Thomas to address Him as Lord and God. In fact, in many ways He stressed His divinity, especially His pre-existence and co-equality with the Father. In particular, Christ appealed to His miracles as evidence of His divine Sonship. ¹⁾ In turn, Paul's Christ was his Lord, ²⁾ and that not because He was adopted by the Father, but because He was pre-existent and co-equal in majesty with the Father. ³⁾ His Christ was a real supernatural person. Accordingly, Paul's conception of the person of Christ was by no means naturalistic; it was supernaturalistic. Paul, furthermore, could never be classed a polytheist, as could so many in his day, neither a pantheist or neo-platonist, but always and only a monotheist.

Next, Paul, as regards the work of Christ, believed Him to be the Savior of the world. Christ Himself had frequently announced that His mission in the world was to be its universal redemption from sin and condemnation by means of His atoning death. ⁴⁾ Paul, in turn, did assuredly not consider Christ merely an exemplar for our faith, but more, an object of our faith. Paul certainly never insisted that we should only attempt to live and believe as Christ had lived and believed while on earth among

1) John 3:16; John 20:28; John 8:58; John 10:30; John 17:5; Matt. 28:18; John 21:17; Matth. 11:27; Mark 14:61,62; John 2:1-11; Luke 8:22-25; John 11:38-44; John 20:14-16, 19-21; John 20:30,31; John 10:37,38. 2) Kyrios, equivalent to God. So also in Septuagint. See Warfield, "God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" in Princeton Theological Review, XV, 1917, pp. 1-20. Boehlig, Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus, in Zeitschrift fuer die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XIV, 1913; J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, ch. 8. 3) Rom. 8:32; Gal. 4:4; Col. 1:17; 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 3:9; Phil. 2:10,11. 4) Matth. 18:11; John 3:16; John 11:25,26.

men. He primarily urged upon the world of his day to accept Christ's redemptive work as the great task of His mission and, as of supreme necessity, to believe in it to their own salvation. In short, Paul's conception of Christ necessarily was that of a divine Redeemer; one come to earth, living here a life of humiliation, suffering and dying on the cross in the stead of sinners upon whom the curse of the law justly rested, and finally arising victoriously from the dead, in order henceforth and forevermore to be not only a Revealer of a pure life, but more than all else, the Savior of the world. ¹⁾ In consequence, Paul's every thought and confession was: "He died for me and gave Himself for me." ²⁾ Hence Paul believed with an undying faith in the efficacy of the atonement and was captivated by the compelling conviction that, by means of this selfsame spiritual force, by means of the Gospel-message concerning the atonement, souls could be converted, homes transformed, ³⁾ yea, the whole bankrupt life and culture of his day revolutionized. Paul's loyalty to, and full agreement with, Christ as His disciple cannot be questioned.

Furthermore, Paul's whole missionary life was proof positive of the same attitude toward Jesus, especially of the inestimable value it possessed in the opinion of this apostle for the whole world. Consequently, his faith in Jesus as the divine Redeemer, as the Son of God and the Savior of the world, made Paul a missionary; or Paul was a missionary because, in the first place, he was a firm believer in Jesus and a true Christian theologian who had to give expression to his faith from a love to His

1) Gal. 1:4; Phil. 2:6-11; Rom. 3:23-29; Gal. 3:13; Rom. 4:23-25.

2) Gal. 2:20; Eph. 2:4; Rom. 8:37; Gal. 1:4; 1Tim. 2:6; Tit. 2:14.

3) Rom. 8:38,39; 2 Cor. 5:19-21; Rom. 1:16;

Master and to his fellowmen. Indeed, because Paul had discovered in Christ a Savior for his own person, "the chief of sinners", he must needs go forth as an apostle to the Gentiles and proclaim the message of a universal salvation to his fellowmen, to the Jew first, but thereafter also to the Greek and Roman. Hence Paul must preach and plant the Gospel in a chain of cities. Hence he must in such manner lay the foundation of a church which soon embraced both bond and free, throughout the Roman Empire, in a common faith and in a common life.¹⁾ Hence he must, under divine inspiration, write his Epistles,²⁾ in order, also through their medium, to strengthen the faith of the souls gathered about the cross of Christ as well as to reach and convert people at a distance, and even impress subsequent generations of men. The great missionary was certainly not a second founder of Christianity.

Paul, then, was in complete accord with Christ as regards His supernatural person and as regards His work, the redemption of mankind, and in consequence compelled to be His missionary to the world of his day. More than that, he also demonstrated his loyalty by a full agreement with his Master on all fundamental doctrines in the four Gospels. Thus Paul was one with Jesus, for instance, (1) as to the central doctrine of grace: it was for him the forgiveness of sin by grace, not by works, through faith in the redemptive work of Christ; (2) as to the means of grace: these were the Word of God and the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, whereby faith should respectively be created in man's heart or strengthened; (3) as to the conversion of the sinner: it was for him the change effected in the heart and the life of man by the work of the Divine Spirit through the means of grace; (4) as to the resulting fatherhood of God: it was the new relation, consequent upon faith, in which God

1) 1 Tim. 1:15; Rom. 5:15; 2 Cor. 5:14,15; Gal. 3:26-29.

2) 2 Tim. 3:15-17; 1 Cor. 2:13.

the Father stands in His household of faith, not to man in general, but specifically to the loyal disciples of Jesus; (5) as to the dominant ethical principle in the life of the disciples: it was true love for God and man and not a mere external conformity to the divine law; and (6) as to the Kingdom of God: it was the Church divorced from all political and materialistic associations.¹⁾ There is, then, a strong and full agreement between Paul and Jesus, for which many other parallels might be found, an agreement certainly sufficient to convince an unprejudiced mind that Paul's theology is identical with Christ's theology.

But, finally, did Paul draw solely upon the New Testament Gospels as a source for his theology and not instead upon some extra-Christian sources, i. e., upon pre-Christian Judaism or pre-Christian Paganism? Is Paul possibly after all a second founder of Christianity, and the Christian religion not a unique force, but only an interpenetration of Pagan culture? It is certainly true that a contemporary Jewish conception of a transcendent Messiah prevailed in Paul's day. Certain apocalypses, such as the Similitudes of 1 Enoch, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch,²⁾ designated the Messiah, in the terminology evidently borrowed from the canonical books of the Old Testament,³⁾ as the Elect One, the Righteous One, the Anointed One or the Messiah, and the Son of Man. According to these apocalypses the Messiah was merely a mysterious, pre-existent heavenly being. However, Paul employed a different and more precise terminology

1) Compare, for instance, John 3:16 and Luke 18:10-14 with Rom. 3 and 4 and Gal. 2:15-3:39. John 3:5 and Luke 16:29 with Rom. 1:16 and Rom. 10:17. Matth. 28:18-20 with Tit. 3:5. John 3:3-5 with Eph. 2:1-5. John 14:1-25 with Gal. 3:26-29. Matth. 22:36-40 with Rom. 13:8-10. Matth. 18:36-37 and Luke 17:20-21 with Rom. 14:17.

2) J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, ch. 5;
3) M. Brueckner, *Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christologie*, 1903, pp. 102 f.; Schürer, *Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes*, III, pp. 268-290; W. Wrede, *Paulus*, 1907. 3) See Is. 9 and 11; Is. 65:9-16; Dan. 7:13.

concerning the person of Christ. The apostle constantly referred to Christ as "Lord." Furthermore, as to the work of the Messiah, the apocalypses spoke of him as coming to be the judge over all the earth. Again Paul's conception differed from that of the Jewish writings. For him the Messiah had already come to earth; he had, in fact, died and risen again. Moreover, though, according to pre-Christian Judaism, the Messiah was only a deliverer from external ills, Paul's Messiah, on the contrary, was above all a Savior from sin and condemnation. Accordingly, post-exilian Judaism knew nothing of a Savior from sin; its religion was a credit-and-debit relationship between God and man, and its criterion a system of external rules of morality. Paul's religion, instead, was the religion of redemption, and in no sense a religion in which the ^{mere} imitation of Christ was to be the central object in the life of man. Unquestionably, there was disagreement between Pauline Epistle and pre-Christian apocalypse, but full agreement between Paul and Jesus, Paul's Christ could be only identified with Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ of the Gospels.

Equally so, Paulinism did not draw upon any Pagan mystery religion as a source for its distinctive doctrines. A Hellenized oriental mysticism was, indeed, contemporary to Pauline thought. As especial representatives of the Pagan mystery religion in the Graeco-Roman world of Paul's day might be mentioned the Phrygian religion of Cybele, the Great Mother, the Graeco-Egyptian religion of Isis and Osiris or Serapis, and the worship of Adonis at Byblos in Phoenicia. ¹⁾ However, Paulinism did not only decidedly differ from this Graeco-oriental syncretism in point of terminology, but also in

1) J. G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, ch. 6 and 7; Paul Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, 1911; Kennedy, *St. Paul and The Mystery-Religions*, 1913; Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources*, 1912; R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 26^{te} Auflage.

point of underlying ideas. Thus resurrection did not mean the same for both. According to the worship of Cybele, Attis, the son of the Great Mother, committed suicide through self-mutilation, whereupon the pleas of Cybele were at least heard insofar as the body of Attis was preserved, his hair continued to grow, and his little finger could move. In the case of Osiris, his brother Typhon killed him; he enticed him to test the size of a chest by lying in it; whereupon, closing it, he threw chest and brother into the Nile. Though the body was at last found by Isis, his wife and sister, on the shore of the Mediterranean at Byblos in Phoenicia and brought back to Egypt, it was this time cut up into fourteen pieces by the implacable Typhon. Yet, though all these parts were again gathered by Isis, Osiris did not live anew in this world. He was made king of the nether world and eventually helped his son Horus to gain a victory over Typhon. As regards Adonis, the beloved of Aphrodite, he was killed by a wild boar, but came to life no more than Attis or Osiris. Such are the crude myths of these cult gods. Annually the worship of these gods called for days of sorrow over their fate and days of corresponding joy over a change of their condition. But nothing precise or definite was said concerning a resurrection. Only Osiris was finally discovered in the capacity of a ruler in the underworld. However, he was not a ruler over the living, but only over the dead. Apparently, all three cult gods were vegetation gods; their dying and resuscitation recalled only the annual withering and revival of nature. Of course, as usual in Antiquity, the celebration of the principle of fecundity in nature was also accompanied by immoral practices.

Furthermore, the term "lord", as applied by Paul to Christ, in the mystery religion designated the cult-god; but Paul meant far more than a mythological being in his Epistles. Christ, as Lord, was to him a pre-

existent, supernatural person, who, though He died on the cross, yet truly rose again and even ascended into heaven, to rule forevermore over all mankind, and especially over His Church. In short, death and resurrection was not for Paul a matter of cult, but a historic fact. Likewise, the word "knowledge" in Hellenistic mysticism and Pauline theology was not a convertible term. In the Graeco-oriental cult knowledge was equivalent to an immediate revelation from a god and not an achievement of the intellect; in Pauline Epistle, it was plainly a spiritual gift of God; ¹⁾ it was more than an intellectual acquirement, it was that plus faith; it was knowledge of the Gospel story of salvation plus reliance upon it in life and death. ²⁾ Moreover, in this sense the word was already used in the Old Testament and in the Septuagint. ³⁾ In other words, in mysticism knowledge was the end sought by means of the mystic vision; in Pauline language, knowledge was only a means to an end. Since knowledge came by the hearing of the word, conversion was the end sought by means of this knowledge. Finally, the mystic cults contrasted body and soul, while Paul placed flesh and spirit opposite to each other. However, again no parallel existed between these terms. As for Plato, so for Greek mystery religion, the body, because matter, was evil. In short, the body was the prison-house of the soul. For Paul matter was not inherently evil; the union of body and soul was in no way abnormal. Moreover, when speaking of the "flesh" in contrast with the "spirit", Paul included more than the material nature of man; he by "flesh" designated the whole man as sinful both as to body and soul. Therefore Paul, in contrasting "flesh" and "spirit" did not merely place anything akin to matter and soul in opposition to each other, but always and only the sinful nature of man and

1) See 1 Cor. 12:8. 2) John 17:3; Rom. 10:17; 2 Cor. 4:6; Eph. 4:13; Col. 1:16; 1 Tim. 2:4. 3) Is. 53:11; Jer. 31:34.

the Spirit of God, or simply the sinful man and the Spirit - filled man. Accordingly, a wide difference existed between Paulinism and Graeco-oriental mysticism in the terminology employed respectively by them.

Equally so, however, a wide divergence obtains also with respect to the underlying ideas present in both systems of thought. Thus both recognized the need of redemption, both taught that man was unable personally to acquire salvation, and hence referred to salvation as a gift from a higher power. But, while the mystery religion offered happiness as the final goal to its devotees, the Pauline ideal was goodness, or better, the righteousness of God. While, therefore, the former sought to arouse a longing for a happy immortality in its initiates, Paul urged his hearers to long for the righteousness of God and acceptance by Him. While the one, therefore, pointed to a freedom from the bondage of fate or of external ills, the other offered a freedom from sin and condemnation. While mysticism promised to regenerate man in a mystic vision, Paulinism not only guaranteed his regeneration, but at the same time also his justification in the sight of God, provided he believed in the redemptive work of Christ. In short, while salvation in the mystery religion consisted in the assurance of a happy immortality, for Paul it meant the consciousness that the guilt of sin had been removed by the cross of Jesus. Finally, while not present in mystery religion, Pauline theology possessed a body of theological doctrines as well as of ethical principles. Nothing even comparable to such great theological chapters as the second chapter of Galatians, the fifth chapter of second Corinthians, and the eighth chapter of Romans,

1) Rom. 8:3-13; 1 Cor. 2:14,15.

was ever found in the Graeco-oriental cults. Consequently, Paulinism could be identified with Judaism and Paganism no more than the historic Christ, the theme of Paul's theology, ~~could be with~~ the mythical cult-gods of the mysteries.

Finally, other elements, because long subsequent to Paul's day, could not have exerted any influence upon the great Apostle. Thus, for instance, the mystery religion of Mithras, or of solar monotheism, which was ethically superior to all other mystery religions, had not in the days of Paul attained any prominence, though later, especially in the fourth century, it proved itself a noteworthy rival of Christianity. Similarly the complex writings going under the name of Hermes Trismegistus, which stressed a pantheistic deification of man, ¹⁾ were of much later origin, ²⁾ as were also the so-called Chaldaic Oracles, similar in aim, the magical Papyri recently discovered in Egypt, ³⁾ and the utterance of a Firmicus Maternus .

After all, the genius of the great New Testament theologian did not combine Greek philosophy and oriental syncreticism. On the contrary, he based his faith entirely, though it be foolishness to some and a stumbling block to others, on nothing else than Jesus, the divine Redeemer, on nothing else than the Gospels containing the story of His life and work. Hence, indeed, a unique force was active in the Christianity proclaimed by Paul amid a bankrupt culture of the Greek and Roman world. Consequently also, an inter-penetration of Paganism by Paulinism was out of the

1) "This", says Hermes, "is the good end to those who have received knowledge, to be deified." Tractate I, 26. Heinrici, Die Hermetismystik und das Neue Testament, 1918. 2) W. Kroll, De Oraculis Chaldaicis.

3) "Be of good courage, ye initiates, since the God is saved; for to us therè shall be salvation out of trouble." Firmicus Maternus in Paul Cumont, The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, 1911. quoted also in Op. Cit. by J. G. Machen.

question. There occurred, instead, a revolution of Pagan civilization by means of Pauline Christianity identified as the Christianity of Jesus.

On the other hand, were the Church Fathers, loyal disciples of Jesus, especially the Anti-Nicene Church Fathers, some of whom directly came in contact with Stoicism and Neoplatonism? Christianity is not merely or chiefly an academic process; an exact formulation of thought or a systematization of ideas might be desirable. However, principles must also be applied; religious doctrines must become a part of the life of man, otherwise they are valueless. In Paul's case preaching and practice, or faith and life, conformed to the teachings of Jesus. Some Church Fathers, as for instance Clement of Alexandria, were not so felicitous in the definition of their faith. This former Platonist really endeavored to make Christianity a philosophy par excellence. He would have us conceive of the peace of God or the Logos as the summit or apex of all knowledge. ¹⁾ He employed the terminology of the Stoical ethics. ²⁾ Though, of course, he did not identify God and Nature, he maintained that ten elements constituted man: body, soul, the five senses, the voice, the power of propagation, and reason. ³⁾ He designated the body as "The tomb of the soul." ⁴⁾ Likewise, intelligence extended for ⁵⁾ him through the universe.

1) Op. Cit., Vol. II, Miscellanies, II, 17. 2) Op. Cit., Vol. II, Miscellanies, II. 3) Idem, II. 4) Idem, III. 5) Idem, V

In his Christology again, where neither Plato nor the Stoics could serve as a guide, he fairly presented the conception of ^{the} Johanine Gospel and of ^{the} Pauline Epistles. Furthermore, Origen, the pupil of Clement, and the earlier Justion Martyr are similarly influenced by Hreek philosophy in the presentation of their doctrines. In short, some Church Fathers used Platonic or Neoplatonic terms in stressing their cosmological and theological views, while the Stoics must assist them in expressing their ethical teachings. In turn, some teachers in the early Church spoke of a double morality, an esoteric and exoteric, a higher and lower sanctity. The former consisted in obedience to the Ten Commandments, the latter included, in addition, the observance of the so-called evangelical counsels, such as fasting, and continence; in short, it embraced an ascetic life. While thus the Fathers of the Eastern Church, especially, those of the School of Alexandria under a philosophical training, showed a greater interest in metaphysical problems and hence profoundly assisted in the fixation of the doctrines of the Trinity and of the two natures of Christ, the teachers in the West manifested rather a practical, psychological tendency in their effort the better to understand the ~~phd~~ problems of sin and grace, or man's relation to God in the plan of salvation. Later, unfortunately, here as also in the East, Ascetic practices ended in world flight and monasticism, in work righteousness and moralism, and in an externalized religion and traditionalism.

However, meanwhile many a Church Father and layman had accepted Pauline doctrine and ^{had} not cast it in any philosophical mold. Thousands, also ~~xxx~~ among those who had died for their faith in Jesus in the arena or at the stake, had not read the works of a Clement or Origen, both of Alexandria; they were, instead, familiar with their Bible, at least with

the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament. (If they were not able to read the Greek, there was the Latin version, the Itala, and later the Vulgate, translated by Jerome; The Syrian could likewise enjoy the Bible in his own tongue, the Peshito. All, moreover, had had an extended and thorough religious training prior to their admission into the Church. They had access in addition to the volumes in the church library. Especially noteworthy in Antiquity were the libraries in connection with the Church at Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Constantinople. The latter, at the Church of St. Sophia, contained 150,000 books in the fifth century. Here could be found, aside of the Bible, the apologies written in defense of the faith against Pagan slander, here were commentories, homilies, catechetical and doctrinal treatises, church histories and tracts. They heard, so long as persecution abated, able men in the pulpits of their churches every Sunday, perhaps morning and evening. The form of service, or the liturgy, of which three are still extant from that early period, centered their thought on Christ. ¹⁾ So did the Greek and Latin hymns, ²⁾ as well as the Canticles, for instance, the "Gloria in Excelsis." So did the Creeds of the Church: the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. In consequence, the masses believed, under the instruction of the Church Fathers: (1) that they were sinners who had transgressed the divine law and were deserving of condemnation; (2) that Jesus was the son of God and their Savior from sin and condemnation; (3) that God, to whom they now owed allegiance, was one Lord, and He none else but God their Father, God their Redeemer, and God their ~~xxxx~~ Comforter; (4) that the Bible was their divinely inspired guide and standard telling them what to believe and what to do in order to please God; and (5) that all men, since also saved by the

1) Op. cit., Vol. VIII, pp. 537-568. 2) ^{A Latin hymn,} "Let the earth now praise the Lord" by Ambrose; A Greek hymn, "A great and mighty Wonder" by Anatole.

blood of Christ, were their equals and in the hour of need deserving of their charity. Thus thousands, despite defects in the theology of the Church Fathers, were sincere Bible Christians and found their only consolation in Christ as their Lord, and Savior against all ills in time and eternity.

Of course, the Church Fathers, to employ a modern term, were fundamentalists. Consequently, the two outstanding ideas invariably heard in pulpits and read in books, were the doctrines of sin and grace. Moreover, these were based respectively on the law of God and the Gospel of salvation. At once upon this preaching and throughout the early Christian era, the ideas of sacrifice, of human priesthood, and mediation were eliminated from the life of the individual and the family. Christ, indeed, had once for all laid down His life a sacrifice for the sins of the people. Consequently, since man was fully reconciled with God through His own Son as the perfect Mediator, no further sacrifice was necessary; it would be an affront to God; it would call the efficacy of His atonement in question. In fact, in this truth of man's redemption by Christ was found not only the very heart of Pauline Christianity, but likewise that of the Church Fathers. Nay more; here was the given necessity and justification for the establishment of the Church of Jesus Christ. Here was the basis and foundation upon which, in fact, the whole early Church was erected. Here was the glorious truth of the cross about which, in the first century, gathered a Christian population of five hundred thousand, as estimated, and in subsequent centuries, from the second to the fifth, respectively, two, five, ten, and fifteen millions of people. Here was that unique force, whereby a veritable revolution was effected, the force that transformed Greek and Roman civilization by first transforming Greek and Roman family life.

So then, a revolutionizing spiritual power was this Cross of Christ

or, what is the same, the Gospel of salvation from sin, in short, Pauline Christianity, even though it was not presented in all its fullness during the early Christian era and, in fact, not until the Reformation. However, to understand more fully the part which a dominant and all pervading thought or belief played in the life of a people, - and that thought or truth the risen and living Savior-God desirous of drawing all men to Himself about the Cross,- let us note the extraordinary influence which this thought concerning the Christ, in cold logic implying monotheism, supernaturalism and universalism, exerted upon a defunct civilization. To that end, to note in particular its influence upon the unit of all civilization, the family, let us contrast with one another, the Greek and Roman family respectively under Paganism and under Christianity.

II

THE GREEK VIEW OF MARRIAGE.

Sentiment or love between young people was not a dominant motive for marriage in the Greek world, at least not during the classic age and throughout the Alexandrian period. Strong heart might occasionally triumph over stern custom, the seclusion of the women in the home and the separation of the sexes. But as a rule, the young people who were most concerned in the matter, were not primary factors at all; their respective fathers were the match-makers. Moreover, family interests demanded action of them. The reasons, imperative in their opinion, were the perpetuation of the family,¹⁾ the inter-family retention of real estate, which was required either by the gens in Greece or by the State in Rome, as well as the assurance of their own future peace, i.e., the promise of the continued propitiation of the ancestral spirits and the desire for the prevention of their possible transformation into restless and retributive demons. Hence this business of marrying, this cold contracting to secure a wife and deliver her to the son.

Note first the Greek betrothal. Of course, no courtship worthy of the name ever preceded it. Neither was the formal consent of the girl or the youth secured. Such a small matter was taken for granted. Not even ~~the~~ the presence of the parties most interested in the transaction was considered necessary. However, the respective parents or the appointed

1), - Each tribe in Attica was organized into three phratries, or religious brotherhoods. These in turn were divided into thirty gentes, or "great families," whereas each gens embraced twelve families.

guardian were on hand to sign the contract constituting the betrothal between some Helen and Patroclos. The parents, - Beg pardon! - the fathers were present. These haggled over the bride's dowry. These stickled over the amount of the mortgage necessary to secure payment of the dowry, or its return, in the event of the divorce of the wife by the husband without any just cause on his part.

Witness next the nuptials. Already upon its approach the bride of fifteen or sixteen has dedicated her maiden-girdle, her doll and girlish toys to the virgin-goddess Artemis, especially so her maiden tresses, now shorn. Of course, an auspicious day is selected, some day during the full moon. Then, on the evening of the wedding day, as soon as the groom and family friends enter the bride's home they eat a piece of wedding cake, made of pounded sesame seed and honey. The bride's father sacrifices to the god of marriage, to Zeus, Hera, or Artemis. The bride is handed over to the husband with the utterance of the respective formula whereby she is freed from the control of the father and from the further worship of the family gods. The marriage banquet, ^{follows, to which,} as an exception to common custom, ~~to which~~ the women are admitted, but seated at separate tables. A gay procession wends its way to the home of the groom, led by flute players and torch bearers and enlivened by the nuptial hymn to Hymenaeus. Old shoes are meanwhile thrown at the young couple. Upon arrival at the husband's home, a shower of dates, figs, nuts and little coins welcome the party, which, of course, the boys of the neighborhood hugely enjoy. The bridegroom next lifts the bride across the threshold. Both dressed in white approach the family hearth, whereupon the young wife sprinkles lustral water upon it and stretches forth her hands to its fire. Prayers at this time commend her to the favor of the gods. The husband and wife now eat of sesame cake, and in addition the young bride, partakes of a quince as a token of fertility at the door of the bridal chamber.

Finally, both enter the room (thalamos) containing the nuptial bed with its red coverlet whilst a chorus of maidens at the door sing the bridal hymn or epithalamium.

Such was this inter-family affair, this formula whereby the stipulations of the parental contract were fulfilled. It was to all intents a marriage de convenance, dictated largely by finance and practically legitimized by finance.

Under the circumstances, the consequences were frequently deplorable, especially so to the wife. In the first place, there was ignorance of each other's temperament and character. The bride and groom had most likely seen each other for the first time on their wedding day. More than all else, a glaring disparity separated husband and wife. The bride was immature; she had been brought up apart from men, apart from social intercourse save that of her own family and even apart from the culture and education of the day, all privileges under whose enjoyment the personality of the groom had been developed. After all, the chief motive, was not sentiment, but calculation, a contract for family ends. Yet, what about love? Hush! By all means a son must be introduced into life through marriage, a son who, in turn, can perpetuate the family, a son to whom all property can be willed, a son who as priest will continue to propitiate the ancestral spirits and thus prevent their transformation into demons. Hence this business of marriage.

But after all, what about love, not sensual love, not self-love, but love that is concerned about the welfare, the comfort, and the best interests of our object of love? It was an unknown quantity in Greece, at least in the majority of its homes. Even at the Grecian betrothal, the bride and bridegroom had no opportunity to meet each other. They were not present for the occasion. Hence what need for amatory poems?

Of course, Greek literature possesses none. Even Sappho, the lyrical, love-sick poetess and music teacher of Lesbos, can do no better than identify love with lust. Consequently, also the Grecian drama is minus the Shakesperian characters, such as a Miranda, Isabella, Beatrice, Portia, or Rosalind, all women who loved, loved with a faithful and honorable love. Nor is it surprising that sculpture does not present some noble model of love. The great artist, Praxiteles, lover of the courtesan Phryne, can do no better than employ her as a model for a statue of Aphrodite, the goddess of love, and offer it, moreover undraped - an innovation in his day - to the Greek Westminster at Delphi. Note, it is not as Pallas Athene, who symbolizes wisdom, that he presents Phryne in stone, but as Aphrodite, the goddess of sensual love. Praxiteles, certainly, does not wish to immortalize the inner worth of woman, but rather some transitory gift of the graces. Hence says Tatian in his 'address to the Greeks': "Female statues among you did not glorify womanhood, they glorified the sexually abnormal". He might thus have referred to the statue of Phryne, but as well also to those of Sappho, Panteuchis, and Besantis. Likewise mythology offers no testimony in behalf of an ideal love. Greek mythographers show that concupiscence, often bestiality, was the essence of the 'love' of the gods; at least romance was entirely absent from the relations of the sexes in the Olympic heaven. Finally, the ideal love of the Greeks, the romantic type, as depicted by Xenophon or Plato in their respective 'Symposium', is not love for woman, but strange and unnatural / love for some man, the call of masculine comelines. But enough of this stupidity of Greek culture, the worship of the physical, in view of the absolute value of the family as a basic institution.

The general absence of sentiment told rather heavily against the prospects of married happiness. Nevertheless, for some husbands the wife

was more than a housekeeper. Themistocles, for instance, said pointing to his boy, "This little fellow is the most influential person I know." When friends inquired his meaning, he replied, "Why he completely governs his mother, while she governs me, and I the whole of Greece." Young men also wrote the names of their lady loves on walls and columns along public walks. Naturally, some romantic features survived amid all this worship of the physical. However, romance and courtship were seriously handicapped by custom and convention, and true marital happiness, under the circumstances, was not of too frequent occurrence.

THE ROMAN CONCEPTION OF MARRIAGE

After the second Punic War, (202 B.C.) especially so during the late Republic, and dominantly so during the Empire, marriage was considered a matter of individual convenience and finally a burden. Prior to the second Punic War the old stern Roman aristocracy and, thereafter even in early Imperial Rome, a Puritanical party of this group lived for the best interests, if not of the Plebeian, at least of the Patrician class. The obligations to the State and to their domestic religion were on their part still recognized as solemn responsibilities. Marriage to them was a necessity for the common good in order to perpetuate their social order and to supply sons as future supporters both of the State and of the family religion. However, independence from material wants, due to the influx of wealth through pillage, tribute from the captured colonies, and the spread of slavery through conquest played havoc with these conservative and sane ideals. Eventually, during the Empire, it was the fashion for both sexes to live according to loose Asiatic ideals.

This attitude toward marriage was naturally reflected in the customs of the period, as they applied to betrothal and wedding ceremony, and was especially apparent in the evasion of the common marital responsibilities.

Roman sponsalia or espousals, however, only indirectly revealed the spirit of the times. Nevertheless, it was significant that the Latin language possessed no equivalent for our "courting" or "wooing". Again the patres of the young couple arranged the match between them, or the suitor addressed himself in person to the father of the girl. Their mutual consent was indispensable to the marriage of their children, sons and daughters alike. For the marriage of the son the consent of the father, grandfather, and great grandfather, if he were alive, was asked; in the case of the marriage of the daughter, the consent of the grandfather, as head of the family, sufficed. The girl was also a factor; however, her consent to the union was assumed unless she openly refused it. Often 'marriage-brokers', or professional intermediaries, made the necessary arrangements. These preliminaries might even have been attended to whilst the girl was still a small child. At all events, if she were not already promised, the parents sought a husband for her when she was thirteen years of age. An unmarried girl of nineteen was distinctly an "old maid". Always, unfortunately, considerations of wealth and family convenience determined the choice. Witnesses to the betrothal contract, though not required, were usually present. The oral agreement was cemented in their presence by the formula, 'spondeo -- spondeo.' Aside of these specific words no formal ceremony was called for. However, this whole arrangement was never legally binding; the betrothal could be broken off by a repudium¹⁾ on either side, without any redress at law. In Imperial Rome, moreover, repudiation from mercenary considerations was more frequent. Likewise in this period, a new element, i.e., the donatio, the settlement of property by the husband upon his bride, played an important part in addition to the

1), - A repudium always involved mutual consent to a separation.

dos or dowry settled by the father upon his daughter. Finally, pre-nuptial unchastity no longer met with stern disapproval.

In particular, marriage customs, however, were vitally affected by the trend toward utilitarian individualism and its emphasis on money and personal gratification. Thus in pre-Imperial Rome, the wife came *sub manu*, or under the power, of her husband in three prescribed ways:

(1) by means of the ancient religious ceremony of *confarreatio*, the eating of the sacred cake, made of far,¹⁾ in the presence of the Pontifex Maximus,²⁾ the Flamen Dialis,³⁾ and ten other witnesses; (2) by means of the civil contract, called *coemptio*, i.e., the symbolical sale of the woman to the man; and (3) by means of a private arrangement, usually by Plebeians, designated *usus*, i.e., a year's mutual intercourse during which the wife never absented herself beyond three days from her husband's home. However, in the late years of the Republic and in the days of the Caesars the sacred rite of *confarreatio* was rarely observed save in the case of the marriage of priests; likewise the two other forms of marriage were largely obsolete. Instead, the practice of free marriage, marriage without *manus*, obtained. The wife under this arrangement remained in her own family, nominally under the power of her father. Consequently, she was almost independent of her husband; he had little or no power over her conduct; he only administered her *dos* and *donatio* and enjoyed the income.

However, the wedding ceremony itself disclosed less important changes under marriage without *manus*. The essential step to a valid marriage was the formal consent of the interested parties. Of course, the wedding could not be held on such inauspicious days as the *dies parentales* (Feb. 3-12) or the unlucky days (*dies atri*), the *calends*, *ides* and *nones* of the

1), - A grain like spelt. 2), - Chief of the college of priests.
3), - Priest of Jupiter Farreus.

month, since all these were under the ban of Hymen. Many popular customs were still retained. On the night of the wedding the bride was dressed in a long white garment with vertical seams, called the tunica recta or regilla, and veiled in brilliant orange red (flammeum), while her flowing hair was confined in a scarlet net. Then followed the deductio uxoris in domum mariti, i.e., the festal procession of the bride to her husband's home, led by torch bearers and flute players. Meanwhile the boys in the crowd enjoyed the nuts, which the bridegroom scattered among them. Upon arrival at the husband's home, the bride first anointed the door posts with lard or wolf's fat, and then was lifted by the bridegroom over the threshold. Thereupon the marriage rites proper followed: the formal salutation by the bride, "Ubi tu caius, ego Caia, i.e., where thou art Lord, I am lady, the dextrarum junctio, i.e., the placing of the bride's right hand by the pronuba¹⁾ into the right hand of the groom, the sacrifice, and the circumambulation or the walking of bride and groom around the sacrificial altar from left to right. The ceremonies end with a gay banquet, the coena nuptialis. Such were the customs necessary to make sanctas nuptias.

But what significance attached, in the life of the Imperial age, to the substitution of free marriage, or the marriage without manus, for marriage with manus? Marriage had now become a purely private matter which no longer required any religious rites, though the auspices were still taken in connection with the sacrifice, and a priest was invited to the ceremony. Naturally, to change in the form of marriage might prove immaterial. However, the reasons for the change revealed a deplorable condition, because they urged the nominal retention of the married

1), - A Roman matron, once married, who served as attendant of the bride.

daughter under the power of her father and in consequence virtually granted her freedom from any obligations to her husband. Accordingly, the motives were purely mercenary and dictated by greed for gold. Under the arrangement the estates could be held under the control of the family or the father. The dos or donatio could only be administered and enjoyed by the husband during the period of marriage, but never alienated. Consequently, interest in dollars and not in heart^s determined the selection respectively of husband or wife. Naturally, amid abounding wealth and amid leisure, due to slave labor, matches were frequently dictated by mere personal gratification. Nevertheless, this dry rot of selfishness and frenzied pleasure-seeking had not blighted every home. Note, among others, the devoted married life of Pliny and his noble wife Calpurnia. However, such models were in the minority. They were surrounded, on the one hand, by a wealthy leisure class bred in luxury and idleness and, on the other, by a steadily increasing poverty stricken proletariat, - all conditions most unfavorable for the growth of a healthy family life, Hence we have the Messalinas, the Julias, and the Poppaeas of the early Empire, anything but model wives. Hence we find a long array of the most wanton husbands and wives of Antiquity. Hence we find - a most significant and withal unique fact in the history of human marriage - speeches by public men upon the evils of celibacy. But these Pagan speeches would not suffice. Hence we have the Gracchian agrarian laws,¹⁾ which first placed a premium on the rearing of children, and later, as a serious attempt by Augustus to purify marriage, his laws called Juliae rogationes: - lex Julia sumpturia, lex Julia de Adulteriis et de pudicitia, lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus, and finally lex Papia Poppaea. But legislation also proved a failure, though Augustus issued stern decrees against celibacy

1), - Mommsen, History of Rome, III, 122.

and childlessness, and though he offered substantial benefits to married couples with three or more children. "And yet marriages and rearing of children did not become more frequent, so powerful were the attractions for a childless state".-Tacitus.¹⁾ Hence we have this confession of an eligible bachelor in the 'Miles Gloriosus' of Plautus, who says: "My house is free; I too am free; I want to enjoy life. Thanks to my own riches I could take to myself a wife well-dowered and of noble lineage, but I don't want to bring a barking dog into my house"..... "As long as I have a host of relatives, what need have I for children? Now I live in comfort and happiness, doing just as I please and following my own inclinations".²⁾ Hence, though we discover the leading authors of the period, such men as Ovid, Lucian, Seneca, Suetonius, and Tacitus, severely criticize the conditions prevalent in their day, yet ~~all~~ ^{all} ~~except~~ ^{except} Ovid remained unmarried, and ~~more like~~ a model life. After all, why marry when concubines can be had, Venus canina or boy love can be indulged in without loss of prestige, and heirs can be secured by the adoption of some relative or non-relative, free man or freedman. Hence St. Augustine insisted, even as late as his day, that there were more unmarried than married citizens at least in the city of Rome. Hence also Plutarch's 'Lives' are full of instances of the carelessness with which marriage was contracted and broken. Accordingly, marriage in Rome, as in Greece, evidently was a burden or a necessary evil to many. But why continue the ignoble recital.

1),- Annals, III, 25.

2),- Miles Gloriosus, p. 678 et seq.

CHRIST AND PAUL ON MARRIAGE.

Unquestionably, there was need of an effective reaction. It came under the influence of Christianity, after Christ had laid down those broad principles which were to be the guiding star of life, and after Paul had proclaimed them far and wide in the Greek and Roman world.

According to Christ and His Apostle Paul, marriage, as regards its basis, was a divine institution,¹⁾ the result of a creative act, not of an evolving conventionality. It was a fundamental human relation, a primal, conditioning fact of life and hence sacred and inviolable.²⁾ As to its form, marriage was a civil contract. Hence Christ's refusal, as a judge, legally to adjudicate an infraction.³⁾ On its physical side it was an actual union of complimentary personalities - a forming of one flesh.⁴⁾ But the physical was not the only element nor by any means the permanent element in marriage. On the spiritual side it was a union that sprang from a life which was volitional and moral and not mere passion, in short, a union which love perpetuated, a union in which sympathy, service, and sacrifice motivated. It was assuredly such a union according to Christ, who would lift woman's life above cooking⁵⁾ and man's life above money getting⁶⁾. It was assuredly such a spiritual union according to Paul, since he urged a love between husband and wife comparable to the self sacrificing love exhibited by Christ for the Church⁷⁾. Also in all his admonitions of mutual love between man and wife,⁸⁾ Paul employed the Greek word agapao, not fileo, which in the New Testament urges an intellectual as against a carnal love. However, it would be passing

1), - Math. 19:4-6; Eph. 5:31. 2), - Math. 19:6. 3), - John 8:3-11.

4), - Math. 19:5,6; Eph. 5:31. 5), - Luke 10:38-42. 6), - Math. 19:16-30.

7), - Eph. 5:22,23. 8), - Eph. 5:25; Col. 3:19.

strange indeed, if this great missionary, in view of the vices prevalent in the Greek world, had not, especially when so requested,¹⁾ touched upon the physical side of marriage and urged an honorable union in preference to fornication,²⁾ thus including an advice which was later grossly misapplied by the Church, first in the interest of virginity and later in that of monasticism. Only one conclusion obtrudes itself upon us, consequently, after a study also of the many additional admonitions by Jesus and Paul, all of which urge piety and sanctity, or rectitude and sanctity, upon married and un-married alike, and which warn against any sin of unchastity or lust,³⁾ only one conclusion obtrudes itself upon us: matrimony, for Christ and Paul, was a school for the successful training not only of children but also of parents in a host of noble virtues, a most efficient means in the common love of the spouses for the prevention of immorality, and a most important institution for the conservation of human happiness. In short, upon its widespread abuse or upon its extensive neglect the deluge must follow.

VIEWS OF THE CHURCH FATHERS ON MARRIAGE.

The early church of the first three centuries manifested the same high esteem for marriage. Its agreement with Christ and Paul found expression above all in the exemplary married life of its members, in the discipline of the offending adulterer, in the defense of marriage against fanatic asceticism, and finally in the emphasis placed by it on the spiritual aspect of matrimony, all elements which are frequently met with in the writings of the Church Fathers.

A new life resulted from a dissemination of the Gospels and of the Pauline Epistles. Above all, a new spirit dominated the home; a changed

1), - 1. Cor. 7:1. 2), - 1. Cor. 7:1-9. 3), - Math. 5:27, 28; Rom. 12:1;
1. Cor. 6:18; 13:1; 2. Cor. 7:1; 1. Tim. 4:3; Heb. 13:4.

attitude was apparent in the mutual relations of husband and wife and of both to children and slaves. They now recognized and observed their reciprocal obligations as well as their common responsibilities to society. Moreover, prior to marriage, there was ample opportunity for both sexes to become acquainted with one another, in their attendance upon the services of the Church, upon extended catechumenical instruction, and especially upon the so called love feast (agapae). These factors also rapidly aided in the removal of any educational disparity which, especially in Greece, might still exist between the sexes, though the doctrine of the spiritual equality of man and woman before the Cross¹⁾ primarily reduced all such previous incongruities. An examination of the writings of the Church fathers will convince us that love, and its necessary concomitants, charity and philanthropy, were the leading virtues of the period dominant in home and church alike, while egoism, greed, and licentiousness continued as heretofore in Pagan society and particularly in all inter-family relations. One citation from the fathers in this connection may suffice. It will in particular stress the qualifications shown by a woman, a bishop's wife. In the funeral oration on the death of his father, Gregory of Nazianzen (330-389) states, in the presence of St. Basil, concerning the happy relations existing between his father and mother: "Their marriage was a union of virtue rather than of body; she was given my father not only as an assistant, but became even a leader drawing him on by her influence in word and deed to the highest excellence, judging it best in all other respects to be overruled by her husband according to the law of marriage, but not being ashamed, in regard to piety, even to offer herself as a teacher..... extolled for the beauty of soul, and the preservation, or the restoration, as far as possible, of

1), - Luke 8:19-21; Gal. 3:26-29.

the divine image" "she applied herself to God and divine things as closely as if absolutely released from household cares, allowing neither branch of her duty to interfere with the other, but rather making each of them support the other." "Both dealt with their property, not as if it were their own, but as if it belonged to God, of which they were but stewards". "Their marriage was not only a bodily, but a close connection of spirits."¹⁾ Needless to say, the great majority of the Christians, throughout the first five centuries, were married, including the clergy, and led such lives, also as widower or widow, which secured for them the admiration of their Pagan contemporaries.

However, not all Christians proved themselves faithful husbands and wives. But in case of adultery, they were dealt with by the church in a way never attempted by Pagan religious associations. These organizations urged only the avoidance of any sexual intercourse prior to initiation; the Christian Church, instead, excluded the impenitent offender. Moreover, it enforced a single moral standard, proceeding as it did not only against the guilty wife, but also against the guilty husband. Jerome²⁾ as well as Chrysostom expressly stated that, among Christians, what was criminal in woman was likewise criminal in man. St. Augustine wrote in a similar vein. The only form of sexual relation, which was sanctioned by the Church, was the lifelong union of one man and one woman. Thus the Christian Church, in its early history, uncompromisingly opposed the pollution of marriage, which was so common in the pagan world.

Similarly, the early Church arose in defense of marriage against the fanatical ascetic within, and outside of, its circles. When,

1), - The Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (Edited by Philip Schaff), Vol. VII, Oration XVIII.

2), - Op.Cit., 2. Series, Vol. VI, Letter LXXVII. Idem, Chrysostom, Homily IV and XXIX

therefore, various sects appeared, influenced either by the Zoroastrian¹⁾ or the Neoplatonic²⁾ dualism of the purity of the spirit and the evil of matter, and Gnostic,³⁾ Manicheist, and Marcionite forbade marriage as evil and prohibited the admission of the married to baptism, many Church Fathers voiced their disapproval of such extreme views. Clement of Alexandria, for instance, proclaimed the purity of physical generation. Holy marriage to him made also the bishop's home a "house of the Lord". Marriage was a holy estate and consistent with the perfect man in Christ.⁴⁾ He maintained in particular against the false tenets of the Gnostics, after pointing to the melancholy consequences of their enforced celibacy, that Christ taught the blessedness and sanctity of marriage and maternity, whilst He also prescribed to all, whether married or unmarried, a law of discipline and evangelical encraty.⁵⁾ Augustine says, "marriage is not a sin",⁶⁾ "A chaste Christian wife is holy in body". "Marriage is in no place condemned by authority of our Scriptures".⁷⁾ Lust, or shameful concupiscence, is for him not the essence, but only an accident, of marriage.⁸⁾ Furthermore, when extremists among the clergy, in imitation of the Gnostics, entered into 'spiritual unions' and lived together with so called 'adopted sisters',⁹⁾ but out of wedlock, the Church, at the Council of Nice (325),¹⁰⁾ did not hesitate to condemn such procedure.

-
- 1), - So the Manicheist. 2), - Thus the Gnostic and the Marcionite.
3), - Especially the Encratites. 4), - Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. II,
Miscellanies, II, 23. 5), - Idem, III, 3. 6), - Nicene and Post-Nicene
Church Fathers, Vol. III, On the Good of Marriage, p.404. 7), - The same,
p.405. 8), - Op. cit., Vol. V, On Marriage and Concupiscence, Book I.
His specific object in writing on this subject is to distinguish between
the evil of carnal concupiscence from which man contracts original sin,
and the good of marriage. 9), - Subintroductae, extraneae.
10), - Op. cit., Vol. XIV, Council of Nice, Canon III.

Its attitude of the first three centuries toward matrimony may, however, best be gathered, as in a final summary, from the canons of the provincial Council held at Gangra (about 365) in Asia Minor against the Eustathians. In accord with the New Testament, which only recommends abstinence in cases where it may be rendered expedient by calls of duty,¹⁾ this Synod did not attach any exceptional sanctity either to the married estate or the single life. It decreed: " 1. If any one reproach marriage, or have in abomination the religious woman that is a communicant and lives with her husband, as one that cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, let him be anathema. ~~4~~. If anyone separates himself from the communion of a married priest and refuses to partake of the holy communion consecrated by him, let him be anathema. 9. If anyone embrace the state of virginity or continence from a horror of the married state, let him be anathema. 10. If anyone of those who live a virgin life treat arrogantly the married, let him be anathema. 14. If any woman abominating marriage, desert her husband and become a recluse, let her be anathema. 15. If any under the pretext of leading an ascetic life, forsake their children without providing for their sustenance or conversion, let them be anathema. 16. If children upon the same plea desert their parents, let them be anathema. 2)

Nevertheless, a full appreciation of marriage on the part of the Church of this period was revealed above: all in the fascinating exposition of the spiritual aspect of matrimony by the Church Fathers. Thus Clement of Alexandria (160-220 A. D.) declares in 'The Instructor': "For us the God of both is one, the Master of both is one; one church, one temper, one modesty (certainly no double standard); their food is common, marriage

1), - Matth. 19:12; 1. Cor. 7:8-26.

2), - Vol. XIV, The Council of Gangra, P.92 -101.

an equal yoke,..... knowledge, hope, obedience, love all alike."
"There those whose life is common, have common graces and a common
salvation; common to them ~~love~~ love and training.¹⁾" Again he enjoins
"husbands not to treat their wedded wives as mistresses, making a
corporeal wantonness their aim, but take advantage of marriage for help
in the whole of life, and for the best self-restraint".²⁾ "Marriage"
says Clement, "is a school of virtue for those who are united, designated
to educate them and their children for eternity. Every home, every
family must be an image of the church, for, says our Lord, 'where two
are gathered in my name, there am I in their midst.'"³⁾ Of such a
Christian family he justly says: "the children glory in their mother,
the husband in his wife, and she in them and all in God."⁴⁾ Greek and
Roman civilization certainly knew nothing of such an high ideal of
marriage. The classic authors never spoke the spiritual element of the
union.

Furthermore, Tertullian (160-240 A.D.) not only placed a high
estimate on Christian marriage, but he also showed that ^{it was} a Christian
faith and love which effected the change in the estate of matrimony.
"What a union is that of two believers, who have one hope, one rule of
life, and one service? They are brother and sister, two fellow-servants.
There is no difference of spirit or of flesh. Nay, they are truly two
in one flesh. Where the flesh is one, one also is the spirit. Together
they pray, together they prostrate themselves, together they fast; each
teaching the other, each exhorting the other, each sustaining the other.

1), - The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. II, The Instructor, I, ⁴ 2.

2), - ^{Op. cit.} Vol. II, Miscellanies, II, 23. 3), - The same, Instructor, ch. 2.

4), - The same, Instructor, ch. 3.

They go together to the Church of God, and to the Supper of the Lord. They share each other's tribulations, persecutions and refreshments. Neither hides aught from the other, neither shuns the other, neither is a burden to the other. The sick are visited freely, and the poor supported." "Between the two echo psalms and hymns; and they mutually challenge each other which shall better chant to their Lord. Over such things, when Christ sees and hears, he joys. To these He sends His peace. Where two are, there withal is He Himself."¹⁾ Therefore Chrysostom (307-407) wrote to a young widow upon the death of her husband: "He was affectionate, gentle, humble, sincere, so understanding, so devout."²⁾ Such extracts speak for themselves. They reflect not only the teachings of Christ and Paul but, above all, account for the changed attitude towards marriage among many Greeks and Romans during the early Christian era.

THE RESPECTIVE MERITS OF VIRGINITY AND MARRIAGE.

Unfortunately, the high esteem, in which marriage was held by the early Church Fathers, was seriously impaired by their successors. Throughout the first three centuries we read at least of no enforced celibacy. Such a significant depreciation of marriage is plainly a fourth century product, though even then only the result of a provincial and not a general movement of the Church. However, it must be stated, the antecedents of this rigoristic asceticism may quite readily be discerned, first, in an exaggerated notion of voluntary virginity, next, in the disapproval of second marriages, and then, in the prohibition of contracting a marriage after ordination.

1), - Op.cit., Vol. IV, Tertullian, Letter to His Wife, II, 8.

2), - Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. IX, Chrysostom, Letter to a Young Widow.

Responsibility for an undue regard for virginity and a corresponding depreciation of marriage must not be charged to the teachings of Christ and Paul, but to the peculiar dualistic views of Gnosticism and Neoplatonism. It is true, both Christ and Paul commended voluntary virginity, but only "for the kingdom's sake".¹⁾ Nevertheless, Paul's words²⁾ were interpreted in Patristic literature, soon after the second century, as favoring an ascetic life and as virtually declaring: fornication is bad; marriage is good; virginity is better. However, in the passage involved in the matter, the seventh chapter of first Corinthians, Paul was not discussing the basic principles of marriage or its broad moral values. His task was to solve a specific problem, to answer the question propounded by the congregation at Corinth: 'Is it good not to touch a woman?' In answer the great Apostle merely posited a variety of situations³⁾ relative to which virginity or continence, if voluntarily assumed, might be considered a moral good.⁴⁾ Paul nowhere disparaged matrimony.⁵⁾ In fact, no passage of the New Testament could be interpreted as prohibiting marriage or depreciating it. Evidently, the Fathers were not justified in quoting Paul, above all, as a protagonist of their views. On the contrary, a careful examination of their writings will point us to Neoplatonism and Gnosticism as the primary source of their undue regard for virginity. Though, naturally, not in accord with Neoplatonic and Gnostic cosmological dualism, namely, that the One, God, is

1), - Matth. 19:12; 1. Cor. 7:1-35; especially v. 32-35. 2), - 1. Cor. 7:2, 7-9.

3), - Relative to the married, also relative to those united in a mixed marriage, and relative to marriageable youth and to widows.

4), - Thus Meyer-Heinrici Kommentar ueber das Neue Testament, Erster Brief an die Korinther, p. 186 and 218. 5), - See 1. Cor. 7:14; Eph. 5:28-33; Heb. 13:4; 1. Tim. 3:2; 4:5.

good and matter eternally evil, yet many Fathers¹⁾ were influenced by the ethical dualism of these systems of thought and similarly maintained that the body was the prison house of the soul²⁾, advocated asceticism as a means for its purification and liberation³⁾ and therefore differentiated between a lower and higher virtue,⁴⁾ an ordinary and perfect holiness, urging the latter especially upon the clergy.

However, despite this tendency toward asceticism, during the second century, which was principally fostered by the Catechetical School of Alexandria under Clement and Origen, enforced celibacy was nowhere to be found prior to the fourth century. Thus Chrysostom (347-407), for instance, expressly combated the notion that above all the clergy were forbidden to marry.⁵⁾ Likewise Paphnutius, an Egyptian bishop, although himself a celibate, withstood the adoption of such a canon as an innovation at the Council of Nice (325). He insisted: "Marriage is honorable and undefiled, nuptial intercourse of the husband with his legitimate wife chastity." "It is sufficient if according to the ancient tradition of the Church the priest, once ordained, is not permitted thereupon to marry."⁶⁾ The attitude of the Church, as expressed in the provincial Council of Gangra (about 365), has already been quoted.⁷⁾

1), - Especially Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome and Augustine. Thus Clement in *Miscellanies*, IV, 13; Origen in *De Principis*, III, 1-5 (Compare with Plotinus, *Enneads* 11, 9,2), Augustine in his *Confessions*.

2), - Clement calls the body *taphos* and *desmos sarkikos* in his *Miscellanies*, Origen *desmos tes psyches* in his *De Principiis*. See also Gieseler's *Text Book of Church History*, Translated by Samuel Davidson, Vol. I, p.218. 3), - Clement, for instance, requires renunciation of sensual enjoyment or *enkrateia*, to attain the higher virtue, i.e., the passionless state or *apatheia*. 4), - Equally for Clement and Origen the higher virtue must manifest itself in external asceticism. So Clement in *Miscellanies*, IV, 22, 23 and Origen in *Ep. ad Rom.*, Book 3.

5), - *Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers*, Vol. IX, Homily XLIX ad 1. Cor. 7:1

6), - Quoted under 'The views of the Fathers on Marriage' in 'Die Einfuehrung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den Christlichen Geistlichen und ihre Folgen' Von Johann A. und Augustin Theiner. 3 7), - See p. 31

Nevertheless, the way to an obligatory celibacy^{was} undoubtedly paved, many years before the fourth century, by extravagant notions of a voluntary virginity, which included either abstinence from marriage or absolute continence in marriage. Marriage, let us remember, was considered good, but the procreation of children was as a rule to be the measure of a Christian's indulgence in appetite. Hence Athenagoras (about 177) said: "Therefore, having the spirit of eternal life, we despise all things of this life, even to the pleasure of the soul, each of us reckoning her his wife whom he has married according to the laws laid down by us, and that only for the purpose of children. For as the husbandman throwing the seed into the ground awaits the harvest, not sowing more upon it, so to us the procreation of children is the measure of our indulgence."¹⁾ Accordingly, marriage was permitted as a necessary expedient for the continuance of the human species. Of course, it was always considered valuable as a means to restrain the natural tendency of desire to licentiousness.²⁾ However, though marriage was thought to be good and permissible, virginity was better. So said already Ignatius (died about 115): "Ye virgins, be ye subject to Christ in purity, not counting marriage an abomination, but desiring that which is better, not for the reproach of wedlock, but for the sake of meditating on the law."³⁾ So likewise said Methodius (260-312): "And so I will not bring forward the praises of virginity from mere human report, but from Him who cares for us, and who has taken up the whole matter, showing that He is the

1), - Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. II, A Plea for the Christians, 33.

2), - ^{Op. cit.} / Vol. I, The First Apology of Justin, ch. 29, Also Clement of Alexandria, Miscellanies, II, 23.

3), - Op. cit., Vol. I, Epistle to the Philadelphians, ch. 4.

husbandman of this grace." "And this is quite clear, in the Song of Songs." "Virginity is like a spring flower, always exhaling immortality from its white petals."¹⁾ Tertullian, converted to Montanism,²⁾ distinguished between three degrees of chastity: absolute or life long restraint, continence from the time of baptism, abstention from a second marriage.³⁾ Gregory of Nyssa (died 395) desired to find a virginity of the soul in all men, in order that the Divine Spirit might thereby be drawn to the spirit of man. Moreover, this saving virginity was to him a Neoplatonist in this respect - equivalent to love called forth by the sight of the immaterial Beauty. He also maintained that it was seldom found among the married.⁴⁾ Above all, Jerome exalted virginity at the expense of marriage. Finding in his controversy with Jovinian that the latter placed marriage on a level with virginity, he promptly declared that marriage was inferior to virginity. Said he, "The Church does not condemn marriage, it only subordinates it to virginity." "I call virginity fine corn, wedlock barley, and fornication cow-dung." "If you have patience, your wife someday will become your sister."⁵⁾ A young Roman girl, who had dedicated her life to Christ in perpetual virginity, he admonished: "Do not court the company of married ladies or visit the houses of the high-born Learn in this respect a holy pride; know that you are better than they."⁶⁾ For Basil (died 379), in turn, the highest life is the monastic life, because, though there be two high

1), - Op.Cit., Vol.VI, Methodius, The Banquet of the Ten Virgins, VII, ch.1.

2), - A fanatical hyper-Christianity in its extreme ascetic demands with respect to food, dress, and marriage. 3), - Op cit., Vol.IV, To His Wife, I.

3. Idem, On Monogamy, ch.3. Idem, On Exhortation to Chastity, 9,10.

4), - Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol.V. On Virginity. 5), - Idem, Vol.VI, Letter XLVIII, Letter to Pammachius. See also his writing Against Jovinian, 1,13. 6), - Idem, Vol.VI, Letter to Eustochium, pp.28-30. See also Ambrose Vol. I, "Concerning Virgins."

estates, marriage and virginity, marriage offers the greater temptations.¹⁾ Finally, Augustine repeatedly expressed his enthusiasm for the virgin life. He shared the ascetic preference for voluntary celibacy with the Greek and Latin Fathers. He preferred virginity to marriage, as "the better of two good things", not as though one were good, and the other evil. There are two goods, marriage and continence, as health and immortality, as knowledge and charity (1. Cor. 13), but the latter is the better.²⁾ He accepted the distinction, which dates from the second century, between two kinds of morality: a lower morality of the common people, which consists in keeping the ten commandments; and a higher sanctity of the select few, which observes, in addition, the evangelical counsels, so called, or the monastic virtues. Writing to the Lady Juliana, whose daughter had taken the vow of chastity, he said: "For she did not contract an earthly marriage that she might be, not for herself only, but also for you, spiritually enriched, in a higher degree than yourself, since you, even with this addition, are inferior to her, because you contracted the marriage of which she is the offspring." In another letter in praise of this same maiden he exclaimed: "May many hand-maidens follow the example of their mistress; may those who are of humble rank imitate this high-born lady".³⁾

1),- Idem, Series 2, Vol. VIII, note among his ascetic writings: Praevia Institutio Ascetica, Sermo Asceticus de Renunciatione Saeculi, Sermo de Ascetica Disciplina, and Index Moralium. 2),- Idem, Vol. III, "On the Good of Marriage".

3),- Idem, Vol. I, pp. 504, 549-50.

A general roll call of the Church Fathers on the respective merits of virginity and marriage results in the following record,- Ignatius insists on the purity of marriage. However, marriage is only an expedient for the reproduction of children.¹⁾ Hermas urges the purity of marriage and continence in marriage.²⁾ Justin Martyr believes in the purity of marriage insofar as it is expedient for the introduction of children.³⁾ Athenagoras holds that marriage is not sinful, and that it is expedient for the reproduction of children, but he does not allow any digamy.⁴⁾ Irenaeus thinks that marriage is a pure institution.⁵⁾ Clement of Alexandria accepts marriage as a pure institution as well as an expedient for the reproduction of children, but regards virginity as better than marriage and therefore sets up a lower and higher morality.⁶⁾ Origen also declares for a lower and higher morality; the body, in his opinion is the prison house of the soul.⁷⁾ Tertullian, the extremist, states that "marriage consists of that which is the essence of fornication". Hence he forbids digamy and declares that virginity and widowhood are better than marriage.⁸⁾ Cyprian finds a greater holiness in virginity

1),- Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, ^{Vol. I,} Letter to the Philadelphians, Vol. I, ch. 4, Letter to Polycarp, ch. 5. 2),- Idem, Similitude V, ch. 3; IX, ch. 11; Commandment IV, ch. 1, 4. 3),- Idem, Apology I, ch. 29. 4),- Idem, Vol. II, A Plea for the Christians, ch. 33. 5),- Idem, Vol. I, Against Heresies, V, ch. 11. 6),- Idem, Vol. II, ^{Miscellanies,} Miscellanies II, 23; The Instructor, I, 4; III, 1; V, 10, 11; VI, 12. 7),- Idem, ^{Vol. IV,} De Principiis, I, ch. 6-7; II, 8, 3; III, 6, 5-8. 8),- To His Wife, I, 3; Exhortation to Chastity, 3, 9, 10; on Monogamy, 3.

and calls for the exercise of continence.¹⁾ For Methodius virginity is better than marriage.²⁾ Eusebius speaks in behalf of a lower and higher morality.³⁾ Jerome, an enthusiast in this respect, strongly prefers virginity.⁴⁾ Basil is another enthusiast for virginity.⁵⁾ Gregory of Nazienzen sees in marriage an expedient for reproduction and in virginity a greater good.⁶⁾ Gregory of Nyssa likewise conceives of virginity as the better institution; he urges a virginity of the soul as necessary upon all his readers.⁷⁾ Ambrose, again an enthusiast, in every way exalts virginity.⁸⁾ Chrysostom, also an enthusiast, sees more in virginity than in marriage.⁹⁾ Augustine considers marriage an expedient for the generation of children and virginity a more desirable good.¹⁰⁾ Cyril of Jerusalem (315-386) prefers virginity and would grant digamy only to the weak.¹¹⁾ Thus then, a group of influential Church Fathers voiced their preference of virginity, that is, of abstinence from marriage and of exaggerated continence in marriage, while all of them at the same time defended marriage as a chaste institution. In consequence, many were the

p.587,

- 1),- Idem, Vol. V,[^] On the Discipline and Advantages of Chastity, 7.
2),- Idem, Vol. VI, The Banquet of the Ten Virgins, 7,1. 3),- See his Demonstratio Evangelica. 4),- Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. VI, Letter XLVIII, To Pammachius; Letter XXI, To Eustochium.
5),- Idem, Vol. VIII, Letter to Diodorum. 6),- Idem, Series 2, Vol. VII, Oration 37 and 40. 7),- Idem, Series 2, Vol. V, On Virginity. 8),- Idem, Vol. X, Concerning Virgins, Letter IXII, 34. 9),- Idem, Vol. IX, Two Letters to Mopsuestia. 10),- Idem, Vol. I, Letters, pp. 504, 549-50; On Marriage and Concupiscence, 19. 11),- Idem, Series 2, Vol. VII, The Chatecheses. 11),- Ante-Nicene Church Father, - Vol. VII, - Constitution of the Holy Apostles, - Book VI, - 17. - The first six books are considered as written at least prior to 325.

fulsome praises sung in behalf of virginity.

This aberration can only in part be accounted for as a reaction to the flagrant, utterly intolerable, public Pagan licentiousness, which also in our day must be adjudged abhorrent on its characterization by Martial and other Latin authors. A most important factor, prevalent already in the early Post-Nicene Church, was the tendency to externalize religion, to emphasize the negative in place of the positive side of virtue, to urge the Neoplatonic instead of the specifically Christian ideal in morals, in short, to prefer the suppression of passion to the love of Jesus as the chief motive for the whole of life. Consequently, to fight fire with fire, or licentiousness with celibacy, proved a dangerous procedure, for what, in the Nicene Church, was begun in the spirit, finally ended in the flesh during the Post-Nicene period. The foremost protagonists of celibacy, influenced by Tertullian, the extremist, namely, Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, assuredly paved the way for the later extravagant attitude of the Western Church. The false reform movement did not merely stop at the denunciation or prohibition of clerical second marriages. In its later stages, the advocates of celibacy in the West were not even satisfied with the position of the Eastern Church on this question. This branch of the Church decreed, at its Council of Ancyra (314)¹⁾ and later at the so called Council of Trullo (360)²⁾, that any of the clergy might marry provided they expressly declared their intention to do so prior to their ordination, but that,

1), - The Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. XIV, The Seven Ecumenical Councils, p. 71.

2), - Really the Third Ecumenical Council of Constantinople.

otherwise, they would be held to practice celibacy. Such, by the way, is still the position of the Eastern or the Greek Catholic Church. The movement in the Western Church, therefore, went forward from the decision of the provincial Council of Elvira, Spain (305), in behalf of clerical celibacy for that province, to the more generally observed decretals concerning the same matter by a series of bishops at Rome, beginning with Siricius (385), and finally triumphed over all opposition at a council held at Rome in 1075 under Pope Gregory VII. Here the Church adopted, and thereafter insisted upon, obligatory celibacy for secular and regular clergy under pain of deposition. Thus a blow was struck at the pure and honorable character of matrimony from which this institution did not recover until the Reformation. However, our final observation holds good: the early Church of the first three centuries did not advocate an obligatory virginity nor did it insist on matrimony; it did not over-estimate nor under-value the one or the other state; it recognized the right of the individual to decide the matter for himself.

THE REGULATION OF MARRIAGE BY THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

During the first three centuries the church in the main accepted the betrothal and marriage customs which at the time were in vogue in Greece and Rome. It naturally eliminated all superstitious, idolatrous, and sacrificial elements, such as the taking of auspices and the notion to celebrate the wedding only during full moon. Otherwise current customs were accepted. Hence the ceremonies connected with espousals were retained since even according to Tertullian no "breath of idolatry" attached to them.¹⁾ He consequently enumerates, as part of the Christian 'Sponsalia',

1),- Op.cit., Vol. III, On Idolatry, XVI.

the ring,¹⁾ the kiss, the veil, and the joining of hands, to which may be added the dowry - all so many pignora or plâdges of future marriage, which were given and received in the presence of ten witnesses, the friends of the bride and bridegroom. Hence, likewise among marriage customs, both the nuptial procession and the banquet were retained. However, invitations were not extended to Pagans, for obvious reasons. Furthermore, the wearing of the veil by the bride was borrowed from the Romans, whereas in the Eastern Church the wreath made of olive, myrtle, and rosemary took its place. Also the friends and attendants of the bridal pair wore such chaplets in the East.

A noteworthy innovation, on the other hand, were the banns, the public announcement in the Church of the intention of an engaged couple.²⁾ In other words, the clergy were notified of intended marriages. What is more, matrimony was contracted not only with the knowledge, but also with the sanction of the Church.³⁾ Though the formal marriage ritual, embracing parts of the ancient espousals and nuptials, was a later creation,⁴⁾ the bestowal of a blessing by the Church upon the union was early introduced. In the time of Tertullian⁵⁾ it was probably a general custom for the newly married pair, on the Sunday following the private celebration

1), - The Origin of the marriage-ring is traced to the tenth century.

2), - Introduced during the first century. 3) Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. IV, Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp, V; Tertullian, On Monogamy, 11.

4), - Of the ninth century. 5), - Op. cit., Vol. IV, To His Wife, 11, 2, 8.

of the nuptials in the home, to attend divine services, partake of the sacrament, and receive the benediction upon their married life. Furthermore, at marriage festivals alms were distributed to the poor and donations made to the various activities of the Church. During the first three centuries, Christianity was also concerned about the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity and hence insisted upon the observance of the injunctions of Leviticus 18, forbidding even the marriage with a deceased wife's sister or a deceased husband's brother,¹⁾ nay, beyond that, marriage of first cousins.²⁾

Thus, then, marriage was appropriately honored in the early Church, though no ritual was provided for its solemnization. The festivities of espousal and nuptial were, as in the past in Greece and Rome, the business of the family. The Church, in short, believed that marriage, or the family, was instituted by God and initiated in each instance by a civil contract, which was, in turn, to be confirmed by both nuptials at home and benediction in the Church. However, the latter was not regarded as essential. Furthermore, the free consent of the contracting parties was not a mere paper-requirement for Christians, neither in Greece nor in Rome. Nor was only the father's consent necessary; nor in addition only the mother's approval required. The contracting parties also needed the permission of the bishop, especially so, since various hindrances, such as the disapproval of mixed marriages, supervened. Particularly the measures with respect to consent soon produced a radical change, more so within Greek circles. No child was henceforth forced

1), - Op.cit., Vol. vii, Apost. Const., viii, XLVII, 19.

2), - Despite earlier restrictions of Roman law first cousins at this time married freely according to Tacitus, Annals, XII, 6.

into marriage by Christian parents. However, this aspect of the problem was, in large part, quite naturally solved through the freer intercourse between the sexes in their common attendance upon divine services, upon catechuminal classes, and particularly upon the love feasts, whilst the education of the woman, a necessity for the church, and the attendant removal of the former disparity between man and woman was undoubtedly also no mean factor in this respect. Under the circumstances, love was given an opportunity to play the dominant role in a vital problem in the life of man, whilst money was at least no longer lord and master of the situation as of old. Consequently, we can understand how even the daughters of Senators married freedmen with the approval of the Roman Bishop Callistus. Naturally however, the avoidance of mixed marriages between Christian and non-Christian was in this case an added motive for such a union, i.e., a *matrimonium non justum* or a 'marriage of conscience.'

In addition, marriage was made free in more than one sense of the word through the recognition of, and respect for, the liberty and dignity of the individual on the part of the Church. Hence duty to the State and family, as under Paganism, was not advanced by the Church as the only argument for marriage. Individual choice determined the action with regard to entrance or non-entrance into marriage, though again the concept of virginity played no mean role in the decision of many an individual. Above all, the physical aspect of marriage was not, in this regard, granted any voice out of all proportion to the whole of life; the sex impulse was not permitted to act as sole judge, or associate judge with greed. At the same time, its place and function in life, as an important factor when controlled and serving its specific purpose, was given due recognition. Hence it is natural to read, though not from the pen of Tertullian, the Montanist, "Neither lawful mixture, nor child-bearing can defile the

nature of a man, or separate the Holy Spirit from him. Nothing but impiety and unlawful practice can do that."..... "Wherefore, O woman, be ever mindful of God that created thee For He is thy Lord, and the Lord of the universe," "For the conjunction of man and wife, if it be with righteousness, is agreeable to the mind of God. 'For He that made them at the beginning made them male and female; and He blessed them, and said, increase and multiply, and fill the earth.' If, therefore, the difference of sexes was made by the will of God for the generation of multitudes, then must the conjunction of male and female be also acceptable to His mind".¹⁾ Evidently, no more sane words were written in any age in emphasis of the physical aspect of married life. At all events, sane throughout as well as humane and ennobling was the attitude taken by the early Church with regard to marriage, an attitude particularly apparent when contrasted with the prevalent corrosive views of ancient Greece and Rome on this same subject.

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON MARRIAGE

LEGISLATION IN ROME.

A new force in the days of Constantine began to influence Roman legislation. It was the Christian religion recognized as a State religion²⁾ by an Emperor who at the same time was not unmindful of his own interest through such an alliance. Consequently, men imbued with Christian ideals began to share honors with Stoic ethicists in determining the laws of Imperial Rome. It was not, however, as the codification of mass-thought that laws with a Christian impress were promulgated. It was rather the solidarity of a virile minority that created respect for its

1),- Op.cit., Vol. VII, Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, VI, ch.27.

2),- By Constantine, Jan., 313.

views and secured a nation-wide recognition for them. Thus, then, if we investigate only its influence on domestic legislation, we shall discover that, especially from the fourth century forward, no little influence was exercised upon Roman laws concerning marriage. (1) The matter of prohibited degrees received especial attention, The sons of Constantine forbade marriage, in accord with Lev. 18, also with a deceased wife's sister or a deceased husband's brother, whilst Theodosius I again, as in the early Pagan Empire, forbade the marriage of first cousins. These prohibitions were included in the Justinian Code. (2) Numerous laws were enacted imposing disabilities upon those who united in mixed marriages or marriages with heretics and apostates. (3) Second marriages were dealt with in the Theodosian code. These entailed forfeiture both of the dower and donatio to the offspring of the first marriage if such existed. (4) Those provisions of the Lex Papia Poppaea which imposed penalties on celibates and childless parents were repealed. In addition, the Church was responsible for the enactment of laws respecting divorce as well as others relative to the family, i.e., those respecting the prohibition of infanticide and the limitation of the absolute power of the father over his children.

The imposing array of enactments, concerned only with marriage, sufficiently convinces one that the Church was a power to be reckoned with at Court. The next question, however, that comes to mind, is one of value. After all, when was the Church a greater force for good, prior or subsequent to its recognition as a religio licita? Though exception is taken to the alliance of the Church with the State, though some of the enactments are declared to be extreme, though the value of reform by means of cold legislation is questioned, yet it must be granted that a new force was engaged in remodelling the whole fabric of the State and of

society in general, in that it was recasting the very unit of civilization, the family. To what extent and how thoroughly it accomplished its task, as contrasted with ancient Greece and Rome, is a matter of record. It will be more fully understood as we proceed to examine other questions related to marriage, such as divorce, the form of the family, household organization, the status respectively of husband, wife, and child, and particularly those leading functions of the family which its economic, moral, social, educational, and religious life manifests.

III

EARLY CHRISTIANITY AND DIVORCE.

The primary requisite for the conservation of the life of a nation and its common psycho-social heritage is the permanency of the family, the basic unit of society. A severance of industrial relations may occasion serious, yet withal only temporary inconvenience. No more than the property of an individual or of a family is involved. No necessarily irreparable loss has been sustained. However, disruption of the family affects more than property, it affects not only its economic basis, it affects the totality of the normal functions of this institution, all so necessary in their reactions for the wellbeing of man and society. More, the marital union, apart from any utilitarian considerations, must guarantee continuity to its members, both the original and potential members involved in its organization, because otherwise the common mission in life, or the mutual pledges, consciously or unconsciously made, cannot be realized, assuredly all so many requirements demanding a normal life time for their consummation. More than that, under no prospect, except that of a life-long association, can complete trust or full devotion to the common objects of the union be established in husband and wife. Under no other normally conditioned arrangement can more than a mere physical heritage be assured to the offspring of the union, not only origin and life but also the psycho-social heritage, requiring of necessity a slow and gradual process for its effectual transmission.

Therefore, the foundation of society or the family can be struck no greater blow than by means of divorce, especially so if it become a common practice, as in the age of the Roman Empire, in favor of complete satisfaction of sensuous desires. On the other hand, no greater service can be rendered the family, or the State, than by the effectual retardation, if

not virtual elimination, of divorce. The attitude toward divorce assumed respectively under Greek and Roman civilization and under the influence of Christianity will sufficiently attest the value of the latter as an invaluable instrument for the improvement of abnormal conditions of life.

In the historic period of Greece divorce was far from unusual. The husband met with little difficulty in case a separation from his wife was desired. Public opinion, indeed, somewhat controlled his action. In particular, it required the return of the dowry to the father or guardian of the wife. But if he were so disposed he might dismiss his wife in the presence of witnesses simply because, in his opinion, she was unattractive or uncongenial. Aside of the statement, 'here is your dowry, give me the keys to my house, go back to your father or guardian,' no further procedure was required. In two instances, moreover, no objection whatever could be raised to the husband's decision of a separation, that is, in case of barrenness and in case of adultery. The first cause was justifiable ground for divorce, in Greek opinion, because the fundamental purpose of marriage, - the generation of offspring to perpetuate the worship of ancestors, - had not been realized. In consequence, barren wives sometimes substituted an exposed child to forestall a divorce. As respects the second cause, adultery, Greek law and custom extended no mercy to the wife. If surprised in the act the injured husband might kill the wife and paramour provided he meted out the death penalty at once. Otherwise he could administer corporal punishment upon the offending wife or incarceration in the home. If, furthermore, her infidelity became common property, the law demanded the annulment of the marriage and barred the wife from any visit to a temple or participation in national religious rites and sacrifices. Greek superstition believed that the infamous woman would somehow defile the sacred precincts and render their magical ritual non-effective. However, under

the double standard of Greek morality no similar opprobrium attached to the husband, though this scapegrace was wellknown to visit the houses of hetairae, to parade his boy-love at market place and banquet hall, and besides to keep his concubines. Why under ^{the} circumstances, except to avoid further reproaches from his wife, should the husband divorce her? The very fact that he nevertheless dismissed her, and that for trivial reasons, speaks volumes on Greek attitude toward divorce.

On the other hand, it was a difficult matter for the wife to secure a divorce. A written complaint, presented in person to the chief archon of the city, was necessary to initiate proceedings. But this bill of divorce could not charge the husband, no matter how well sustained, with any adultery as a ground for separation. It had to prove that his debaucheries resulted in gross neglect of, and in genuine cruelty to, the family. To forestall any action a suspicious husband might well counter the wife's effort with confinement in the home. Finally, a decision in favor of the courageous litigant might only mean a cold reception of an unwelcome member at the old home and at all events submission to the authority of the father or of the brother. Still another and far less cold method might be employed, provided both parties to the act were more congenial or perhaps rather more indifferent to their common obligations, separation by mutual consent, no doubt a very comfortable expedient in case of prospect for a new alignment of the respective interests.

Accordingly, divorce was largely subject to the whims of the husband, who himself in most Greek homes was not above adultery. No serious impediments prevented its consummation by the husband or by husband and wife, if both were agreeable. In fact, Greek religion with its adulteries among the gods did not voice its disapproval, nor did the law, save in the single case of the wife's adultery when, in view of the public

knowledge of her act, it demanded annulment of the union. ~~Divorce, then, was the private concern of the family, and Greek attitude significantly reflected in the action of the family heads.~~ Divorce, then, was the private concern of the family; its consummation subject to the decision of the family head; its law or criterion was custom determined by the average total grounds for which Greek husbands dismissed their legitimate wives. The Greek attitude toward divorce is sufficiently evidenced by the liberal views and the loose morals of the family heads.

Bad as general conditions were found to be with respect to divorce in Greece, these were in every way eclipsed by Rome during the later Republic and the Empire when she was herself conquered by the loose morals of Greece and Asia. Preceding the second Punic War marriages were not severed on the slightest provocation. Both custom and law prescribed certain restrictions. The dissolution of the marriage depended upon the manner in which it had been contracted. When the manus over the woman had been acquired by the religious ceremony of confarreatio, the contrary religious act, the diffareatio, was required to dissolve the marriage, i. e., the bonds could only be broken in the presence of the witnesses to the earlier ceremony. Marriage by coemptio or usus was dissolved by remancipatio, i. e., by recommitting the wife to the authority of her father or brother. Naturally the wife had no direct voice in dissolution of a marriage with manus. But the marriage without manus, which had already come into vogue, required at least the consent of husband and wife for a separation, equally as it had for its formation. The fact that the husband was not the sole judge in a divorce, save when the wife had committed adultery, served as another impediment to divorce. Otherwise he first had to call a council of his own and his wife's male relatives and lay the matter before them before he could pronounce the formula, 'Tuas res tibi habeto';¹⁾ and perhaps

1) Keep your property for yourself.

1) add; 'foras exi' . Besides adultery, only the commission of a capital offense and wine drinking could serve the husband as a cause for offense. However, some husband might include barrenness²⁾ and separate from his wife despite the opinion of the family council, though ^{in that case} he might in addition be cited before the Censor and be publicly reprimanded. Finally the matter of dowry served as an impediment. If the wife were guilty, only certain deductions could be made upon ~~the~~ reversion of the dos to the father, whilst if the husband was guilty, the dowry had to be returned plus certain penalties.

Though divorce was no doubt restricted, yet a double standard controlled. The wife was throughout at a disadvantage, save perhaps in case of a separation by mutual consent. Cato of this period well puts the fact: "If you were to catch your wife in adultery, you would kill her with impunity without trial; but if she were to catch you, she would not dare to lay a finger upon you, and indeed she has no right."³⁾

However, a change in this attitude toward divorce was soon effected after the Second Punic War. Disruption of family ties became quite frequent until, in the late Republic, there was no need of any serious motive. The usual thing was marriage as well as separation by mutual consent. Thus the old 'Puritan' restrictions were comfortably avoided. The influx of wealth largely determined this policy. The dowry under this contract was not separated from the father's estate. The wife remained nominally in the power of her father. Hence each party tacitly understood that the union was to continue only so long as the other desired it. In short, free reign was

1) Get out. 2) The famous case of Spurius Carvilius Ruga, 230 B. C., erroneously referred to by Plutarch as the first instance of the repudiation of a wife at Rome. 3) Quoted in Goodsells 'The Family' from the 'Fragment, De Dote,' in the Quae Extant (Leipsic, 1860), p. 68.

given to individualism. The early age at which marriages were contracted, at most fifteen for girls and twenty for boys, might be considered an important cause of lax views on marriage. Undoubtedly the principal cause was egotism: union or disunion dictated by purely economic and political reasons among the leading Senatorial families. The attitude of the period is perhaps best illustrated by the frivolous remarks of one Aemilius, when friends desired to know the reason for his repudium of wife Papiria. Said he, pointing to his shoe: "Is it not beautiful? Is it now new? But none of you can tell where it pinches me. In fact, some men divorce their wives for great and manifest faults, yet the little but constant irritation which proceeds from incompatible tempers and habits, though unnoticed by the world at large, does gradually produce between married people breaches which cannot be healed".¹⁾

Ah, yes, divorce at length became both a fad and a public scandal in the Augustan Age. Augustus enacted his famous *Lex Julia de adulteriis*,²⁾ thereby attempting to restrict divorce. The active party in the divorce was required to declare his or her intentions in the presence of seven witnesses, all full Roman citizens. The law remained a dead letter. *Libelli* of repudiation passed merrily to and fro. There was even no perceptible difference in the attitude toward divorce between public officials and private citizens. But why not? Augustus himself, for political reasons, compelled the husband of Livia to repudiate her when she was already pregnant, that he might marry her himself. Caesar, predecessor to Augustus, had four wives, Anthony four, Pompey and Sulla five. At that they were not actors, nor did they enjoy the luxury of a press agent. No, their former wives did not die on their hands. Some of them were jolly divorcees whilst their husbands, as well, enjoyed the repudiation.

1) Plutarch's Lives, p.

2) Passed in 18 B. C.

Caesar repudiated Pompeia because he, the roue⁶, merely suspected her lax in conduct. Cicero divorced Terentia, in middle life, and married his ward, a young and wealthy girl, only soon to dissolve the marriage as unsuitable, because unhappy. Sulla induced Pompey to dismiss his wife, Antistia, in order to marry Aemilia, Sulla's step-daughter, though she at the time was not only married, but an expectant mother. Two divorces and a new union simply because Sulla, Roman general and Consul, desired to reward Pompey for military service, ~~and~~ needed his support in furtherance of his own political interests. Why, in view of these matrimonial affairs of the upper Four Hundred, should a lower public official, a Roman quaestor, not marry a woman for a matter of a few days to appear as a married man and thus acquire a necessary qualification for public office?

Law, indeed, in the matter of divorce, was in the days of the late Republic and of the Empire a scrap of paper. The law might determine that the union could be dissolved provided the husband were a homicide, a magician, or a violator of a grave, and the wife an adulteress, witch or panderer. Imperial legislation in particular might impose pecuniary penalties on the culpable party with respect to the dowry. After all, individual interest determined the matter. Divorce was a family affair. Though Septimius Severus, during the first years of his reign, punished no less than 3,000 for adultery¹⁾, he failed to remand all divorces to a court for review or consummation. Divorce was a vested right of the family. Yet despite this widespread disregard of sacred obligations, divorce was not too frequent among the more sober, industrius middle class. They, however, in many instances found a substitute for divorce in slave-concubines. Officialdom and citizenry of the provinces copied the morals of the capital; life in the mediterranean world and especially in the effete East was from the same die. Withal chastity often dwelled next door to adultery and the evil of divorce. A consul, Tuintus Lucretius Vespilla could inscribe, in

1) Dion Cassius, lib. 66, 16.

19 B. C., these words upon his wife's tombstone: "Seldom do marriages last till death undivorced; but ours continued happily for forty-one years." ¹⁾

What, in turn, could early Christianity offer in order materially to reduce the letters of repudiation to a comparatively small circle? A strong and aggressive third party in the person of the church, creating a different attitude toward divorce by word of Gospel and Epistle, by class instruction, by appeal from the pulpit, by means of discipline, and, if need be, by excommunication, so that the Mediterranean world was soon aware of a new virile spirit in its midst. Thus the church went far in cleansing the Augean stable.

Jesus was responsible for the new views on divorce. In a few words He set up a new program on the question for the world. He regarded divorce as impossible save as a formal recognition of an already broken union.. This severance of a union of two personalities could only be established on one ground, that of adultery. ²⁾ Moreover, Jesus did not command, he only permitted a divorce on this ground provided the innocent party did not condone the act, but insisted that the separation initiated by adultery continue permanently so. Remarriage of the guilty party had to await remarriage of the innocent party. The Church meanwhile was to proceed against the guilty and, in the event of impenitence, exclude from its communion. ³⁾ Paul in turn was in full accord with Christ on the question. ⁴⁾ He did not add another ground for divorce in presenting a case of malicious desertion. He rather shows when the innocent party, though not at all desiring a separation, will be obliged to submit to it, i. e., when the guilty party despite all efforts at reconciliation, will not continue the union. ⁵⁾ Furthermore remarriage by the innocent party will not

1) Friedlander, Roman life and Manners under the Early Empire, Vol. I, p.243

2) Matt. 5:32; 19:9; Luke 16:18; Op. cit., Vol. I; The Pastor of Hermas,

II, Com. 4,1; Vol III, Tertullian Against Marcion, IV, 34. 3) Matt. 18:

15-18; 1 Cor. 5:11; 2 Thess. 3:6. 4) 1 Cor. 7:10, 11. 5) 1 Cor. 7:10-15.

be possible so long as any hope of reconciliation may be entertained,¹⁾
i. e., prior to remarriage by the guilty party. In the meanwhile
the Church will deal with the offender and exclude the impenitent.

Therefore, the early Church admitted only one cause for divorce,
adultery. All other divorces were pronounced grave offenses. Of course,
there could be no separation by mutual consent within church circles,
save the voluntary temporary separation a mensa et thoro on the part of
both husband and wife. Most assuredly the single standard prevailed.
Not only the wife's, but also the husband's offenses were reprehensible,
on the basis of Christ's words: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and
marry another, committeth adultery against her, and if a woman shall put
away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."²⁾

Any known offense against matrimony met with immediate suspension³⁾ from
the communion table and eventually with excommunication from the church
provided no repentance intervened.⁴⁾ Prior to excommunication the disciplin⁵⁾
included reproof and censure, but in accord with Christ's three grades⁶⁾
of admonition. Disciplinary proceedings were in the hands of the laity.
Voluntary repentance was required before readmission to full membership.
Remarriage of the innocent party after divorce was permitted, but after the
third century frowned upon, as were all second marriages. Augustine not
only advocated the prohibition of such a remarriage, but even of a divorce

1) 1 Cor. 7:11; Op. cit., Vol. IV, Tertullian, on Monogamy, Ch. IX.
2) Mark 10:11,12. See also Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. II, The Pastor
of Hermas, Book II, Com. 4,1. 3) Op. cit., Vol. VII, Apostolic Constitu-
tions, Book VIII, XLVII, 6,48. 4) Op. cit., Book II, XVI, XXI, XXXVII - XLI.
5) Matt. 18:15-18; see also Op. cit., Book II, Sec. III. 6) Op. cit.,
Vol. IX, Origen's Com. on Matt., Book 13, 30,31. Penal jurisdiction was
assumed by a few bishops about the middle of the third century, by many
about the middle of the fourth. Laity deprived of all activity in the
management of the affairs of the Church at Synod under Symmachus at Rome,
502.

1) on the ground of adultery. The motive for the Church's attitude during this period was the sanctity of married life, the divine institution of marriage, not any sacramental character of matrimony. Thus, early Christianity materially limited the alarming neglect of marriage, the freedom of divorce, and the frequency of adultery. In wide circles even the terms for certain species of adultery, as sodomy and bestiality, became unknown.

Naturally, the Church's attitude was in part reflected in Imperial legislation. Christian Emperors, imbued with new ideals, attempted to improve the evil of divorce by a revision of the civil laws pertaining to marriage. Marriage and divorce, unfortunately, continued, in accord with current Pagan conception, a family affair. No provisions were made for a tribunal covering domestic relations, or even for public registration of the privately arranged marriage and divorce. Marriage continued to be dissolved by mutual consent, on any ground. 'Sacred vested family rights' prevented a legislative reform at this time. No radical reform was effected in the West until the downfall of the Empire, 2) and in the East until late in the ninth Century. 3) Meanwhile the Christian Emperors from Constantine to Justinian hoped to improve conditions by assessing a heavier penalty against the guilty party to a divorce and a fine against an active agent for the dissolution of a marriage on frivolous grounds. In consequence the guilty party, if the husband, would forfeit the whole dowry, if the wife, the donatio. If no dowry or donatio had been provided the culpable party forfeited one-fourth of his or her property. In case of a frivolous divorce the law declared the person who had urged it guilty of misconduct and liable to the same pecuniary 4) penalties. Adultery was declared as a capital crime and punished accordingly.

1) Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. , De Adult. Conjug., Ch. 13.
 2) Thereupon Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Courts determined domestic relations.
 3) Divorce by mutual consent was prohibited by the Emperor Leo the Philosopher (865-910). 4) Already under Constantine, 340.

Married people were prohibited from having a concubine. In addition, the *divortium communi consensu* was legally recognized; and no penalty assessed against a so-called *divortium bona gratia*, i. e., a divorce by good grace, secured on the three following grounds, a physiological impediment preventing offspring, a five year foreign captivity of the husband, and the desire of one of the spouses to enter a monastery. Though not much was accomplished at large by this legislation, yet the Church's voice secured for itself an ever larger audience. While Churchmen could still inveigh against loose Pagan morals, the public conscience was aroused as never before.

IV

THE FORM OF THE FAMILY

The family must be monogamic in form. It must be a union composed of no more than two individuals at the same time. Such is the dictum which, aside from moral considerations, arises insistently from the very nature of the physiological basis of the union. Man is so constituted that not the individual, but alone the pair of sexually differentiated persons represent a complete independent whole. The individual as such can as little maintain himself in the world as he of his own accord can enter it. It is the pair that can function normally, that can preserve and reproduce itself. Therefore, physiologically considered, not one of the individuals to the union is a means and the other an end, but both of necessity are a means and an end in the union.

Greece and Rome, as many nations before and after them, committed the fundamental blunder of admitting more than two into the organic union of the family and thus, in their historic periods, practically transforming monogamy into polygamy through the practice of what may be termed polygyny, polyandry, or promiscuity. Theoretically monogamy was the one form recognized. Said the imperial law both for Greece and Rome: "Nuptiae sunt conjunctio maris et feminae et consortium omnis vitae," i. e., marriage is the conjunction and lifelong companionship of a man and a woman. Practically, however, aside of legal monogamy, concubinage, the usual accompaniment of slavery, was common among the upper and lower classes of Greek society. Likewise, prostitution prevailed among the poorest element and sodomy and hetairism among the intelligentsia. In consequence, as under any polygamous character of the family woman was not considered an end but only a tool and an appendage. The male of the human species represented, according to Platonic philosophy, the complete participation in the idea of man. Woman, according to Aristotle, is an incomplete development. Also in Rome monogamy prevailed legally, but

heavy inroads on the monogamous character of the family were made by widespread concubinage, the curse of slavery, and generally among the four hundred by the practice of 'free love', resulting virtually on the part of woman in polyandry and on the part of man in polygyny, all so many products of their laissez faire divorce-mill.

Alone under Christianity monogamy came into its own. Christ, the founder of the Church, plainly reaffirmed the Mosaic account of the divine creation of the monogamic family ¹⁾ and on this ground urged the rejection of any other form. To Jesus there could be no other union, in view of this genesis of the family, but that of one man and one woman ²⁾ into one flesh. The Church Fathers accepted the same record as the history of the true origin of the family and recognized therein the divine institution of a union of twain into one flesh. ³⁾ In the preservation of this union by its constituent members they saw the promised blessings attending parents and children, ⁴⁾ and in its disruption inevitable punishment for the guilty. Their appeal for the purity of the home, or for a lifelong monogamous union, was not primarily based on social utility, as was that of Greek and Roman society, but on the divine institution of the family, on the union of one male and one female into one flesh. Every other union was opposed on this ground as without divine sanction. On this account the Church Fathers did ⁵⁾ not approve of the polygamous life of some of the Old Testament characters. The letters of divorcement, permitted by Moses, were shown to be an expediency of civil law. On this ground the Church set its face like flint

1) Gen. 1:27, 28; 2:23, 24. 2) Matt. 5:31, 32; Mark 10:1-12; Luke 16:18. Paul in agreement, 1 Cor. 6:16. 3) Op. cit., Vol. IX, Origen's Com. on Matt., Book XIV, 16; Vol. IV, Tertullian's Treatises on Exhortation to Chastity, ch. 5, and on Monogamy, particularly ch. 5. 4) Gen. 1:28-30. 5) Op. cit., Vol. IV, on Monogamy, ch. 6.

against any Greek and Roman liaison. It drove Greek concubinage as an adulterous union from the home. On the other hand, it recognized the legalized concubinage of Rome, the *matrimonium no justum*, i. e., the union of a Roman citizen with a person of an inferior rank, as morally binding. Under the Church's influence the Christian Emperors, Constantine and Justinian, effected a change in this respect. Constantine removed from this 'morganatic' marriage the legal disabilities, the inability to inherit, from wife and child. Justinian declared the *matrimonium nojustum* regular. In short, the Church's insistent appeal to the divine sanction of monogamy and ^{the} the divine prohibition of any other form of the family had a tremendous effect and went far in sweeping out of the world a host of Greek and Roman misalliances. It reestablished as far more than a definition, *nuptiae sunt conjunctio maris et feminae et consortium omnis vitae.*'

V

HOUSEHOLD ORGANIZATION

Household organization in the Greek and Roman World and under Christianity can perhaps best be treated under the following topics: first, type of organization, including the powers of the governing head, the membership in the family, and the relation of the family to the State; and next, the respective status of husband, wife, and child in such an institution.

The change effected by Christianity would receive consideration, wherever applying, under the particular heads.

The Greek and Roman family was of the nature of a political state, and organized body, composed of a governing head and members who submit to his authority. The Government or organization was patriarchal in type. In fact, prior to the Punic War, the Roman familia was the most complete example of such a type known to history. Under this form of organization all power was centered in the father as governing head; all religious, legal, and economic rights were vested in him. He was the priest who acted in behalf of the family in domestic ancestor-worship. He was the law-maker and judge with regard to inter-family matter, chief executive of all social affairs, and the one legal agent who could represent the family in a civil tribunal. He was, finally, the sole owner and administrator of the family property. To illustrate some of the more important aspects under such an authority: The House Father exercised a right over life and bodily freedom, in some cases extending to the power of putting to death, maiming, chastising and deciding whether newly born children should be preserved or not; the right of betrothal, including control over the dowry received by the women of the family; and the right to administer the property of all the kin, even the right to control the earnings and acquisitions of the

children, married son or no, in behalf of the kin as a whole. So comprehensive in general was the patriarchal authority of the Greek and Roman family head.

However, it must not be forgotten that a difference existed between the patriarchal authority of the Greek and Roman paterfamilias. Whereas in Rome power was delegated to the father by the State, in Greece it was committed to him by the Gens, or the great family. Consequently, patria majestas was limited in Greece. At least, the father's action might be subject to legal revision. Under the circumstances the patriarch in Greece was only a trustee of the family property and power. The family was really the unit of power. In Rome, on the other hand, the father was an absolute monarch. At best interested parties of the family could act only in an advisory capacity. Their counsel was in no way binding on him. The will of the father was law. Accordingly, the Roman family was a larger or smaller group of relatives compactly organized under the family head, a state in parvo, an imperium in imperio. Such was the state of affairs with regard to patria potestas during the historic period of Greece and practically also during the late Republic and the Empire of Rome.

Furthermore, membership in the family was not based in Greece or Rome upon ties of blood relationship; rather, the determining factors were the coming under the power of the family head and the sharing in the worship of the family gods. Hence, the membership was not only increased by birth, but also by adoption into the family. Likewise, it was decreased not only by death or marriage, but also by emancipation of a son from the control of the father by means of a thrice repeated fictitious sale. Therefore a son, once emancipated from paternal authority, was henceforth excluded from the membership of the family and could no longer participate in its worship. Admission of a daughter, at marriage, into her husband's circle was in turn effected by a solemn ceremonial before

the family hearth and the subsequent invocation of the domestic gods by the new member of the family. Therefore a married daughter, who in Rome during the Empire usually contracted a "free marriage", i. e., the marriage without manus, legally retained her membership in her father's household and continued, nominally at least, to worship at his hearth and to live under his tutelage. On the other hand, a youth of another Gens or kin, when adopted, became a real member of the new family and henceforth shared in the cult of its household gods. Finally, slaves, recruited either from captured and purchased barbarians or from exposed children, came as famuli, servants, and lowest in the scale of membership, under the power of the paterfamilias. The normal family, then, included in Greece and Rome, father, mother, all the Children, the Children's children, *and slaves*.

Finally, the State recognized only the family, or better, only the paterfamilias.¹⁾ The father was, according to law, a 'person', but not so the wife or child, not even the married son during his life time. Naturally the slave was not a 'person', but neither was the freedman; he, whilst liberated from slavery, still remained under the manus of the family head. Consequently, the unattached individual had no legal standing, he was as such outlawed. Alone attachment to the family, such as by birth or adoption, secured to the individual whatever rights he might enjoy in the society of his day. Under the circumstances, the paterfamilias was responsible before law perhaps for a large clientele: for the immediate members of the family, for town and field slaves, and for a fair number of freedmen. Consequently, individual did not deal with individual, but rather family with family through its respective head. Indeed, as regards

1) In view of the rights and exemptions enjoyed by such a freeman, one can readily appreciate Paul's action on various occasions. See Acts 16:37-39; 22:25-29; 25:10-12.

legal action, everyone was a minor but father. "All in the household", say Mommsen, "were destitute of legal rights, - the wife and the child no less than the bullock or the slave." ¹⁾ It was through him that transactions, such as a business enterprise, a contract or a will, were legalized; through him that a settlement of a difficulty or payment of a debt was obtained for a client; through him that injuries and offenses were righted even in behalf of a married member of the family. At one time, in turn, he might arbitrarily and unjustly settle a case between a freedman and a litigating family head or especially between a slave and such a plaintiff in the action. He might presently be disgusted with the past unsatisfactory behavior of his wards, or he might be occupied with some more personal affair. Consequently, he might summarily dispose of the case; he might at once agree to the terms which would satisfy the plaintiff, or even commit the slave to him for any punishment which would appease his anger. At another time, he might protect his ward from any evil consequences of his misdeeds as if he were deserving of the most trustworthy consideration. At all events, it is readily understood why State and society always stressed that the father's foremost duty to the family and the State consisted in taking a wife and securing a legitimate successor. A 'person' was needed also in the future for the legal, economic, and religious well-being of the family. In short, the individual apart from the group, had no worth in the Greek and Roman world.

Upon the advent of Christianity, two vital changes were naturally effected, one with reference to patria potestas, the power of the father, and the other with reference to slavery. In view

1) Mommsen, History of Rome, Vol. I, p. 74.

of the teachings of the Church such questions as the following would inevitably be raised. Has the mother no voice in the government of the family? Should not her consent be secured to the marriage of a child? Has the child no right to life, and shall the father also in future be empowered to reject it at its birth? Furthermore, shall slaves perpetually continue in the relation of famuli as an integral part of the household? Should they always be dealt with as so much personal or movable property? One tenet of the church would suffice to revolutionize thought and conduct with regard to the rights of the paterfamilias and to slavery, namely, the teaching concerning the equality of believers in the Kingdom of God.

As an unavoidable consequence of universal redemption from sin and from entailing disabilities,¹⁾ Paul taught that all believers, whether bond or free, male or female,²⁾ were members of one divine family, of the Kingdom, that all were united under Christ as their Family-Head,³⁾ and that all were equally entitled to all privileges resulting from the redemptive work of Jesus.⁴⁾ Now, then, no human middleman was in future necessary, also no earthly paterfamilias, in order to transact business even with the Lord of lords, or the supreme government of the universe.⁵⁾ God did not deal with the family as a unit, but directly with the individual. Neither could the father, under Christianity, any longer confer with God in the role of the sole priest of the whole family.

1) Gal. 3:26,27; John 3:16. 2) Gal. 3:26-29; also 1 Pet. 2:9,10 and Matt. 23:8-12. 3) Eph. 1:20-23. 4) Gal. 3:26-28. See in this connection concerning rights of citizenship in the kingdom, Eph. 2:11-13, 19. 5) Rom. 5:2; Eph. 3:18; 3:12.

The Church Fathers similarly expressed themselves, though by no means so comprehensively. They did so particularly in the admonitions, in which they instructed masters on their conduct toward slaves. Thus Ignatius supports his plea with regard to inter-family relations, also in behalf of the treatment of children and slaves, in the following words: "Wherefore I write boldly to your love and exhort you to have but one faith, and one kind of preaching, and one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ; and His blood which He shed for us is one; one loaf also is broken to all the communicants, and one cup is distributed among them all: there is but one altar for the whole Church, and one bishop, with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow-servants. Since, also, there is but one unbegotten Being, God, even the Father; and one only begotten Son, God, the Word, and man; and one Comforter, the Spirit of truth; and also one preaching, and one faith, and one baptism; and one Church which the holy apostles established from one end of the earth to the other by the blood of Christ, and by their own sweat and toil; it behooves you also, therefore, as 'a peculiar people, and a holy nation', to perform all things with harmony in Christ. Wives virgins children, servants, husbands, fathers, Masters, by ye gentle towards your servants, ... for there is one nature and one family of mankind. For 'in Christ there is neither bond nor free'.¹⁾ Generally, however, the Fathers urged love as a guide for all conduct in inter-family relations, and referred to Christ's love for the Church,²⁾ His love for children, the communion of

-
- 1) Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. I, Epistle to Philadelphians, Ch. IV.
 - 2) Op. Cit., Vol. I, Epistle of Ignatious to Polycarp, Ch. V.

1) faith, and the golden rule 2) as a reason, or model, of love.

Thus the harsh practices of Pagan family life were materially modified or entirely eradicated.

However, we must not lose sight of the fact that at least the power of the Roman husband and father over the immediate members of his family had gradually declined long before the establishment of Christianity. The Roman wife who remained under the power of her father was certainly independent of her husband and to all intents her own master, as was frequently her wont. Caesar Augustus had likewise limited the power of the father over the son; he at least permitted the son to dispose of those acquisitions by will which he had obtained in the active exercise of his profession as a soldier. Later this privilege was extended to all acquisitions of the son in potestate, whether he secured them during military service or no. The ancient custom whereby the father might act in the capacity of a judge over his wife and children and exercise the power of life and death had long since become a dead letter.

Naturally, then, upon the advent of Christianity the tendency to restrict the patria potestas was not checked, but accelerated. In consequence, husband and wife were given approximately equal rights before the law under the Christian Emperors. The exposure of new-born children was prohibited. The killing of a grown-up child was branded as murder and punished accordingly. Only an extremely destitute father could still sell his child as a slave, but only, provided the child was an infant. To quote from Muirhead: "With the Christian Emperors the last traces disappeared of the old conception of the familia as an aggregate of persons subject absolutely to the power and dominion of its head".³⁾ Again accord-

1) Idem, Vol. VI. Apostolic Constitutions, IV, XII. 2) Idem, Vol. I, Epistle of Barnabas, ch. XIX. 3) 'Historical Introduction to the Private Law of Rome', p. 387, quoted in Goodsell, 'A History of the Family', p. 177.

ing to Muirhead: "All that remained of the patria potestas in Justinian's legislation is what is sanctioned in modern systems: the right of moderate chastisement for offenses, testamentary nomination of guardians, giving of the son in adoption, and withholding of consent to the marriage of a child. The latter was subject to magisterial intervention if unreasonable.¹⁾" In short, under the Christian Emperors the worth and dignity of the individual was finally recognized.

Also with reference to slavery some change had been initiated in the pre-Christian period. Heretofore the master possessed absolute power over his slave. The latter could be given, let sold, exchanged, and seized for debt. He could not contract a legal marriage; his union, formed with the consent of his master, might terminate at any time by sale. He could not claim legal parentage, nor property, nor the right to legacy. He could not appear as plaintiff or witness before a magistrate against his master. Killing a slave was not equivalent to murder, but only to destruction of property. He plainly had no legal status; he was not a 'person', only so much chattel. Aristotle classes him an instrument, an animate instrument with a soul, but after all a soul without a will. The Roman Varro similarly assigned a place among implements to the slave, though not alongside of the dumb wagon or the inarticulate ox, yet in the category of implements that talk.

The partial limitation of the absolute power of the master was due to the humane principle of the equality or the unity of mankind, as it was voiced by Stoicism. "Man is a sacred thing to man", says Seneca. "We are

1) ~~Historical Introduction to the Private Law of Rome~~; P. 390, quoted in Goodsell, 'A History of the Family', p. 177.

ALL formed from the same elements, and have the same destiny.¹⁾ - Ulpian, the great jurist of the age of the Antonines, writes: "According to natural law, all men are born free; in civil law, it is true, slaves are treated as having no rights; not so, however, by natural law, for by this all men are equal." Nor was all Stoicism mere rhetoric or sentiment. While Cato's slaves were compelled to work in chains, and find a sleeping place among the stalls of the oxen, on Pliny's estates no slave ever worked in chains, their master even permitted them to acquire property, and he frequently ate at the same table with his freemen. Furthermore, Hadrian forbade the arbitrary killing of slaves, without trial. He prohibited the sale of slaves, without the intervention of judges, ~~for~~ for the contest of gladiators. The 'Ergastula', i. e., slave prisons on country estates, were abolished. Slaves could in certain cases be admitted as witnesses.

Yet, though the school of the Stoics exerted no mean influence upon Roman jurisprudence immediately preceding the Christian Emperors, it unfortunately found adherents to their humane ideas only among the cultivated classes. Hence its audience was decidedly circumscribed. Christianity, on the other hand, addressed itself to the masses and wrought a transformation in the heart of the master as well as in that of the slaves. Under its influence they now sat next to each other in the church, and partook of communion together. Not infrequently it occurred that a slave was an elder in the same church of which his master was a member. It is true, the Church would not receive a slave without a certificate of good conduct from his Christian master, but upon its

1) Compare therewith the well-known saying in Terence: "Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto."

receipt he became a full member and might even at length, but only after emancipation, be ordained into the clergy.¹⁾ Moreover, harsh treatment of slaves, though not punishable by civil law, excluded the master from communion. "Thou shalt not issue orders with bitterness to thy maidservant nor thy man-servant who hope in the same God",²⁾ was already the injunction of the Epistle of Barnabas. In turn, the Church exhorted the slaves to obedience.³⁾ The Church also deemed it a praiseworthy act for a master to emancipate his slave. Hence many, when they became Christians, set all their slaves at liberty on the day of their baptism or at Easter. On such an occasion, a rich Roman, in the time of Trajan, presented twelve hundred and fifty slaves with their freedom.

Unavoidably, this new spirit would also influence legislation. Laws relating to slavery, we hear, were "imbued with Christian discipline",⁴⁾ because they so notably reflected the spirit of humanity. Thus Constantine declared the poisoning of a slave, or branding him, to be homicide. He provided that emancipation of slaves should take place in the church in the presense of the assembled people and the clergyman. The law, moreover, threw every obstacle in the way of separating families. "Who can bear", says the Theodosian Code, "to see children separated from parents, brothers, from sisters, wives from husbands." Above all,

1) - Op. Cit., Vol VII. The Apostolical Constitutions, Book VIII, XLVII, 82. 2) Op. Cit. Vol. I, Epistle of Barnabas, ch. XIX. See also Eph. 6:9; Col. 4:1. 3) Idem, Vol. VII, Apost. Const. Book IV, XI. See Eph. 6:5-8; Col. 3:22-25. 4) Christiana disciplina imbutus; Theodosian Codex, LX, 12.

Justinian under the influence of Christianity circumscribed the power of the master and advanced the cause of human liberty. Slavery was suppressed as a penalty. The age limit, at which a bondman might be freed, was abolished. A freeman could marry a slave-woman by first freeing her. The violation of a slave-woman was made punishable by death. Slaves or freedman could arrive at the most important offices, provided the masters did not oppose. Thus by various steps the patria potestas was weakened until slaves disappeared from the roster of the familia. Unquestionably, Christianity, at this time, proved itself to be a most powerful spiritual force. However, the unfortunate ~~an~~ union of the State and ^{the} Church under Constantine, must be regretted since it prevented the natural extension of the Church, i. e., the gradual conversion of a people and the slow reformation of their manners and morals by the Christian faith, but, instead, suddenly transformed a vast population into nominal Christians.

VI

THE STATUS OF THE HUSBAND.

It remains for us to consider the Status of husband, wife, and child as affected by Christianity. Evidently the Church - let us recall - recognized the worth of the individual, since it taught that Christ had laid down His life for each and every soul in the world, that he appropriated the benefits of His redemptive work to all in baptism and that He by this ceremony actually adopted them into His Family.¹⁾ We have also heard how this concept of the spiritual equality of believers was in the main responsible for the material limitation of the power of the family head. Let us, in addition, note the effect which this idea, necessarily, also had, on the mutual relations of husband and wife as well as on those of parents and children. To note this result, let us point to the respective obligations and responsibilities growing out of this mutual relationship in the Graeco-Roman world and in the Church.

What, then, were the several obligations and privileges of the husband and father in his relations to wife and child within the Greek and Roman family circle? The word 'father' itself in part answers our question. Both in the Greek and Roman tongue this word signified fundamentally, not paternal relationship, but authority, dignity, and power. In other words, the father in the Greek and Roman home was 'long' on privileges and 'short' on obligations. The emphasis was placed on submission of wife and child and not on opportunity for service in their behalf. This tendency will be quite apparent if we briefly recall the Greek and Roman conception of the

1) Op. cit., Vol. II, The Instructor, Book I, 6; Vol. VII, Hippolytus, Discourses on The Holy Theophany, 10.

respective duties and rights of the husband and father. On the one hand, we may enumerate as paternal obligations: (1) The father as priest must perpetuate family worship. (2) The father, as sole owner in Rome and as trustee in Greece, is expected to administer the family property and thus provide for the family. (3) The father as family head must secure an heir to the family estates either by marriage or by the adoption of a son in case of childlessness or celibacy. Custom, furthermore, required the father to educate his son. Social utility urged such a provision as practical upon Greek and Roman.

On the other hand, we may enumerate as the privileges of the father: (1) his power over the person of his wife and child, and (2) his power over family property. In Greece the husband possessed complete power over the person of his wife, in Rome only in the marriage with manus. He could accordingly divorce her for adultery, no matter how adulterous he might be. In the historic period of Greece and during the Empire in Rome, he might dismiss her for any cause, even because he considered her unattractive and uncongenial. As regards the children, the father might accept or reject, i.e., expose, them at birth. He might, in case of an offense, scourge, sell, banish, or put them to death. He could bestow both son and daughter in marriage. He could assign a wife to his son, divorce him when married, or transfer him to another family by 'adoption'. Of course, such extraordinary power was modified by natural affection. However, in any difference of opinions the father's decision would naturally be final. As regards family property, the father held all rights to it. Likewise, the fruits of his wife's work, the acquisitions of his children, and any donation or inheritance which came to any family member, were his unquestioned property. Indeed, the husband and father was 'long' on privileges; he was even so whether worthy or no. At all events, Pagan custom and law contrived to make of him a stern, cold tyrant; at least, it equipped him with all the

machinery to be such, if he so elected, or if natural affection did not somewhat temper his relations toward his wife and child. Moreover, that the Pagan father at times seriously abused his rights is sufficiently attested, if by nothing else, then, by the legislation of pre-Christian humane Emperors, who to some extent attempted to limit the paternal power.

Only under Christianity a host of Greek and Roman fathers were found who in no sense resembled a tyrant. In fact, all the literature of Antiquity set forth no such noble ideal of a husband and father as did the New Testament and the writings of the Church Fathers. It is true, both declared: "The husband is the head of the wife." ¹⁾ Headship was unquestionably and necessarily granted to the husband, but the emphasis was not so much on privilege as it was on obligation. In fact, throughout the first three centuries privilege made way for service in Church and home. The reason for this attitude on the part of the incumbents of position or office, as that of the husband or father in the home, was to be found in the introduction of a new guiding principle for headship. In other words, the determining principle in any sphere of activity was love, not mere cold authority; it was not self-love, but the well-being of others. Therefore, both Paul and the Church Fathers directed the head of the family to a model for his imitation, to none else than to Christ, the head of the Church, in particular to His self-sacrificing love for the Church. ²⁾ In consequence, stern measures were not eliminated, such as serious admonition and moderate chastisement, to counteract the disobedience of children, nor was sentimentality, which would condone serious faults, permitted. But true love was always to have the well-being of the individual at heart,

1) Eph. 5:23,25-33; 1.Cor. 11:3. See also Op.cit., Vol. VII, Apost. Const., Book I, 8; Book III, 6,9.

2) Eph. 5:23-33. See also Op. cit., Vol. I, Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp, ch. 5.

also where it might be obliged temporarily to hurt his feelings. After all, in all the interrelations between husband and wife as well as parent and child, it was a far cry from headship by arbitrary measures to headship by self-sacrificing love. The former would necessarily beget opposition, hatred, and fear, the latter alone, a willing submission and a pleasant co-operation.

Furthermore, the emphasis on obligation in headship was also apparent in its characterization as a trust or stewardship.¹⁾ This understanding of the status of husband and father, also new in Greek and Roman life,²⁾ involved accountability to God for the whole tenure of his position. Under this conception, moreover, both husband and wife were mutual gifts from God; children were equally a blessing for both from above, and power over property was a joint stewardship.³⁾ Since outright ownership of any of these blessings, under divine law, was never understood, but only their temporary enjoyment, the trusteeship demanded that the common life of husband and wife prove a means for their mutual improvement and an aid to their final salvation.⁴⁾ It demanded that the character of the children

1).- Op. cit., Vol. VIII, Apost. Const. VII, 1, we read: "To be an Apostle or a bishop, or in any other such office, is not in our power; but at the disposal of God, who bestows the gifts." See also Idem, Vol. VIII, Clementine Homilies, III, 63, 64. 2).- Col. 3:19, 24, 25. See also Op. Cit., Vol. VII, Apost. Const., Book I, 3. 3).- Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. VII, Oration XVIII by Gregory of Nazienzen; Ante-Nicene Church Fathers Vol. I, Irenaeus against Heresies, ch. XI; Idem, Vol. VII Apost. Const., I, 8. 4).- Op. cit., Oration XVIII, by Gregory of Nazienzen.

be developed for their future well-being by means of education and religious nurture.¹⁾ Finally it prohibited, as regards the joint use of property, any form of extravagance or the useless waste of goods.²⁾ Assuredly, family life was revolutionized under Christianity. Moreover, the legislation of Christian Emperors sufficiently reflected these new ideas, as for instance among other measures, magisterial intervention in case of any punishment above moderate chastisement of children, or in case of an unreasonable withdrawal of paternal consent to marriage.

1.- *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, *Epistle of Ignatius to Antiochians*, ch. 9; *idem*, *Epistle to Philadelphians*, ch. 4. 2).- *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, *The Instructor*, II, 3; III, 2, 3.

VII

THE STATUS OF THE WIFE.

What, next, were the respective obligations and privileges of the wife? As regards her status in Greece and Rome, one word tells the story: tutelage or minority. Grecian and Roman wives were perpetual minors. At marriage they were received as adopted daughters into the homes of their husbands. If, as in later Rome, the wife lived in a marriage without power under the tutelage of her father, she still was legally no more than a daughter. Consequently, both in Greece and Rome wives were in the eyes of the law only sisters to their children. In case they became widows or fatherless daughters a guardian was provided for them. At no time, of course, could mothers be custodians of their children. At no time could they have a voice in the government of the family. In the great historic periods of Greece and Rome they could be divorced on the slightest provocation, whilst the Grecian wife might only secure some redress when her husband's debaucheries resulted in gross neglect, or genuine cruelty, to his family.

Yet, despite these legal disabilities, the Roman matron might well be envied by her Greek sister. The former was received with honor and respect at large, the latter was treated as a moral inferior. The Greek wife was ill-educated, the Roman, with regard to learning, the equal of her husband. The mother's task in Greece was to take care of the body of her children, in Rome, to act as partner of the family head in their education and training. The Greek wife could not play mistress of the house and, for instance, assist her husband in the entertainment of his guests at table. She was only the housekeeper, that is, the director of

the household slaves and the guardian of the household supplies. But her Roman sister could certainly appear in the company of her spouse in public without injury to her good name. In Greece the woman could participate in family worship, though her presence was not necessary, in Rome she stood as priestess at the side of her lord. In Athens the widow and unmarried daughter could not inherit lands and personal property, whilst, in Sparta at least, they could freely do so. But in Rome, both received equal shares with the sons.

Consequently, the obligations of the Greek wife were many and her privileges practically nil. Her prominent duties listed as absolute obedience to her husband, household supervision, and chastity, her rights as gracious permission to participate in family worship. On the other hand, the Roman matron, though under the same obligations prior to the second Punic War, always enjoyed inheritance rights as well as the honor and respect of her countrymen. Whereas, under the Empire, she could in addition claim some freedom of choice. In fact, under the so called 'free marriage', she was indeed a free agent, independent at least of her husband, especially so in the event of her father's death when under the tutelage of a guardian. Some women at this time were even factors in the political life of the day, some gave their attention to intellectual pursuits, but most of them lived for social affairs. The majority were 'high livers'. None manifested a spirit of self-criticism, none were interested in the betterment of social conditions arising from slavery and the poverty among the proletariat. Also the women were self-centered. Undoubtedly, because the old Roman matron, at this time, was largely a reminiscence, Plautus declared the ideal wife to be the mother who manifested womanly dignity, respect for her parents, obedience to her husband, and reverence for the gods. In other words, there were many wives who lived for society and pleasure, and few who lived for their home, or for their husband and child.

But why do we find such a disparity existing between the Greek and Roman wife, even in the best periods of these countries? The reason is, of course, largely to be found in the respective attitudes of these two worlds toward woman. In Rome, as we know, the matron was honored. But where in Classic Greece is there *Frauenlob*? It is true, the physical beauty of woman was enthusiastically rendered, but only physical beauty and that, in the main, of the courtesan. Ask Praxiteles, the sculptor, if he knew of a better model among women. Inquire of Plato. It is true, his theoretical lady is placed on an equality with man in his ideal State. Yet in his opinion, the State would be disorganized where women in general enjoyed such a privilege with their husbands.¹⁾ See Aristotle. For him woman is of an inferior kind, an incomplete creation. Says he, "The slave has no deliberating faculty at all, the woman has, but it is without authority, and the child has it, but it is immature". And again he says, "If she have a will, it is a will without rights, and if she have virtues, they are kindred to those of slaves."²⁾ Hear Demosthenes. He declares in a public, "We have courtesans for pleasure, slave concubines for personal service, and wives to bear us lawful offspring and to be faithful guardians of our houses."³⁾ And both Euripides and Menander will declaim, woman is a necessary evil. After all, why this attitude especially of the Grecian intelligentsia toward the wife? It is undoubtedly due in large measure to the very curious physiological notion that the generative power belonged exclusively to man, and that the woman had only an insubordinate part to play in the production of children. But be that as it may, the wife in Greece was a perpetual minor, whilst in Rome, despite this same legal status, she enjoyed more liberties, and due to the form of marriage

1),- Plato's Republic, Jowett's Edition, 2,401.

2),- See also Econom V, 3.

3),- Oratio in Neaeram.

under the Caesars, could insist on freedom from conjugal restraints and thus usurp undue privileges and render her union of non-effect.

No less than the salvation of the home called for a reconstruction in view of the attitude of the husband toward the wife in Greece and chiefly of that of the wife toward the husband in Rome. Christianity, therefore, removed the legal tutelage from both the Greek and Roman wives; it elevated the Grecian woman to such a position beside her husband in which she was fully recognized as his wife and as the mother of his children; and it subjected the Roman matron to those restraints which are necessarily implied in a conjugal union. Indeed, under the influence of the Church, the wife began to enjoy privileges which had never been hers in Greek and Roman life. Thus, then, both Paul and the Church Fathers insisted on mutual rights for both spouses to the other's person and service. ¹⁾

Likewise, the Church expected both jointly to train their children and enjoy their property. ²⁾ They were to have these in common. Not only the father but also the mother was henceforth to be honored by Greek as well as Roman sons and daughters. Christ in honoring His mother was their exemplar. ³⁾ "Thou didst not disdain that Thy only begotten Son should be born of a woman," says the consecrating prayer for deaconesses in the ancient Church. ⁴⁾ This fact, the birth of Christ from a woman, this virgin birth, in no small measure helped to give woman her rightful place beside her husband in the home. Assuredly, the wife was to be henceforth more than a convenient instrument for the introduction of legitimate children, more also than a nurse or housekeeper; she was to be more than an adopted daughter to her husband, and more than a sister to her children.

1),- 1. Cor.7:3,4. Op. cit., Miscellanies, III, 15,18. 2),- Op. cit., Vol.IV, Tertullian, To His Wife, II, 8. 3),- Op. cit., Vol. VI, Methodius, Oration on Simeon and Anna, X. 4),- Idem, Vol. VII, Apost.Const.VIII, 20.

Moreover, as the Christian father was the priest in the home, so the Christian mother was priestess in the family circle. In a case of emergency, father or mother might baptize their infant. ¹⁾ Both were to attend to the religious nurture of their children. ²⁾ Both were to be an example to their children. Unquestionably the woman, in the opinion of the Church, was neither the moral nor the intellectual inferior of her husband. "Man and woman", so Clement of Alexandria expresses this thought, "may share equally in the same perfection" "they can be conversant with anything whatever, provided they have the advantage of education, and application and training; and virtue, we have said, depends on ourselves above all For the gift is one conferred by God." ³⁾ The Church decidedly disagreed with Plato and Aristotle on this question. As never in Antiquity, the full and perfect worth of woman as a human being was recognized. Man alone no longer possessed this dignity. Already in the Gospel story woman occupied, as a matter of course, a prominent and honorable position. ⁴⁾ Now single women and widows entered the profession of a deaconess, prepared women candidates for baptism, ministered unto the sick, and cared for the needy adult as well as orphan, the latter, in the institutions of the Church, ⁵⁾ which at this time were established. Again, as never in Antiquity, women were interested in social betterment.

Hence also the legislation of the Christian Emperors, influenced in part by the women at Court, went far in establishing an equality

1),- Idem., Vol. III, Tertullian, On Baptism, ch. 17.

2),- Idem, Vol. I, Ignatius, Epistle to Polycarp, ch. 4. 3),- Thus among others Mary, the mother of Jesus, Mary and Martha, the sisters of Lazarus of Bethany, the woman at the well of Samaria, and Mary of Magdala.

4),- Idem, Vol. II, Miscellanies, Book IV, 19. 5),- Idem, Vol. I,

The Pastor of Hermas, I, 4; Vol. VII, Apost. Const., III, 16.

before the law between husband and wife, especially so after the fourth century. The Justinian Code expressly stated, "Tutelage of women must be done away with." Free mutual consent to marriage was required. A joint control of children was established. The wife's and widow's position with respect to property was much improved. She was henceforth entitled to both dowry and donatio in the event of the insolvency of her husband, in case of divorce without just cause, and upon his death. Finally, Justinian also gave the mother the right of legal guardianship over her children. Thus practically all economic and legal disabilities had in part prior to and more so under Christianity been removed from the woman. She was now approximately enjoying equal rights with her husband under the law.

So then, as never before, woman was crowned with privileges. Naturally, on the other hand, all these - the mutual rights of both spouses to each other's person and service as well as to their children and property, - also implied in the wife's case a corresponding increase in duties or responsibilities. Among these obligations, however, only one calls for particular emphasis, the one resulting from the relation of the wife to her husband as the head of the house. Of course, the irresponsible attitude of the Roman lady of the Imperial period, could not be thought of under normal Christian conditions. What, then, must be her particular status in this respect according to Paul and the Church Fathers? Since the husband was head of the house, the wife was consequently subject to him. She was his helper, his assistant. Nor could spiritual equality in any way obviate this relation of woman to man. This liberty, evidently, did not confer each and every right to all individuals, including the children. It only declared all classes of men to be absolutely identical before the Cross

1), - Eph. 5:22,23; Pet. 3:1-6; 1.Cor. 11:3. Op. Cit., Vol. VII, Apost. Const., VI, 29 and I, 8.

and granted them, in view of their universal need, one privilege, the general privilege of salvation. Instead, two reasons strongly supported the status of woman as the helpmate of man: (1) She was in nature, temperament, and physique different from man, in fact, so created physiologically different from man by God; (2) She was so created by God for man. Accordingly, the difference, established at the respective creation of man and woman, embodied a difference in the relationship between the two. In short, since woman was biologically secondary in origin, she was ancillary in intent. So said Paul and the Church Fathers unequivocally. ¹⁾ They certainly did not, as the Greeks, believe woman to be morally and intellectually inferior to man. They only accented a biological difference in the weaker vessel and the limitations resulting therefrom.

They granted her the enjoyment of every right in home, state, and church, save as it was limited by the headship of man. Consequently she was not to be a ruler in the State and exercise authority over men. ²⁾ She was not to be a minister in the Church. She might as deaconess teach children in the Orphan Asylum or prepare women candidates for baptism, but she was not to speak in public in the Church before men nor in public administer the sacraments. ³⁾ Paul and the Church Fathers, in this connection, refer also to the custom of veiling as a handicap and a further ⁴⁾ reason for abstention from public speaking before men in the Church.

Greek and Roman women of the period appeared in public with their head veiled. To show one's self otherwise advertised the courtesan and subjected the chaste woman to insult. Above all, then, woman was not to be the head of the home under normal conditions. The husband was to be the

1),- 1.Cor.11:8,9; 1.Tim. 2:12,13. Op.cit., Vol.IV, Tertullian, On the

Veiling of Virgins, ch. 7. 2),- 1.Tim.2:12. 3),- 1.Tim.2:11-13;

1.Cor. 14:34. Op. cit., Vol.VII, Apost. Const.III, 6 and 9.

4),- 1.Cor. 11:3-15. Op. cit., Vol. IV, Tertullian, On the Veiling of Virgins, ch. 7.

head and the wife, as the helpmate, subject to him. But naturally, as for the headship, so for the wife's obedience, a guiding principle obtained. Neither headship nor submission could be unlimited. The husband, let us recall, was to be head of the wife even as Christ was head of the Church. Thus, then, as the Church was subject to Christ, so wives were to be subject to their husbands. ¹⁾ As the obedience of the Church to Christ was the result of a self sacrificing service, so the devotion of the wife was to be the response to manifestations of love on the part of the husband. In fact, the respective status of husband and wife can never be a bugbear where love in the relations between the spouses is supreme. ²⁾ There alone we shall find a loving guidance and a willing submission and cooperation. After all, Christianity re-established the natural relations between husband and wife.

1),- Eph. 5:22-24. Op. cit., Vol. VII, Apost. Const., VI, 29.

2),- Eph. 5:22-23. Op. cit., Vol. II, Miscellanies, IV, 20; Vol. VII, Apost. Const. VI, 29; I, 8.

VIII

THE STATUS OF THE CHILD

Finally, we must consider the status of the child, or its respective rights and duties, in Graeco-Roman life and under the Church. On the side of duty absolute obedience was required. Both the boy and the girl were obliged to obey their father. The rod was by no means spared, if not worse employed, in case of insubordination. However, though the Greek mother might receive adequate consideration from the daughter, she found her son, the future lord, less amenable to her wishes, when once he was going to school and becoming more and more acquainted with a man's world and its privileges. The Roman matron of the pre-Punic period was highly respected by all her children. There was, however, a dearth of children during the Empire, especially among the high and mighty. At all events, they were under the supervision and in the care of slaves, often even of coarse slaves. And therefore early exerted themselves as lord and lady respectively. Consequently, in this period many children respected or rather feared 'the boss' and at best admired the lady.

On the side of rights, let us remember that Paganism is not a child's world. There was, of course, natural affection displayed, but only too often also brutality. Thousands were not even given a right to life. Solon gave parents the right by law to destroy their own children. Plato, the world's first eugenicist, maintained that all children, born of unions which had not been sanctioned by law, should be exposed.¹⁾ Said Aristotle,

1), Republic, V, 457-62.

"Let it be the law that nothing imperfect or maimed shall be brought up."¹⁾ There was simply no conception of the sanctity of life among the ancients, no idea of the equal right of every human individual upon conception to a birth, and thereafter to opportunity and progress in life. Of course, the monstrosity, or seriously defective child, was then done away with as is today an undesirable dog or cat. The pistol was not handy, but the club was. Always the slave could be ordered to dispose of it. Besides, the fastidious could employ more humane ways; such as drowning or opening the veins of the wrist.²⁾ There were certainly no institutions for idiots, for the blind, mute, and deaf children, nor a foundling asylum for the undesirable child. Above all, abortion was practiced without any compunction. It was in fact so common, that it is frequently thought that the ancients excelled all moderns in the knowledge of the technique of this murderous practice. Even the perfect child of a normal family life was not infrequently exposed. Undoubtedly the common rule was: the poor shall systematically abandon the female and the rich at least any defective child. If the infant was not dropped, enclosed in a large earthenware vessel or pot, at some convenient spot where the passerby might notice it, it could readily be left in the precincts of the temple or, as in Rome, at some designated place, there at the Lactarian or Milky Column in the Herb Market. As a rule, human scavengers made their selections from an evening's offering to prepare the more robust specimens of human flesh either for houses of prostitution or mayhap for the gladiatorials. Some vultures at least had an eye to business.³⁾ Concerning many children, not even so fortunate,

1) Politics, (Jowett trans.), VII, 16; 1335b. 2),- Op.cit., Vol. III, Tertullian's Ad Nationes, ch. 15, 16. 3),- Op. cit., Vol. I, The First Apology of Justin, ch. 27.

Tertullian said, "You can drown them, let them freeze to death, starve them or let them be eaten by dogs".¹⁾ What else might you expect if the law, for instance, the Twelve Tables in Rome, justified the father in killing his children, and therefore accepting or rejecting them at birth? Hence Greek and Roman evaluation of children, during their historic periods, would conclude: (1) In general children are a burden. (2) Abortion, infanticide, child exposure and other shameful practices are not a crime. Hence Quintilian's apothegm read: "To kill is often held a crime, but to kill one's own children is sometimes considered a beautiful act among the Romans".²⁾ Hence Latin literature constantly alluded to the inhuman treatment of children. Hence though laws against infanticide had been passed in view of the alarming decrease of the birthrate, they were nevertheless non-effective.

Since the very right to life was so precarious, the privileges of children, in general, were few and far between. Thus, though not the Greek, yet the Roman father might sell his young children into slavery as late as the beginning of the Empire and even thereafter in case of extreme poverty. Education was not universal. In Greece only the boy received an education. In Rome both boy and girl were given a good schooling. Finally, property rights were extremely limited. Any acquisition or inheritance by, or donation to, a child was, at least in Rome, considered the property of the father. However, acquisitions, made whilst in military service, could by will be disposed of by the son. Upon the death of the father the oldest son in Greece inherited the house and lands under the law of primogeniture. The other brothers shared equally in the movable property, whilst the sisters possessed dowry rights.

1), - Idem, Vol. III, The Apology, ch. 9.

2), -

In Rome, instead, primogeniture was unknown. Sons as well as daughters received equal shares. The daughter, however, could not administer her property. Under the Empire, on account of 'free marriage', a guardian was even required by law for the married daughter. In turn, upon the death of the mother, the dowry went to her children. Naturally, the children of a matrimonium non justum, since not full Roman citizens, could not inherit property.

It must not be forgotten, however, that already in the first century of the Empire the Stoic doctrine of the "natural law" of equal rights was gaining a strong hold upon Roman conceptions of law. Consequently at this time, though the father could still expose his infants, he could not as household judge and executioner put his son to death. In fact, the father was limited, in the reign of Alexander Severus (191-211 A.D.) to moderate chastisement of his son, and in case of serious offences committed by his son, was obliged to turn to the courts for a redress of the wrong. Nevertheless, taken as a whole, the conditions of childhood were far from ideal under Paganism.

Naturally, under Christianity, the movement inaugurated by Stoicism was accelerated and therefore the legal status of the child materially improved, whilst, of course, its position at least in the Christian home was ideal and in many respects a worthy pattern for Pagan parents. As a matter of course the Church obligated the child to obedience toward its parents,¹⁾ but to secure such a result, did more than to advocate the rod; it directed the child to the example given by none else than Jesus, the Founder of Christianity, to His submission to His mother and foster-father.²⁾

1), - Eph. 6:1-3; Col. 3:20; Op. Cit., Vol. I, Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians, ch. 4. 2), - Luke 2:51, 52. Idem, Irenaeus Against Heresies, II, 22, 4.

In fact, the whole early life of Jesus was no mean factor in child training. Above all, whereas formerly brutality and fear prevailed as twin aids in the age-old problem of securing compliance in the home, love now for the first time was given an extensive opportunity to mold the character of the child. Moreover, the compelling pattern for parental love was none else than the love of Christ and of the Father, as exhibited respectively in the blessing of little children and the reinstatement of the prodigal son.¹⁾

On the other hand, the rights of the child were recognized as never heretofore in Grecian and Roman homes, above all, the right to life and love, whether girl or boy, and to an education and training which would prepare both not only for good citizenship in the state, but also for efficient membership in the church militant as well as triumphant.²⁾ Several factors contributed to this result. Of course, the sanctity of human life was proclaimed far and wide among the masses. Furthermore, there was stressed the equal right of every soul, before the Cross, to all blessings secured by Christ. Consequently, the early Church showed that the unborn foetus no less than the infant was a temple of an immortal soul.³⁾ Another strong argument was that abortion and exposure involved one not only in child murder, but also through prevention of baptism, in the damnation of a soul.⁴⁾ Above all, Christ's attitude toward child life in general secured for it the highest consideration. Although the law against

1), - Mark 10:13-16; Luke 15:11-32. Idem, Vol. II, The Instructor, I, 5; Vol. III, Tertullian, on Repentance, ch. 8. 2), - Idem, Vol. I, Epistle to Diognetus, ch. 5; Vol. VII, Apost. Const. IV, 1-3. 3), - Op. Cit., Vol. III, Tertullian's 'Treatise on the Soul', ch. 25-27. 4), - Idem, Vol. II, Athenagoras, A Plea for the Christians, ch. 35.

infanticide under the Empire had remained a dead letter, the word of the Church did not now go unheeded. According to Augustine's admonition, in thousands of Christian homes children were at this time "lovingly welcomed, kindly nourished, and religiously brought up".¹⁾ Nowhere in Pagan literature do we therefore find such grateful acknowledgement of parental love as in the Confessions of Augustine concerning his mother Monica. Consequently, institutions also arose under the Church, in order to compete with the panderers for the exposed children and provide for them in founding and orphan asylums.

Likewise the legislation of Christian Emperors reflected the influence of the Church. Laws were passed against infanticide, child exposure, and the sale of infant children. Valentinian declared in 374 that infanticide was a crime punishable with death. Justinian enacted that (1) a father lost all authority over the child he exposed, and that (2) an exposed infant could never be enslaved. Unfortunately, this law was effective only in the Eastern section of the Roman Empire. Parents, however, might still sell their children. The Church's influence in behalf of the rights of children may also be seen in the laws pertaining to property and to the custody of the children in the event of divorce. Whilst, under Diocletian, the settlement of the children was left to the discretion of the judge, now under Justinian the children were given, if the husband was the guilty party, to the mother provided she remained unmarried, and the father was obliged to pay for their maintenance. If the mother in turn was found guilty, the father had the right to their custody. Furthermore, the son through marriage was placed upon a plane of legal equality with his father which approximated the modern position in this

1), - Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. V, On Marriage and Concupiscence, I, 19.

regard. Finally, under Justinian, property reverted to the natural descendants of the deceased, whether emancipated or not, without distinction of sex, to the exclusion of all other relatives. Heretofore, only relatives on the father's side could inherit, if no direct heirs remained. Hence also a strong drift to equality of rights between male and female children was apparent. Thus the Church gradually but unmistakably improved the condition of the child in the Grecian and Roman home during the early Christian era.

IX

THE LEADING FUNCTIONS OF THE FAMILY.

In general, the activity of the Christian, the Grecian, and the Roman family was the same. Attention was paid respectively to the biological, the economic, the social, and the psychical, or the religious and educational, aspects of family life. Each of these groups sought by means of the marital union to perpetuate the human race, provide the necessities of life, secure the advantages which come by association and companionship to its members, and as far as it was deemed necessary, to supply the needs of religion and education. A difference obtained, with regard to these functions, only in education. The Greek family limited the girl to a knowledge of household duties, but in no sense handicapped the boy intellectually, whereas the Roman family provided, in home and school, a more equitable education for both sexes. Naturally, the Christian household, on account of its profession of Christianity, could not neglect to educate the child and especially attend to its Christian nurture.

Among these functions, however, two were considered, in the Greek and Roman family circle, as above all essential, namely perpetuation of the family and the continuity of its domestic worship. In other words, an offspring must by all means be secured in order that he, in turn, might act as legal head of the family and as priest of the household. Thus the best interests of the group, in Pagan opinion, could alone be conserved: past interests through worship of the ancestors and regard for their will by a father priest, present interests by means of the wise guidance of a ruling head, and future interests through the provision of an offspring. Yet the

Greek and Roman family, in thus supplying its own highest needs, did not fulfill its whole mission in life. In fact, it was not an end in itself, but only a means to an end.

The end and object for which the Greek and Roman family existed and on account of which it exercised all its functions was the State. The State alone was everything. The family was something only because, in and by its legal head as a citizen, it formed a component part of the State. Above all, the individual per se, the individual detached from a family, counted for nothing. Even the father was regarded as of value only with reference to his earthy destiny as family head, because as such he - and the members of the family under him - proved to be a means to an end, because he thus served to contribute to and realize the great ideal, the State. For this reason, marriage was demanded of every citizen, i.e., of the legal head of a house who was endowed with the patria potestas. For this reason celibacy was forbidden; the family was expected to produce citizens or legitimate male descendants. For this reason woman, child, and slave counted for nothing; they legally contributed nothing to the ideal of the state. Therefore also virtue, as conceived and evaluated by the pagan, was purely political. We hear: Do not kill the citizen, for it is murder, but to kill the slave is only injuring the property of his master. We read: Expose the child; ¹⁾ drive out all beggars; ²⁾ despise the barbarian, hate the enemy, such is our duty, a part of patriotism. In short, man, if he was anything, was completely a political being and the family but a means to an end, in so far as its various functions conserved the best interests of the State.

1), - So Lycurgus and Solon. 2), - Plato in the 'Republic' on the ideal State.

On the contrary, in the Christian home, or under Christianity, every human being as such was at once of value, irrespective of his particular destiny in life; no matter whether affiliated with a family or not, no matter what his race, nationality, or station in life. A basic tenet of Christianity necessitated such a view, the tenet that Christ's redemption was not limited, but universal and cosmopolitan, that it embraced every human individual.¹⁾ Equally so compelling were the many concomitant tenets, such as the work of the Holy Spirit to bring the blessings of Christ's redemption to every soul through individual conversion, sanctification, and preservation in the faith.²⁾ and especially the designation of the kingdom of Christ as a communion, not of believing families, but of individual believers.³⁾ Accordingly, in Christian circles each individual was considered an end in itself, an end in the common end and goal, God's Kingdom. Consequently, a different spirit, the spirit of Christ, animated the Christian home in the performance of its various duties, a spirit which manifested itself in a love for all members of the family; in sympathy and service for all, inclusive of the wife, the child, and the slave, and which in consequence transformed homes in ever increasing number, be they Greek or Roman. If then, under Christianity, any function is to be designated as the outstanding one of the normal Christian family, it must be the psychical function, or more definitely, the spiritual development of the individual member of the family.

1),- John 3:16; Mark 16:15. Op. cit., Vol. I, Justin Martyr, Dialog with Grypho, 13, 95, 130, 140. 2),- John 16:7-11; 1.Tim.2:4. Idem, Vol. I, Irenaeus Against Heresies, V.10.11. 3),- Mark 16:15,16; Eph.2:19-22. Idem, Vol.I, Irenaeus Against Heresies, V, 27; Cyprian, Espistle 41, 22, 23.

THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF THE FAMILY.

It was slavery that proved to be a veritable curse upon the economic life of the Greek and Roman family of the early Christian era. The victories of Greece in the Classic age and again in the Alexandrian period and those of Rome during the post-Punic era resulted, on the one hand, in the spoliation of enemy countries and in the enslavement of 'barbarian' peoples and, on the other hand, in the production of the leisure rich and the idle poor of the ancient world. Henceforth in the Greek city-state, in the main, 'everybody worked but father', that is, everybody but this high-born citizen and politician. Why till your soil in Homeric simplicity when slaves in Attica and serfs in Sparta are to hand. What necessitous citizen, when even no longer capitalist, can so forget his high station in life as to work along side of slaves in shop or factory, especially when these are largely controlled by native freedmen or foreign merchants, all men, mark you, beneath him. Who, moreover, even if he did not identify work with slave labor and consider it degrading, who could successfully compete with such labor? Anyhow, in some way the idle poor citizenry, or nobility, will eke out an existence on the oboloi and the emoluments of petty office which the state supplies. The class ideal of a gentleman was distinctly opposed to industry, particularly to manual labor.

So then in Greece, not the father, but the slave works -- and mother. Whilst her lord plays the gentleman, the wife supervises the work of the slaves in the home, engages in spinning, weaving, and cooking, and proves herself an expert at embroidery. Despite this fact, the gentleman of leisure and education nevertheless believed himself qualified to give his wife advice on the value of work. He presumed to tell her that if she desired to glory in a perennial bloom on her cheek she must not forever

sit about as a slave girl, but stand at the loom, teach her household what she knew and learn what she did not know. He undertook to advise her to look on at the bread making, to go about inspecting everything, and thus to practice her profession as well as to take a walk at the same time. He ventured even to say to her that excellent exercise could be had by making beds and kneading dough.¹⁾ Of course, the well-to-do family head was also kept busy by other problems. He had to manage an estate and proved himself at times an expert at high finance as well as later an able teacher of his Roman conqueror. Yet manual labor was not meant for the gentleman. That was the business of the wife and of the slaves.

In the Rome of the late Republic and during the reign of the Caesars, the same contempt for work and aversion to labor existed. Again victories, the 'glorious' victories of the Roman Eagle, were responsible for the introduction of slavery and for the influx of wealth as well as the continued spoliation and heavy taxation of the conquered provinces for the aggravation of these conditions. Again, as a result, we discover the leisure rich alongside of the idle poor. In fact, soon after the second Punic War the small farmers of Italy, the backbone of the early victorious legions, could no longer successfully compete with the slave labor of the wealthy. Prior to this time the servile population had at least not equalled the free population. Moreover, especially upon the conquest of the Eastern provinces, certain families came by immense sums of money, as it were, over night, without the expenditure of honest effort. Crassus, for instance, took 10,000 talents, or \$11,316,300, alone from the temple in Jerusalem,²⁾ and Gabinius, as

1), - Isomachus to Socrates in Xenophon's 'Economics'.

2), - Josephus, Antiquities, XIV, 7,1.

proconsul of Syria, exacted one hundred millions of denarii, or \$16,839,360, ¹⁾ from this province. Thus these conditions, immense wealth in the hands of a small group and cheap slave labor, combined to force the agrarian population from time to time into the cities. But here, in place of field-slaves, factory - and house - slaves denied the poorer class again the usual opportunities for a livelihood. Moreover, only a limited number of such freemen could turn to a calling open to gentlemen, to medicine, architecture and commerce; only some of them could secure even a common position and perhaps be an inferior attendant upon a magistrate, a servant in the college of priests, or an assistant at a funeral. A middle class of free laborers was out of the question. Thus then, on the one hand, there was immense wealth, especially in the days of the Caesars. Some country estates covered several square miles in area and some city residences as much as four acres. Everywhere the usual fruit of slave labor, waste, extravagance, and bad management, was visible. On the other hand, there was also present the fathomless pauperism of the plebs urbana, the natural consequence of this whole vicious system. The poor of the city of Rome, for instance, numbered no less than 320,000 in Caesar's day. Of necessity, they had to be supported at public expense. They were given a monthly ration, usually 56 lbs. of bread per person. Otherwise, the hungry mob might become a dangerous element to the wealthy class in any city. However, such debasing charity only confirmed the plebs in its indolence and very much encouraged it in its demands for 'bread and games'.

1), - Dio, XXXIX, 55.

Unavoidably, these conditions also seriously effected the economic life of the family. The wealthy father and mother would not, and the poor could not, engage in any manual labor. The former considered it beneath their dignity to place themselves in, this respect on a level with a slave, the latter, no matter what their pride, found no opportunity for such labor under the system of slavery. As a matter of fact the wealthy fathers and mothers found themselves ruling over a formidable institution, an institution comprising townhouse and country estate, each with a large retinue of slaves. We are apt to forget that, during antiquity and as late as our own Colonial period, the home, to a larger extent than in our day, supplied its own needs in raw material and in finished product, especially with regard to the big items of food and clothing. Under those circumstances, the materfamilias superintended the management of the household; she occupied herself with the supervision of spinning and weaving, nursed her children, or better, shared in their care, and watched over their education. Such at least was the approved occupation of the Roman matron, as it was frequently summarized by the husband in his farewell formula addressed to her "cura rem communem." Unfortunately many wives, under 'free marriage' did not measure up to this ideal. The father in turn, though he might also hold some important public position, was, as regards his own household or corporation, its president, its board of directors, and its attorney. Such was his approved task. If, however, he belonged to the poor aristocracy, he might, as we heard, be an architect, a doctor, teacher, or engage in commerce. But all other work, according to Cicero, was positively degrading. Slavery had accordingly played havoc also in Rome. The former distinction between a patrician and a plebeian had given way to a division of society into rich and poor. Consequently, a false standard was applied in all homes, the standard of pride and,

in many as well, the standard of luxury. Hence, in Rome, as in Greece, the same attitude toward labor prevailed; only the evils attendant upon it were more pronounced. According to Roman opinion, only the slave worked, but not the father nor the mother.

Then came Christ, who had worked at the trade of a carpenter, and placed a very different estimate upon labor. Then went forth as His apostles, Peter, a fisherman, and Paul, a tent-maker, both proclaiming that labor was not a disgrace, but an honor; not an unworthy bondage, but a service commanded of all men by God. In place of the cry of the heathen: 'Panem et circenses', the watch word of ^{the} Christian was 'Ora et labora.'

In fact, in contradistinction to Plato and Aristotle, who declared labor to be degrading to a freeman, Paul exhorted everyone to work with quietness, and eat his own bread and categorically laid down this principle: "If any would not work, neither should he eat".¹⁾ Equally so, the 'Apostolic Constitutions' urged industry upon all church members 'For the Lord our God hates the slothful. For no one of those who are dedicated to God ought to be idle.'²⁾ They in particular admonished the young persons of the Church: "Mind your business with all becoming seriousness, that so you may always have sufficient to support yourselves and those that are needy, and not burden the Church of God."³⁾ Likewise, they enjoined upon the bishop to procure work for artisans who were without employment.⁴⁾ In a way the Christian ecclesiae or congregations

1), - 2. Thess., 3:10-12.

2), - Op.cit., Vol. VII, Apost. Const., II, 63.

3), - Idem, Apost. Const. II, 63

4), - Idem, Book IV, 2.

became little fratentities of free laborers and competitors to the great slave-estates. Furthermore, the wealth of private individuals and the treasures of the churches were used to redeem those slaves who were bound to licentious professions as well as to ransom unfortunate captives.¹⁾ The Theodosian Code even urged such a course upon the Christians.²⁾ In addition, the new faith changed many useless servants of Roman Society - the parasite, the pimp, the circus rider, the gladiator, the servant of idols, the low and obscene comedian, and the prostitute - into industrious producers and workers.

Especially the views of the Christian father and mother showed marked changes as a result of the new attitude toward labor in church circles. They looked upon themselves as stewards responsible to God for the employment of their time as well as for the use of their property and wealth.³⁾ They remembered the needs of the family, but likewise those of the poor, the needy, and the traveller. Moreover, the claims for their own person were no longer extravagant, but moderate. Both Clemens and Tertullian describe the Christian mother as displaying, in this connection, three graces, namely industry in her home, simplicity in her appearance, and charity or social service toward unfortunates. She works faithfully in her own home, these Fathers tell us, she dresses herself, husband, and children not gaudily, but becomingly in clothes made by her own hand or directly under her supervision. She does not even consider it, if necessary, a disgrace to turn the handmill herself in order to secure flour for the household; nor does she forget the poor and needy, nor hesitate to render a service to the traveller.⁴⁾ Naturally as idleness was banished

1), - Idem, Book IV, 9.

2), - Cod. Theod. V. 5, 1.

3), - Op. Cit., Vol. V, Cyprian, Treatise II, 11

4), - Op.cit., Vol. II, The Instructor, III, 10, 11; Miscellanies, IV, 20.

Vol. IV, Tertullian, To His Wife, II, 8.

from the home, thrift was given a place of honor; as luxury was frowned upon, modest apparel was made the order of the day; as extravagance in home furnishings was vetoed as sinful, careful stewardship began to direct affairs; and thus, as irresponsible idleness was supplanted by active enterprise and especially contempt for labor by a recognition of the moral value of labor, the old pride was forgotten and in its stead the ideal of service enthroned in the heart.¹⁾

It must not, however, be forgotten that, under the Emperors Severus and Caracalla guilds of artisans arose and free labor gradually gained ground. Nevertheless, the most profound impetus to the rehabilitation of labor was unquestionably given by Christianity. This force gave to the worker, both man and woman, the Lord's Day as a day of rest. Already Constantine had ordered that on Sunday no labor should be performed and that courts and administrative offices should be closed. The same was reiterated by the Theodosian and Justinian Codes. But, above all, the Church gave to both Greece and Rome industrious fathers and mothers, fathers who did an honest day's work and mothers who found joy anew in their home duties, in short, parents who sought not to serve self, but humanity.

1).- Op. cit., Vol. II, The Instructor, II, 3; II, 13, Vol. VII, Teaching of The Apostles, 13; Apost. Const., II, 63.

XI

THE MORAL LIFE

The Greek and Roman worlds were lamentably lacking in self-control, especially when at the height of their glory. There was no dominant spiritual force, such as the Christian religion, with which to hold the natural desires of man within their appointed bounds, so that these, properly directed, might prove a blessing instead of a curse. A doctrine, as that of the Christian religion, that it is criminal to gratify a powerful and transient physical appetite, except under the condition of a life-long contract, was altogether unknown. Purity did not have a seat in the Olympian heaven. Instead, the very Gods of the Greek and Roman religion misled their adherents into immorality.¹⁾ It could not be otherwise when especially the writings of Homer and Hesiod, in Greek literature, served in the nature of a bible and were made the basis of Greek and, indirectly at least, of Roman religion. Here Zeus recounts his many liaisons with other women to Hera, his wife as well as his sister.²⁾ Here the ballad of Demodokos relates the amours of Ares and Aphrodite.³⁾ Here the Hymn of Aphrodite explains that Zeus filled her with a passion for the comely mortal youth Anchises because he had so often fallen a victim to her charms.⁴⁾ Under the circumstances attempts were made to read a mysterious or allegorical meaning into Homer in order thus to counteract the evil influence of his epics. "But", says Plato, "the young person cannot judge what is hidden meaning and what is not, but what one at that age adopts as one of his notions, is wont to prove hard to wash out and incapable of dislodgment."⁵⁾ Consequently, Justin Martyr said to an offended heathen father: "Why are you, being a Greek, indig-

1),- Op.cit., Vol. I, Justin Martyr, Discourse to the Greeks, ch.3 and 4; Vol. III, Tertullian, Ad Nationes, II; 13 and Appendix; Vol. VIII, Recognitions of Clement, 20-23. 2),- Iliad, XIV. 3),-Odyssey, VIII, 269 sq. 4),-Iliad XIV, 35 sq. 5),- Republic, 380.

nant at your son when he imitates Jupiter, and rises against you and defrauds you of your own wife? Why do you count him your enemy, and yet worship one that is like him? Any why do you blame your wife for living in unchastity, and yet honor Venus with shrines?¹⁾ "If a god does it, why should not I, a man?" Pled therefore an adulterer in the writings of Terence.²⁾ "If I could only catch Aphrodite," exclaimed Antisthenes, a friend of Socrates, "I would pierce her through with a javelin; she has corrupted so many of our modest and excellent women." Indeed, she had. The temples dedicated to her promoted lewdness; her priestesses were prostitutes. At one time one thousand women were serving the goddess at Corinth and sacrificing their purity at her shrine.

Though womanhood, in the palmy days of Greece, had lost its treasure of chastity and modesty, in one respect it excelled that of Rome. Wives as a whole were virtuous. Remember, adultery on their part was severely punished; the double standard controlled. 'Milord', could have his concubines and mistresses, and in addition could associate with the hetairae, the cultured courtesans, provided always he could afford it. It was good form, said Demosthenes in his 'Oration Against Neaera': "Mistresses we keep for pleasure, concubines for daily attendance upon our person, wives to bear us legitimate children; and be our faithful housekeepers".³⁾ Socrates himself, according to Xenophon, discussed with the beautiful Theodote, an hetaira, how best she might manipulate and hold her lovers.⁴⁾ Visiting such, as a matter of course, were artists, poets, philosophers, orators, and statesmen, among them Pericles, Lysias, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Parmenides, Menocrates, Aristotle, Speusippus, Aristippus, and Epicurus.

1), -Op. cit., Vol. I., Discourse to the Greeks, ch. 4. 2), -Eunuch, III, 5.

3), -Demosthenes, Orations, Bohn's Classical Library, Vol. V, p. 272

4), -Memorabilia, 3, 11, 1.

Worse than all else, however, was unnatural lust, or the love for boy favorites. It was the practice of the wealthy class, whilst the poor citizens could only waste themselves on concubinage or prostitution. This vice had become a national plague, even early in the historic period. Significant in this respect are already the provisions of Solon, e.g., at what hour the free boy must go to his class room; then, in company with how many boys he must enter and when he must leave. Likewise, no commentary is necessary when Solon directs that the teachers of letters as well as the instructors in bodily exercise are forbidden to open their classroom or wrestling school before sunrise or close it after sunset.¹⁾ The cause of such statutes is well understood. Next, poets treat pederasty with extreme partiality, thus Ibykos and Anacreon. Pindar composes a poem to Theoxenos. It is the subject of comedies by Diphilus and Antiphanes, and also Alkaios and Eubulus make Ganymede their theme. Athaeneus must write: "Both Aeschylus, who was a great poet, and Sophocles brought the amatory passions upon the stage through their tragedies: the one, the love of Achilles for Patroclos, and the other (Sophocles) in his 'Niobe'.²⁾ And even Plato cannot avoid the subject in his Phaedrus, Charmides, Lysis, in the Republic, and especially in the Symposium. Therefore, it is not surprising to find such men of light and leading accused of Sodomy as Themistocles, Lysias, and Aeschines, Pericles and Pheidias, Sophocles and even Epaminondas. Greek genius apparently here celebrates an apotheosis of the animal functions of humanity.

But "Ill fares the land, to hast'ning ills a prey,

Where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

Undoubtedly, Greece was internally decaying whilst externally at the height of its glory. The disease, which was destroying the moral life of the family, was none other than the cancer of immorality.

1), - Solon, 9, 10.

2), - XIII, 601 a.

Rome was equally so a moral leper, particularly Imperial Rome. Here also the wife might with impunity be as profligate as her husband.¹⁾ The Roman matron of wealth might drain to the dregs of pleasure as well as "his lordship". The dry rot of selfishness was, indeed, seizing upon and devouring both of them. A chaste Roman matron, in a society which was imitating loose Asiatic morals, was really a rare and precious woman. Not many husbands and wives were as faithful to each other as Pliny and Calpurnia. Few husbands, in appreciation of a pure wife, could inscribe on her tomb: "You were a faithful wife to me, and an obedient one: You were kind and gracious, sociable and friendly: You were assiduous at your spinning: You followed the religious rites of your family and your state: You did not dress conspicuously, nor seek to make a display of your household arrangements. Your duty to your household was exemplary: You tended my mother as carefully as if she had been your own. You had innumerable other excellencies, in common with all other worthy matrons, but these I have mentioned were particularly yours."²⁾ There were, however, many more immoral husbands and wives. There were also many celibates, at least such in name, despite the tax levied upon them. There were many pederasts. The Romans early adopted a statute called Lex Scantinia de Infanda Venere. The vice entered Rome with Hellenic culture after the conquest of Macedonia, at Pydna, in 168 B.C. Sometime thereafter Polybius wrote: "Some of the young men (of the Roman aristocracy) were in a passion of dissoluteness, some directed at boys, others at courtesans, others were devoted to the entertainment of the ear, and drinking bouts, and waste of money in such pursuits, having quickly seized the laxity of the Greeks for this particular sphere, in the war with Perseus. And so great a dissoluteness had fallen upon the young men in connection with such pursuits that many paid as much as a talent for a boy concubine".³⁾

1), - Rom. 1:23-32. 2), - The Laudatio Turiae. Quoted in 'Roman Home Life and Religion' by H. L. Rogers and T.R. Harley. 3), - Polybius, XXII, II.

Addicted to the same vice were, later, among the Emperors, Tiberius, Trajan, and the Antonines, whilst Hadrian even deified his boy love, Antinous, upon his death. There was wife exchanging. The libelli of repudiation could even aid in making the arrangement permanent. The theatre, the circus, and also the temple were visited to begin and continue amorous intrigues. In Rome alone there were twenty temples of the Venus Voluptas. There were ladies (?) of high birth who had themselves enrolled in the police register as common prostitutes. There were lecherous slaves from the effete East who certainly did not improve the morals of the master and mistress of the Roman household. Moreover, all slaves held their virtue at the will of another. Some were even compelled as libidinous actors to live for the lust of others. At that, often the paintings on the walls and the statuary in ^{the} atrium and in the garden of the Roman home suggested or plainly portrayed filth. Of course, the theatre, especially its comedies and songs, did no better in behalf of a moral home life. If only this sketchy survey were pure fiction! But it is vouched for in the elegies of pornography from the pen of a Catullus, Ovid, and Martial, in the Satires of a Juvenal and Horace, and in the histories on the life of their day by a Suetonius and a Tacitus. Let us turn away from this devolution of society and the home with a few final passages or thoughts from the versatile pen of Seneca: "I see robes of silken stuffs, if they must be called robes, in which there is nothing by which the body or shame can be defended, robes the mistress of which, after attiring herself therein, cannot well swear that she is not naked."¹⁾ Also according to Seneca, Baiae, the favorite watering place of Roman 'society' was no better than Canopus, the watering place of Alexandria, notorious in the ancient world for its immorality.²⁾ There were revels on private yachts. There were music

1), - "De Beneficiis, 7, 9, 5.

2), - Epistolae: 51

and all the allurements of nocturnal dissipation.¹⁾ Finally, he must say: "The same utterance we will always have to make of ourselves; that evil we are, evil we have been, and (unwillingly I must add it) evil we shall be."²⁾

It is not surprising that, in view of such wretched conditions, children were considered a burden, both in Greece and Rome. Consequently, the custom of destroying life in its germ, child murder, the sale of children, and child exposure was a common occurrence. Therefore Menander in his society play 'The Self-tormentor' had Chremes say to his wife: "If you had been willing to carry out my orders you should have killed her" "For abandoned to that old woman by thee was our daughter" "that either she should become a professional courtesan or sold into slavery openly."³⁾ Indeed, exposed children, at least the sturdy, were gathered to be trained as slaves, prostitutes, or hetairae. Hear! Seneca denounced the horrible practice, common in Rome of maiming these unfortunate children, and then exhibiting them with shortened limbs, broken joints and curved backs to the gaze of the compassionate by villanous beggars.⁴⁾ Thus, then, widespread infidelity and all that host of vices, which invariably follows in its wake, engulfed the moral life of the Greek and Roman family.

The early Christians, naturally, set themselves as a wall against this tide of sensuality and brutality. Had not Christ, their Master, taught them the virtue of purity, also masculine purity?⁵⁾ Had not Paul impressed the single standard upon their conscience?⁶⁾ Hence immorality, as also idolatry, blasphemy, murder, fraud and false testimony were punished with exclusion from Holy Communion and, if persisted in, from the church. Moreover, only after a long probation and evidence of earnest repentance could such offenders be readmitted. Hence says Justin

1), -Epistolae: 114,25. 2), -De Beneficiis, 1,10,3. 3), -Hauton Timorumenos, 626 sqq. 4), -Controversi, V,33. 5), -Matth.5:31,32. 6), -1.Cor.7:10,17.

Martyr, "We who formerly delighted in adultery, now embrace chastity alone." ¹⁾ Again he says: "Many, both men and women, who have been Christ's disciples from childhood, remain pure at the age of sixty or seventy years; and I boast that I could produce such from every race of men. For what shall I say, too, of the countless multitude of those who have reformed intemperate habits, and learned these things? For Christ called not the just nor the chaste to repentance, but the ungodly, and the licentious and the unjust."²⁾ The Church unquestionably regarded purity as the most important of attributes.

Though by no means perfect, yet Christian homes stood out as moral oases in a world of filth. The new religion was accomplishing its mission. But might not Stoicism be credited a force able to secure similar moral results? If so, ^{why,} then, did not the 'Enchiridion' of Epictetus or the 'Meditations' of Aurelius rather than the Bible transform the decaying world? There was only the prescription of self-help, that of self-denial, for the vice-ridden, dying patient; here was the great Physician Himself suffering the consequences of the patient's misdeeds and thus redeeming him from the thralldom of vice. There was an external reformation; here a conversion of the heart through faith in the Savior. There was, as motive, the cold duty of conformity to reason; here the love of Jesus moving His disciple not in future to disgrace His name. There was, as goal, restored powers, imperturbability of the soul; here sanctification and final salvation. There was a self sufficient, proud individual with contempt in his heart for weak, misled humanity; here a disciple humble in the knowledge of his own faults, sympathetic with the fallen, and active in their reclamation. There was a creed that might possibly satisfy the exceptional nature; here was a religion for the masses. In short, there was a negative, superficial, reformatory power;

1), - Op. cit., Vol. I, First Apology, 14.

2), - Idem, ch. 15.

here a positive, life giving, aggressive, and therefore victorious force. Consequently, though the emperors under Stoical influence, Domitian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius made some effort to check the nameless vices, it was Christianity which drove them into oblivion.

Furthermore, not only to check race-suicide, but also to secure recruits for his legions, the Emperor Trajan, in 100 A.D., supported 5000 destitute or orphan children at public expense. The Emperors Hadrian, Antoninus, and Marcus Aurelius founded similar benefactions. However, the Christian churches, above all, effectually and systematically provided for exposed children by the establishment of Refuges, or so-called Orphanotrophiae. Moreover, the Christian Emperors, Constantine, Valentinian and Justinian, let us recall, legislated against child exposure. Whereas, formerly, it was the slave's chain or the brothel ("servitas aut lupanar") for this unfortunate class, now under the Church, it was freedom, an education, and the opportunity to set up their own home. Evidently, the religion of Jesus was the force which more than all else could assure pure homes to the State, that is, spouses, who would be faithful 'until death parted them', and parents who would actually sacrifice, if necessary, in behalf of their children.

THE SOCIAL LIFE OF THE FAMILY.

In general, egotism governed the social life of Antiquity. This factor, influenced the mutual relations of husband and wife as well as their attitude toward mankind about them. In this respect both the Greek and Roman world showed some serious defects. The Greek world was above all a man's, or husband's, world. The husband spent his day in the market place, there he discussed public questions, and in the gymnasium outside the city where he played the part of an athlete or of interested spectator, provided the theater or some festival did not engage his attention. The wife remained at home directing the work of the slaves. In fact, the wife was confined to the home with almost Oriental strictness. If, upon permission from her husband, she appeared in public, she was carefully veiled and accompanied either by her husband or, more frequently, by a slave assigned to her by her lord for that purpose. None but prostitutes and hetairae were seen in public unattended, or with head uncovered, and hair cut. Furthermore, though husband and wife usually ate their meals together, on the occasion of a banquet or the visit of a male guest, the wife remained in the gynaeconitis or the women's apartment. So, then, whilst the hetairae were unrestricted, the wife could accept invitations only among those families to which she was related, and had to remain withdrawn in the inner part of the house, where only the nearest relatives were admitted.

Christianity in time improved the social status of the women of Greece. Through the church service and particularly through the love feast, the wife and daughter came in contact with a larger group than her immediate relatives. She was not merely permitted to attend some festival day exercise, as under Paganism. She was, instead, obliged regularly to

attend all Sunday and other special services of the Church. Consequently, the visiting circle was decidedly enlarged. Naturally, she could not go out unattended, or appear in public or at church, without her veil. Had the Christian matron, or virgin, of Greece claimed for herself such freedom from the restraints of established custom, as in this respect is enjoyed in our day, she would thereby have placed herself on a level with the hetairae, or public woman, and brought unnecessary reproach upon the Christian assemblies.¹⁾ Despite these hampering restrictions the woman's world of social contacts immediately widened upon the advent of the Church. In addition, Christianity was opposed to a self-centered life. It demanded love of the fellowman, an interest in his well-being, in his physical and psychical, or spiritual, wellbeing. It demanded such an interest in the neighbor, no matter who he might be, though he be even an enemy or persecutor.

Therefore, along with the widening circle of social contact, the aim for association with the fellowman underwent a material change and naturally manifested itself both in word and deed, in discourse with, and conduct toward, the neighbor. It was the Church which gave its adherents food for thought and for conversation, in this direction, in the instruction which it gave on a wide range of subjects. Consequently above all, the woman's world of discourse now included more than the usual gossip of her former narrow society. Some Isomachus, or Greek husband, could now converse with his wife on something more vital than household management.²⁾ They could now confer with each other even on matter other than a mere intellectual subject. They jointly discussed such new topics as sin and

1) - 1. Cor. 11:13, 15.

2) - Xenophon, 'Economics.'

man's salvation, the salvation of their own souls and that of their children. Hear! The members of the family discuss even the spiritual wellbeing of their slaves, or the slaves quietly gather to pray for the conversion of their master and mistress. Husband and wife might readily invite Pagan friends to a religious gathering in the atrium of their home, but, what would be utterly astounding in that age, also put forth every effort to encompass the conversion of an enemy as well as even arrange to provide for him in his need. Furthermore, home life in general was as we may readily gather, affected by this new interest in the fellow-man, again by no means to the detriment of woman's social position. The Church certainly did not eliminate the common innocent joys of life. There were friendly gatherings and conversation and amusements and instrumental music and the chant, but it could be and was given a new direction. ¹⁾ There was the new poetry in Greek ²⁾ and the new reading matter in Greek, also other than the separate gospels or parts thereof. ³⁾

However, 'The improvement of the social life of the women in Greece' was especially apparent upon the introduction of a then new virtue, a rudimentary virtue, demanded by the Church, the virtue of charity. It was wife and daughter who now, of course properly veiled and attended, frequented the streets and the poorer quarters of the city, as never before, in order to bring relief to the sick and destitute fellowsister. In short, the Church affected the social life of the whole Grecian family, but especially that of its women. Moreover, all were induced thereby to be a

1) - Op. cit., Vol. II, The Instructor, II, 4-7; Vol. IV, The Octavius of Minutius, ch. 31. 2) - Eph. 5:19. "Shepherd of Tender Youth", written by Clement of Alexandria, is the oldest Greek hymn that has come down to us. 3) - Thus, Op. cit., Vol. I, 'The Pastor of Hermas,' 'The Epistle of Clement,' 'The Martyrdom of Polycarp,' etc., etc.

blessing to themselves as well as to others.

The social life in Rome differed materially from that in Greece. In Rome, unlimited social freedom prevailed between the sexes. Consequently, husband or wife, or both, might be seen anywhere in public. Therefore some Faustina's diary, covering a season's gayety, might read: 'Another round of pleasure At the circus, the red won in the first chariot race. I dropped one hundred to Julia. In the second, with the blue runner up, - my luck - Marcus turned over five hundred to me. Apparently Julia made a date with a new sweetheart. Some day her husband will tire of it and divorce her. Oh, well, she doesn't need him' 'The Amphitheater, not much of late ...'the animal baitings are rather tame. Not enough ferocity. So all say. That tiger might have been ripped open wider' 'The gladiatorials are, as Marcella, my friend of the new sect, calls them, 'just gore and murder,' perhaps it's so 'I lost. Spartacus, my favorite, went down. Kill, lash, burn, all about me yelled like maniacs with my coin theirs. Yet the god of the lower world hardly had his hooks in the body to drag it away when my money returned. Righto! No mercy to the wounded? My thumb called for the death of another victim. I'm even with past losses'.....'So to the theatre' 'The 'Attelana', well, fair drollery, but the same old coarse jokes' 'The 'Mimus', some astonishing scene shifting, but Marcella's right, its the follies of our society; only adulteries and amorous intrigues are the staple of the plots. I'mm beginning to wonder what, instead, she sees and hears at her meetings' 'The Saturnalia. Oh, I'm afraid, I am not very much interested in the gods any way. The scenes appeared as riotous as those we witnessed the past spring at Athens, during the Bacchanalia. Too many drunks worshipped (?) at the shrine of Saturn' 'At the banquet of Plautus All were raving over his Aeginetan candelabra. I've really forgotten the price, heard

he paid \$7,500 for a Corinthian bronze vase of exquisite workmanship'....
'I'm surfeited, but Marcella is coming to read to me from a book written
by one Marcus'.

In turn, Pliny in one of his letters wrote: 'Take any day by itself
and it either is, or seems to be, well spent; yet review many days to-
gether and you will be surprised to discover how unprofitable they have
been. Ask anyone: what have you done today? He will tell you: I
was at a friend's who gave his son the (toga virilis'; another requested
me to be a witness to his will; a third asked me to a consultation. All
of these things appear at the time extremely necessary. But when we
reflect that day after day has been thus spent, such employments seem
trifling. ¹⁾ He might have added: 'If life is not spent in frivolity and
dissipation we occupy ourselves with writing, reading, hearing lectures,
composing poems, and admiring those produced by others. He did say:
'During the whole month of April there was scarcely a day in which some
one did not recite a poem'. ²⁾ Again, he might have added: 'Instead of
the Forum or elsewhere, on important business, we go to hear some
rhetorician on morality, or we're off to the baths, our clubs, to talk
about everything and nothing, and then perhaps we are next at some
friends to hear some history or poem. We're declaiming all our life'. ³⁾

Then, came the new religion to the Romans, as it had to the Greeks,
and transformed also here the social life of the people. New reading
matter naturally also here served as food for thought and conversation.
Consequently, in time the encyclopedic filth of an Athenaeus, a Petronius,
and a Juvenal was forgotten. Thousands in time went regularly to divine

1) 'Epistle' I, 9. 2) - 'Epistle' I, 13. 3) - 'Conflict of
Christianity' by G. Uhlhorn, p. 117.

services, the fathers and mothers accompanied by their children, the patricians and the plebeians, the masters and the slaves. Consequently, in time the filth of the theatre disgusted them, nor could they take any interest in gambling, nor enjoy to see murder done in the Arena.¹⁾ Hence in time there went out of existence the theatre, an institution always idolatrous and generally immoral during Antiquity. There was closed the circus as was also the amphitheater, the latter during the reign of Honorius (395-423.) Though other causes aided in this reform, the new faith unquestionably proved itself a powerful leaven.

Furthermore, as in Greece, so also in Rome, public and private social life under Christianity possessed a different aim under Christianity, namely not self-love, but love of the fellowman.

Self-love, indeed, here also found a rival in service. There was, in the first place, a marked difference between believer and heathen especially with respect to the personal appearance of the women. The heathen woman displayed a passion for finery and vanity; the believer manifested a desire for simplicity. In the one case was immodesty; in the other was propriety. There were women who ~~gone~~ at dinner parties; here were wives who dressed to please their husbands. There was an enervated sex, painted, spoiled by art; here were heroines, not even paling at the sight of lions.²⁾ Some might scornfully say, "Ever since she became a Christian, she walks in poorer garb!"³⁾ But said Libanius, had to say it, "What women there are among the Christians."

1) Op. cit., Vol. iii, The Shows, ch. 2. 2)- 1. Tim. 2, 9,10; 1 Pet. 3:3. Op. cit., Vol. ii, The Instructor, iii, 1-3; Vol. iv, Tertullian, To His Wife, ii, 8; Vol. v, Cyprian, Treatise ii, 9,12, 14,15,18,19. 3) - Idem, Vol. iv, Tertullian, on the apparel of women, ii, 11.

Likewise, there was a marked difference in all social gatherings under the new faith. Many practices and customs of an idolatrous nature, at social functions, were naturally at once either entirely eliminated or modified. Hence libations were omitted, or rather grace before meat substituted. There could be no excess at banquets, moderation took its place. Also stark naked promiscuous public bathing, or the bath at home attended by slaves of the opposite sex, could not be tolerated. Purity for the Christian demanded a proper decorum in dress as well as in bathing.) As to all other demeanor, in public and private, not the Aristotelian golden mean was observed, but the Pauline Criterion; "Do those things which are true, and honest and just and pure and lovely and of good report."¹⁾

And the respective attitude in Roman social life, both public and private, toward those of rank or toward the poor, the stranger and the enemy? There was again a decided contrast. Antiquity discoursed much on generosity and hospitality, but back of it all was stark egoism. Hospitality was limited to the rich who could return the favor. The distribution of 'The Sportula' by the rich lord to his poor clients was dictated by self-love. It promoted the splendor of his house; but it also degraded those who gave and those who received, as love was wanting on one side and gratitude on the other.²⁾ Instead, Christians were hospitable irrespective of the station of the individual. They even established hospice homes or Xenodochiae. Letters from distance congregations, certifying that the stranger was a Christian, sufficed as a means of admission into their circles, both private home and church inn.³⁾

2) ^{Phil. 4:8} ~~A Rome, 12:13-21.~~ 1) - Idem, Vol. IV, On the Apparel of Women, II, 13; Vol. V. Cyprian, Treatise XII, III. 3) ^{Rom. 12:13-21;} A Op. cit., Vol. VII, Apost. Const., II, 58; Vol. III, Teachings of the Apostles, ch. 12.

Furthermore, the home was particularly noted for its charity. Regulated, systematic benevolence was also practiced by the Church. Deacons and Deaconesses, after careful examination of the circumstances, arranged their respective lists of orphans, widows, aged, and the poor. The needy were assisted, whilst all were expected to labor to the extent of their ability. As was already urged at the Council of Nice (325), Fabiola, a Roman lady, founded the first hospital for the general public. Finally, Antiquity knew nothing of love for an enemy. Said Plautus: "Man is a wolf to a man whom he does not know"; "Our religion", Justin maintained, "requires us to love not only our own, but also strangers and even those that hate us." ¹⁾ "All men", said Tertullian, "love those who love them; it is peculiar to Christians alone to love those that hate them." ²⁾ They did, and hence under Cyprian, in an epidemic at Carthage, nursed the sick who had been abandoned by the heathen, and buried their dead. They did the same in the time of the Emperor Gallienus at Alexandria, immediately after a horrible persecution.

Such was the spirit animating the Christians in all their social contacts, whether public or private. It could not be otherwise since Christ's word and example was accepted as coming from the constant Friend and Guest of the home. "To sum up all in one word - what the soul is in the body, that are the Christians in the world The soul dwells in the body, yet is not of the body; and Christians dwell in the world, yet are not of the world The flesh hates the soul, and wars against it, though itself suffering no injury, because it is prevented from en-

1) - Op. cit., Vol. I, Justin Martyr, Apology I, 14, 15.

2) Idem, Vol. III, Tertullian, To Scapula, 7.

joying pleasures; the world also hates the Christians, though in no wise injured because they abjure pleasures. The soul loves the flesh that hates it, and loves also its members; Christians likewise love those that hate them The soul is imprisoned in the body, yet preserves that very body; and Christians are confined in this world as in a prison, and yet they are the preservers of the world. The immortal soul dwells in a mortal tabernacle; and Christians dwell as sojourners in corruptible bodies, looking for an incorruptible dwelling in the heavens. God has assigned them this illustrious position, which it were unlawful for them to forsake¹⁾. Our conclusion must be: Christianity was not merely an interpenetration of Greek and Roman life, as Auguste Comte would have it, but a revolution of this life. It was such in particular as a force affecting the social life of the Greek and Roman family. Christian ideals and sentiments governed the social life of the Christian Congregation and the Christian family. In fact, these qualities, especially governed in family life during all persecutions. Under Christianity the house truly became a home, a haven of sympathy and refuge against the adversities of life, particularly so in the manifestation of genuine love toward its own members and those without.

1) - Idem, Vol. I, Epistle to Diognetus, ch. 6.

THE EDUCATION LIFE OF THE FAMILY

Above all, the purpose of education was different under Christianity from that prevalent in Greece and Rome. In Greece, the general end sought was development of the mind and of the body. Consequently, attention was paid to general culture and athletics, to technical preparation for political, civil and social life as well as to military training. However, a difference, with regard to education in Athens and in Sparta must be noted. Whilst both the idealistic and practical elements were emphasized at Athens, also in its higher schools of learning, respectively in the rhetorical schools of the Sophists and in the schools of the philosophers, the practical in the main embraced the Spartan ideal. It was in Sparta also that we, in Antiquity, could find a State supported school, preparing not only the boy, but also the girl for life.

In the Roman world, in turn, matters practical alone possessed value. Military training, law, and, public speaking were therefore important elements of study. However, upon the advent of Paul into the Graeco-Roman world, education took on a new, a higher end and aim. Attention was now paid to the whole nature of man, not only to his physical and intellectual, but also to his spiritual nature. The end sought was the development of man, not merely in his relation to the things of life and to his fellowman, but primarily in his relation to God, in order thereby in turn to determine his attitude to the world about him and to his fellowman. Thus, under the Church, ^{man was} not only to be practical and intellectual, but also ethical, or moral, and religious. Furthermore, education was to be universal. It had to be such in view of the Church's tenet of universal salvation. Education, henceforth, was not only intended for the aristocracy, but mankind; not only for the boy, as in

Greece, but also for the girl; nay, for the slave as well as for the master; for the exposed and orphaned infant as well as for the more fortunate child. Such was the extensive program of the Church that, then in part at least, and more fully after the Reformation, came to be realized.

Though in the realization of the ideal of Greek culture, the Chief agency was not the home, but the school, nevertheless the home, as always in the training of children, played a very significant role. The education of a child began, then as now, with babyhood. The birth of a child was announced by symbols fastened to the door of the house; the advent of a boy, by an olive wreath, indicative of future honors that might be his; the entrance into life of a girl, by a piece of wool, pointing to the household industries to which most of her life would be devoted. Well-to-do mothers seldom suckled their children. Until their sixth or seventh year they had both^a/nurse and a mother caring for them. In the meantime they had playthings to enjoy, such as rattles, go-carts, dolls of painted clay, hoops and tops.

Discipline was not neglected. Parents insisted on prompt obedience and proper decorum in speech and conduct. Otherwise the sandal or slipper was convenient. Mother and slave nurse regularly employed myths and hero tales in order not only to entertain, but also to instruct their charges. Plato, however, had said concerning these very stories based on Homer, "Most of these which are now in use must be discarded."¹⁾ Mother and nurse also referred the children, when obstreperous, to popular bogeys in order to frighten them into docile behavior. Thus the child was told to fear Empusa or Onoskelis or Onoskelon, the monster with

1) - Republic, II, 377.

one human foot and one of brass, which dwelt among the shades of night and glided through dusky chambers to devour maughty children. According to Plato, the approved moral standards guided the home in the training of children. Mother, nurse, father and tutor, then as now, counseled and also quarreled over the improvement of the child. As frequently then as now, it heard; "This is right and that is wrong; do this and abstain from that." Hence Plato again said: "Mother and nurse and father and tutor are quarreling about the improvement of the child as soon as ever he is able to understand them; he cannot say or do anything without their setting forth to him that this is just and that is unjust; this is honorable, that is dishonorable; this is holy, that is unholy; do this and abstain from that. And if he does, well and good; and if not, he is straightened by threats and blows, like a piece of marked wood." ¹⁾ Such influence, particularly on the part of the mother, applied throughout the life of the girl in the home, but only in the early years of the boy. The word of an ignorant and inexperienced mother would unfortunately not carry much weight in the opinion of a boy who through his school was advancing beyond her.

Thus the home shared with the school in the training of the boy. At the age of seven, the brother left the sister at home as he sallied forth to go to school. Always accompanied by his paidagogos or slave-escort, he began to acquire a knowledge of the world and of life. He attended the private school, if at home in Athens; the public, if living in Sparta. He gradually advanced in the school for letters and in the music school; he here studied grammar, inclusive of reading, writing, and arithmetic, next

1) - Republic, II, 325.

paid attention to music, that is, to literature and chorus singing, and likewise to athletics, until that day came when he in his majority was accepted, as fully qualified, into full citizenship. He now visited the public gymnasium, had his military training and enjoyed more fully other educational agencies, such as the masterpieces of Greek art, the religious processions, the pleadings of the law courts, the debates of popular assemblies, the tragedy and comedy of the stage, the Panhellenic games and, last but not least, the School of Rhetoric and the Schools of Philosophy. Undoubtedly this man of learning, this man of the world, was making progress in life whilst his sister had long ago been left far behind, and his mother as well had been unable to follow him. According to Xenophon, the ideal education of a girl demanded of her, "to see as little as possible, to hear as little as possible, and to ask as few questions as possible." But the sister had meanwhile at least been taught cooking, spinning, weaving, and the art of embroidery, in short, house-hold management. However, with such limited training, she was, indeed, 'sorely handicapped when at fifteen, ignorant and inexperienced, she left her home and became the life companion of a cultured husband.

The Roman ideal of culture was markedly different from that of the Greek. It sought to prepare the youth for public life by means of a practical training. Furthermore, the daughter's education was not neglected in the Roman home. Yet in the days of the Caesars, that basic institution, the home, had immeasurably lost in value as an educational force. Its defect in this age was not to be found in the transfer of the training of the child to the school, but in the general disinterestedness on the part of the parent in the future well-being of their offspring. Few mothers then sang at a child's cradle, except some of the wives of the freedmen. The 'lady' preferred a lap dog or perhaps a pet bird. Such

noble matrons as Cornelia, the mother of the Grachi, who herself carefully reared and trained her sons, graced few households in this age of luxury and egoism. Formerly, mothers had nursed and trained their own children, now they turned them over at birth to slaves. Whilst parents in ancient times were the sole teachers of their offspring, they now entirely shirked this sacred responsibility. 'What is done at present by many men', says Plutarch, 'is in the highest degree absurd. They select among their slaves some to work in the fields, some for service at sea, and some to look after their merchandise. They pick out others to oversee their household affairs and still others to manage their finances. But if they happen to have a slave who is given to drink and gluttony, who is in fact good for nothing, to this fellow they assign the oversight of their boys'.

Formerly, parents were discreet in word and action in the presence of the girl and boy of tender age, now they might be lax in conduct and abominable in their speech. The children might find father in the company of his mistress or of some male object of affection. They might hear impure songs coming from the dining-room and even look on things too shameful to narrate. Consequently, the unfortunate children might learn vices before they knew that they were vices. With what success might such fathers attempt to correct their sons? Furthermore, in pre-Punic days the child was raised in rigorous simplicity and trained in those habits of industry and self-control which are so necessary for the preservation of the family and the state. Now they were enervated from their infancy by luxuries. They could crawl about on purple. They could eat whatever their palate craved for or already had been trained to desire. They grew up in sedan chairs and if they touched the ground they were supported by attendants on each side of them.²⁾ Finally, in the atrium of their

1),- Plutarch, 'The Education of Boys' pp. 47-54,

2),- 'Institutes of Oratory', Ch.11, quoted in 'the Family' by W. Goodsell.

patrician home stood the images and waxen masks of their dead ancestors as of old, but tales of their bravery and stories of their devotion to the state were no longer employed to arouse to similar deeds of valor, but rather to develop an undue pride in past achievement and the spineless snobbery that goes with it.

Though also in Rome education had shifted from the home to the schools, the stern moral training of the early Republic lived on in a few families. Horace, for instance, in paying tribute to his father's interest in his education, declared: "If the faults and defects of my nature are moderate ones,..... if (that I may praise myself) my life is pure and innocent and my friends love me, I owe it all to my father. He Himself was ever present, a guardian incorruptible, at all my studies. Why say more?"¹⁾ Some fathers, as the parent of Horace, were solicitous of their son's education. Such would still guide and direct the training of their children. However, they would not, when their sons were six years of age, have them, as of old, as their constant companions visit farm, military field and forum and thus prepare them by actual practice or observation in the school of life for their future tasks. Indeed, education had shifted to schools modelled after the Greek institutions and had become literary and intellectual in character. Hence fathers would now select, and have their boy attend, an excellent grammar school, which had Latin and Greek in its curriculum, and the rhetorical school, whose aim was to train orators and statesmen. Meanwhile the proud father would see his son in his sixteenth year in solemn ceremony, in the forum and the Capitol, exchange the toga praetexta for the toga virilis, become a fullfledged citizen, and continue to perfect himself for the careers open to him on the Campus Martius, in the tribunals of the forum, and even in the Senate.

1),- Satires, I,6.

Unfortunately, only a few fathers cooperated with the school master, most of them shifted the burden of responsibility, as in our day, entirely to his shoulders.

The same criticism applies to the education of girls in Imperial Rome. In the early period of the Republic, the daughters of patricians received a careful home training in their future duties as housewives and mothers. They were also occasionally sent to 'ludi litterarii', or private elementary schools. Now, however, as a rule only the daughters in the home of the middle class were instructed in the use of the spindle, and the loom. The daughters of the higher class were given an intellectual training and taught at home under the direction of tutors. Their education included a thorough command of language, appreciation of the poets and prose writers of Greece and Rome, music, which included voice culture and often also instruction on the lyre, and finally dancing. Unfortunately, again there was little cooperation between parent and tutor. But with the advent of her thirteenth year they did busy themselves about her. They cast about for a husband and, above all, considered his wealth and family connections and not primarily their daughter's happiness. They certainly would not have an unmarried girl of nineteen, an 'old maid', under their roof. Thus the education of Antiquity, as the home shared it with the school, was in the main utilitarian. A comprehensive course in morals and religion was not thought of. The girl was as a rule neglected in Greece, whilst, in Imperial Rome, parents shifted the responsibility for the child's physical and literary learning as well as its moral training, such as it was, to the school. Universal education, including in its scope also all of the middle class and the slaves, was out of the question.

Under Christianity, various fundamental principles were responsible for material changes in the problem of education, as it confronted the home and the school. These ideas in general altered the aim of education,

modified and added to the subject matter of instruction, extended to all mankind the benefits of learning, introduced a new agency in the dissemination of knowledge, in particular secured a mother's hallowed influence for the home in its task of child training, and implanted in both parents a belief in their sacred responsibility for the development of the child's character so that in consequence, they insisted on an all-inclusive nurture or discipline for their child as well as a circumspect conduct on their own part as its exemplars.

The foremost educational principle of the Church, which pointed to man's relation and responsibility to God, especially in view of Christ's redemption, as the dominant motive force of his life, was responsible for a veritable revolution in home and school as well as in state and church. In consequence, a new criterion was introduced for the determination of man's right conduct in the various spheres of life, i.e., of his right attitude in his relations toward superiors, inferiors, and equals. The problem of education could no longer be dominated only by utilitarian or practical values, nor could mere intellectual, aesthetic or idealistic values prove to be the sole determining factor. Also civil and political values could not control all else. The apex of the pyramid of values, according to the Church's program of education, must be none other than its own moral and religious, or in short, spiritual criterion. Heretofore, the question was, what is permitted or prohibited in our particular polis or municipium, or what say the laws of the Twelve Tables? Consequently, the life of the individual, the conduct of husband toward wife and child, as also of master toward slave, the attitude toward heathen worship, or loyalty to the state, - in particular, though unjustly so, that of the Christian, - was interpreted as good, bad or indifferent by the yardstick of this custom or that law. Accordingly, a

mere political or civil righteousness sufficed, namely, customary morality, a purely external or orthodox conformity to law. Political virtue, or the external righteousness of the pharisee, was glorified as if it had been sanctioned by the gods. Under Christianity, however, a higher morality was required, a morality based, as the inevitable result of faith in Christ's redemption, not merely in general on the relation of man to God, but specifically on that of a child to its Father.¹⁾ Hence a morality was required as characterized by Christ's interpretation of the Ten Commandments in His sermon on the Mount:²⁾ accordingly a life including a pure heart,³⁾ a conduct motivated by love and mercy toward others as brothers,⁴⁾ and an allegiance to God and Christ, as Father and Savior, which would necessarily excel all other loyalties.⁵⁾

Next, the subject matter of instruction, whether in home or school was necessarily affected by the Church's foremost educational principle of man's relation or responsibility to God in view of Christ's redemption. It at once required a modification of existing programs of education, wherever outlined for the observance of home and school. Naturally, the Church could not, in its day, materially affect the Pagan School; it was and largely remained for the inculcation of secular branches, a private enterprise throughout antiquity. It set up, however, for^{use in} the Christian home and its own Charity School and, above all, in its catechumenical School or Catechumenate, a comprehensive moral and religious course of instruction. The subject matter of the course was presented by means of the Socratic method under such general heads as the ten commandments, the creed, and the Lord's prayer.⁶⁾

1), - Gal.3:26-29. Op.cit., Vol.II, The Instructor, I, 6. 2), - Matt.5-7. Op. cit., Athenagoras, A Plea for the Christians, ch.11, 32. 3), - Matth.5:8, 28. Op.Cit., Vol.IV, Tertullian Against Marcion, IV, 16, 17. 4), - Matt.5:43, 44. 5), - Matt.6:33; Acts 5:29. 6), - Op.cit., Vol.VII, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles; Apost. Const., IV, 1-3; VII, sec. III.

Furthermore, man's relation and responsibility to God as well as his equality before the Cross on account of an equal need, called for universal education, according to the Church. Heretofore, the beneficiaries of learning had been largely confined to the aristocracy, including in Greece, moreover, only the boy of the household. Under Christianity, all limitations in this respect were removed. Hence all classes, irrespective of color and race, whether parent or youth, whether bond or free, were admitted by the Church to its Catechumenical School. The latter was particularly a strong institution in the fourth century. Attendance over an extended period of time was necessary in order that candidates of baptism might be admitted as intelligent and efficient members into the Church. A thorough religious training was necessary since the Church expected to make many and varied demands, especially in periods of persecution, upon the time and ability of its members. Likewise, if the gospel was actually intended for all, and if every Christian was not merely in name a king and priest before God, a thorough instruction was indispensably necessary, in order through the new member to realize the missionary commission of the Church. Consequently, parents, once received, were required to convert their home into a school, to disseminate here the acquired knowledge, and thus transform its atmosphere.

Under this general requirement a new agency also entered the field of education, the Church. Not only did the Church convert the Christian home into a school in parvo, it also established, aside of the Catechuminate, its own Charity School for the education of slaves and children under her tutelage, particularly of orphaned and abandoned children. These schools, presided over by efficient matrons and deaconesses as teachers, reared and educated boys and girls under its new curriculum, and finally sent them forth, the boys fitted for a trade

and the girls to be efficient housewives or deaconesses. Those preparing for a position in the Church could attend its so-called Catechetical Schools or Seminaries, at such large centers as Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Rome, and thereupon enter the ministry or diaconate. The Church assuredly took an extraordinary step in its day when insisting upon universal education and, as best as it might in the early Christian era, attempt to realize this program. What would have happened if the rulers or the archai of Athens had been asked to tax the rich in order that slaves might be educated? What if the Roman Senate had been petitioned to provide teachers for the plebs and the famuli? Would Cato's persistent 'caetero conseo' have been more frequently heard in behalf of their cause? Thus the Church on its part extended the opportunity for a moral and religious training, as it never had been attempted and, especially in its Charity School, provided both a secular and religious education for those upon whom, in the past, no such effort had been expended. Unfortunately, no school system akin to the idea of the Charity School with its curriculum covering both secular and religious subjects, was elaborated for the youth of the Church at large or the youth of the diocese. Most children of Christian homes continued to frequent the private school for the secular branches and there in many instances sat at the feet of Pagan teachers, whilst they secured their religious training both at home and in the Church. The establishment of a school, teaching both secular and religious subjects and admitting both boys and girls to such a liberal education, had to await the period of the Reformation.

Above all, the Church secured a mother's hallowed influence for the task of child training.¹⁾ It had elevated her status in the Greek

1), - Op.cit., Vol.IV, Tertullian, To His Wife, II,8.

home and in general reinstated her, as her husband's helpmate, also in the education of the children. Furthermore, the mother was now as well informed as the father, under the common instruction by the Church, on the proper relation of parent to child and child to parent as well as their joint relation and responsibility for all their life to God. Consequently, she could and did intelligently assert herself with an eye especially to the spiritual well-being of the child. Moreover, the house was not now divided against itself on the question of child training. The father was no longer the absolute monarch, to whom final appeal could be made, in order to nullify perhaps a mother's best intentions. Joint counsel was taken on the welfare of their children. Also the boy, as in Greece, soon discovered that his mother was an authority in the home. The father's changed attitude toward the mother not only so informed him, but above all, his insistence on obedience to her word as well as on respect and honor for her from the children in the home. Such united action went far to eliminate a child problem in the home. Indeed, many ideal Christian mothers were found in the early Church, such mothers who were fully aware of the seriousness of the problem involved in the development of character, and recognized that Christian patience and above all Christian love were necessary thereto. In consequence, they on their own part received such a schooling as teachers in their homes that it was not surprising later to find many of them, during periods of persecution, not only nobly confessing their faith, but also dying for it as heroines in the arena. At any rate, Pagan biography knows nothing of such mothers as are honored in Christian biography. No Pagan author expresses such profound respect for his mother as does, for instance, Augustine in his 'Confessions'. Under Christianity, as never before the mother was a power for good in the development of the character, and that a Christian character, of her children.

Finally, as never before, both parents, under the teachings of the Church, were convinced of their mutual responsibility to God for their introduction and reception of children into their home. Hence they were jointly intent upon their nurture and discipline as well as upon a circumspect conduct, above all, in their presence. Christian parents, indeed, believed the child to be a blessing come from God and themselves trustees responsible to God for its nurture and discipline.¹⁾ Neglect of the child involved them, in their firm conviction, in deserved divine punishment. Early the child was taught to list the name of Jesus. It said its "Abba, amen" as its grace at meat. It early heard of the love of Jesus for children and was informed that Jesus, since omnipresent and omniscient, saw and heard everything that children did and said and, in case of persistent disobedience, could not call them His own nor receive them into His heaven. Discipline, if necessary, was not spared. Above all, the immoral myths and fables of Paganism were replaced by the fascinating and ethically pure stories from the Old and New Testaments, all ~~indeed~~, stories which invariably teach their own wholesome lesson. Moreover, the Church held the home responsible for the whole education of the child; particularly, its religious education on the basis of a simple interpretation of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer.

Equally so, parents held themselves responsible to God for their own conduct in the presence of their children. In the Christian home excess was avoided in the use of the necessaries of life, of whatever

1),- Op. cit., Vol.I, Ignatus to the Philadelphians, 4; Vol.VII, Apost. Const., II,2; Vol. II, The Instructor, III, 12 also 10, 11.

pertained to food, drink, and dress. The same rule applied to social intercourse with friends, with regard to the language and the songs employed. Children no longer saw their parents frequenting the circus or theatre; instead they accompanied them on their visits to the sick and needy and discovered how one might prove himself a missionary in behalf of the Church. Despite persecution they found them loyal to the government and praying for its preservation as well as for a change in its attitude toward the Church. They beheld them accepting both joy and sorrow as a blessing from the Lord and thus proving themselves Christian optimists, for whom "all things must work together for their good." At last, they saw their parents depart this life, and heard their final prayer in which they bade the Lord to preserve their children in the faith, in order that they all might be united again, on the great resurrection morning, in heaven. Thus parents, as Christian exemplars, not only prepared their children for a life on earth, but also for the life to come. Thus, indeed, the whole educational life of the family found no parallel in Grecian and Roman homes prior to the advent of Christianity.

XIV

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF THE FAMILY

Greek and Roman families, as regards their religious life, differed only in minor details from each other. Both represented so many closely knit religious organizations. Characterizing both of them as such were the following elements: A definite membership; the office of a priest, the worship of family gods, particular places and days for religious exercises, as well as sacred daily rites and special ceremonies for special occasions. The members united into a "community of the same domestic gods,"¹⁾ were all those who by birth, adoption, and marriage came under the power of the father. The priest of the *sacra familiae* or family worship was the head of the household. He, as its representative, officiated at all religious exercises. The family gods worshipped were the departed ancestors or *lares*, including the *Lar familiaris*, the founder of the house, next the divinities of the larder or *Penates*, among which especially *Vesta*, the fire-goddess, and finally the *genius* of the *paterfamilias* or of the household, a tutelary deity or guardian spirit,²⁾ especially the procreative spirit responsible for the continuity of the family. The equivalent family gods in Greece were *theoi genethlioi*, *pater genethlios*, *Zeus Herkeios*, *Hestia*, and *demon*, the latter the guardian spirit so frequently referred to by Socrates in Plato's *Apology*. The *Lares*, as departed spirits resting in their necropolis and in the underworld, were likewise known to the Romans as *manes*. All the household

1), - Plato, *Laws*, V, 729 (Jowett Trans.) 2), - Varro, quoted by St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, VII, 13; Appuleius, *On the Demon of Socrates*, 15; Karl Kircher, *Die sakrale Bedeutung des Weines im Altertum*, p. 74 sqq., Giesen, 1910; *Op.cit.*, Vol. III, Tertullian, *A Treatise of the Soul*, ch. 39.

gods, the Lares, the Penates, Vesta and Genius were accepted as guardian powers, in the spirit of the old Roman worship.¹⁾

The place for household worship was usually the atrium, because here the altar-hearth was located, and at stated times also the ancestral tomb, because here the urn with the ashes, or the coffin with the remains, of the departed was preserved. Moreover, above the altar, as in the nature of a reredos, was found the shrine (lararium), containing the images and statues of the household Gods. In the more pretentious home of the Imperial period a chapel, or lararia, was provided for both altar and shrine. Naturally the shrine in the atrium, or the chapel, also held the statues of superior Gods, in particular the patrons of domestic affairs, such as Jupiter and Juno, the Greek Zeus and Hera, Whilst everyday was a day of worship for the family, special days were also observed. Thus Rome especially remembered the household gods on the Calends, nones, and Ides of each month and particularly on the memorial days of the year, or Parentalia, extending from midday February 13 to February 21, the day of the Feralia. In Greece, certain days were set aside for the same purpose.

Finally, special ceremonies were had on special occasions, particularly at the formal naming of a child, at weddings, and at funerals. At the Greek ceremony of Amphidromia, held at the time when the child was five or seven days old, the nurse, in carrying the infant around the sacred hearth of the home, introduced it to both the living and the departed ancestors of the family, and the father formally acknowledged the child as a member of the family and promised to rear it. Again on the tenth day, at the second festival in behalf of the new member, the father offered a solemn sacrifice at the family altar, to insure ancestral blessings before,

1),- Op. Cit., Vol. VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen, III.

formally giving a name to his child. Relatives and friends on this occasion also showered presents upon the infant and sat down to a gay banquet. Similarly at Rome, the child was laid at the father's feet soon after its birth and thereupon, if it was not exposed, taken up by him in the supposed presence of the ancestors. The father by this act (*susceptio*) acknowledged the child as his own and admitted it to all those rights and privileges which membership in a Roman family implied. Meanwhile during the infant's first week, offerings were made to Juno Lucina in its behalf. Likewise, the ninth day after the birth for a boy and the eighth day for a girl, the father offered a sacrifice and performed the ceremony of purification (*lustratio*). At this time he also gave the child its personal name or *praenomen*. Friends, at this festival, presented small metal trinkets and especially *lunulae*, or figures shaped like a half-moon, to the child in order thus to protect it against witchcraft, or the evil eye (*fascinatio*). In turn, the *bulla aurea*, i.e., a round medallion of gold containing an amulet, was given the child on its first birthday by the father for the same purpose. All were worn, suspended from the child's neck, until the day on which the boy assumed the *toga virilis* and the girl left her home as a bride. Birthdays were certainly celebrated. On such occasions incense was burned, a libation of wine offered up to the family gods, and a pig slain.

Above all, religious exercises were observed at weddings and funerals. The Greek wedding was not celebrated without its sacrifice. The father of the bride himself offered it in his home before her departure to the gods of marriage, to Zeus, Hera, or Artemis. Moreover, the gall of the victim was carefully removed so that no bitterness might mar the married life of the young couple. Furthermore, after the bridal procession, both in Greece and Rome, bridegroom and bride at once drew near to the family altar in their own home and worshipped the domestic gods. The young wife sprinkled

lustral water on the hearth and stretched forth her hand to the sacred fire whereupon prayers followed which commended her to the gods of her new hearth and home. Likewise, eating the cake of sesame seeds at this time symbolized communion with each other and with the domestic divinities. However, only one officially religious rite accompanied the Roman wedding. It was customary, during the wedding ceremony to have the auspices taken by a priest. Finally in Rome, on the day after the wedding, during the second feast provided only for intimate friends and relatives, the bride made her first offering to the gods as matrona.

The Greek and Roman funeral, in turn, likewise contained many similar features. Honorable burial was by all means accorded the dead. In extreme cases, three hands full of dust must at least technically cover the corpse.¹⁾ Otherwise the soul would haunt the home and bring evil upon its inmates. Accordingly, the body was laved, anointed, clothed, crowned with a chaplet, and laid out in the vestibule with the feet toward the door. A coin, the obol in Athens, was placed between the lips, - the pocketbook of the ancients, - as a fee to Charon for rowing the departed spirit across the river Styx. About the bier were placed the vases and other personal effects, which later were to be deposited in the grave. Prior to burial, the fire was extinguished in the house. Furthermore in Greece, branches of laurel and acanthus were suspended over the doorway, whilst in Rome a bough of pine or cypress was erected before the door to warn all passing by, especially religious functionaries, for whom any contact with death was strictly taboo, that a corpse lay within. Meanwhile also, the corpse was watched day and night by its natural guardians until the hour for burial arrived. In Rome, burial usually took place on the third day, but at night by torchlight,

1), - So in the 'Antigone' of Sophocles.

in Greece a little before dawn. On this third day a eulogy might also be delivered in the home or at the tomb by a male member of the family, next of kin to the deceased. However, an oration was held in the Forum, and that during the day, in the event of the death of a senator or some high official. The funeral procession usually went from the home to the tomb in the following order: musicians, mourners who sang the dirge and uttered lamentations, the body on its couch, the immediate relatives, and finally the friends. Thus all accompanied the remains to their last resting place,¹⁾ either the place of cremation,²⁾ or the place of burial. At the funeral of a prominent Roman citizen, the dead man's ancestors were, in addition, impersonated by actors who marched immediately ahead of the funeral couch and wore the respective war masks of these worthies as well as the dress appropriate to their time and station. At the tomb a last farewell was pronounced. Three times was spoken: "We commit the spirit to its tomb and call it for the last time with a loud voice." Thereupon waters of purification were thrice sprinkled over those present. Furthermore, upon the return from the tomb, the house was purified by an offering to the domestic gods. On the evening of this same day, a funeral feast, in Greece, was celebrated in honor of the dead. Upon the ninth day at Rome, in turn, an offering was made at the

1),- In Rome along the Appian Way; at Athens, beyond the Dipylon Gate, on the road near the Sacred Way leading to Eleusis. 2),- Cremation by the time of Augustus was all but universal, but even in Rome the practice of burial was never entirely discontinued, since cremation was too costly for the poor. Hence burial societies were organized.

tomb and followed by a feast, at which the mourning dress was put off and gala attire donned. Likewise, the anniversary of death and burial as well ^{as} certain other memorial days, in honor of the departed, were observed. On such occasions the relatives visited the tomb and made offerings of flowers and of salt cake of bread soaked in wine. The masses, however, laid their dead silently away. For the poor, the bodies were flung uncoffined in common pits.

We have, accordingly, before us a formidable array of religious elements which unquestionably stamp the family as a religious organization. What, next, were the outstanding characteristics of family worship, considered under the aspects of its basic form, its chief purpose, and the foremost means employed to attain its end? What, in the first place, was the *sacra privata* as to its nature? In this and many other respects, family and national religion, both Greek and Roman, resembled one another. They were, of course, polytheistic and anthropomorphic in form. There were groups of divinities, each of which in addition had its supreme head, Zeus and Jupiter occupied this position in the Roman religion and the Graecus ritus, whilst the *Lars familiaris*, the founder of the house, was considered in a similar capacity. Likewise, human attributes were ascribed to all of them, naturally so in the case of the *Lares* and *Penates*.

More than all else, the *sacra familiae* was plainly ancestor-worship, whilst this element was likewise by no means wanting in the national rites. The home, indeed, worshipped other divinities aside of the departed spirits, however, principally the patrons of domestic affairs among the superior gods, who themselves were united to one another by family ties. Thus the domestic shrine included among its images the statues of Jupiter, the Father, and of Juno, the mother, of the divine family. In fact, ancestor-worship appears to have been the earliest rite among Greeks and Latins.

There is at least no doubt about it that the character of family religion, as ancestor worship, strongly influenced the sacra publica. Greek personal divinities were grouped in certain relationships around and under a supreme father of gods. The Olympian patriarchal family comprised, aside of Zeus as its head, his wife, Hera, his son Apelles, his daughter Athena, his brothers Poseidon and Hades, and others related to Zeus as well. The Roman heaven, upon the introduction of the Greek gods through syncretistic identification, was similarly organized.

Above all, Jupiter and Zeus were considered the father of the land; at least some divinity was worshipped in the capacity of founder or father in every country and city, and the specific furniture of the family religion was employed in the public rites. Thus Perseus was worshipped as the founder and patron of Attica, Palæas Athene, of Athens, and Romulus, of the city of Rome. Jupiter Capitolinus was honored as the head of the Roman State and Zeus Olympus as the father of Greece. Quite significantly too, not only the home, but also the state as well as each community had a hearth dedicated to Vesta. The public hearth for the whole Latin people was located at Lanuvium near Rome, that of the city of Rome in the Forum. Moreover, on public as on private hearth, the sacred fire was kept burning. Rome also had its temple dedicated to the national Penates near that of Vesta. Similarly, as the home had its Lares domestici, so each locality or nation had its Lares publici. Under the Empire, we discover a genius ascribed also to public institutions and groups of people, such as the senate and the plebs. That ancestor-worship was no mean factor as a dominant character of religion is also evident from the remarks of generals addressed to their troops prior to battle. Often they called to the minds of their soldiers, to inspire them, that, as of old, their common ancestral deities would proceed with them against the enemy and lead them to victory. Finally, the character of the family religion, as ancestor

worship, apparently permitted it to outlive the national religions. It included at least an element of natural piety which the national cults severely lacked. Hence the curtain was rung down on the Graecus ritus in the historic period and on the Roman religio during the late Republic. In both instances the gods were primarily consigned to Hades through a deserved criticism of their shameless immorality and human impotency. At least amid similar denunciations, Lucretius, Propertius, and Ovid effectually buried the corpse of a dead religion. Family religion, instead, survived as late as the fourth century. Amidst the burial of the religio publica, Cicero, for instance, still found comfort in the elements of ancestor worship. He still believed in the deities of the household and the spirits of the dead, in the protecting deity of Rome, and the spirit of the everlasting hearthfire of the city. Ancestor worship was not even obscured by the inrush of Oriental cults. It finally gave way only to Christianity.

What, furthermore, was the chief purpose of family or ancestor worship? The same as that of the national cult. Gold, power, individual gratification, and prosperity were the ends sought through the instrumentality of religion. In short, also the keynote of the cult of the Lares and Penates was merely material success. For this reason the worshipper, whether in the home or in the temple, sought to retain the favor of the Gods, or the pax deorum. For this reason he hoped for some favorable sign from them to foretell the future, some good omen which, for instance on his wedding day, might indicate a happy married life, or which, in some business venture, might promise an acceptable profit. For this reason - oh horrors! - the worshipper must not slight the shades of the departed, incur their ill will, transform them into malignant demons and heap misfortune upon himself. So then he must, perfunctorily at least, worship the gods, and ordinarily the dollars ought to roll into his pocket.

On the other hand, he might in every other respect be a conscienceless scoundrel toward his fellowmen. What of it? He was prospering and getting on the world. There was the evidence of divine favor.

Consequently, no other criterion than good fortune was necessary. Indeed, to make man virtuous was not the function of religion, neither of domestic nor of national religion. It was deemed altogether foreign to its sphere. Therefore no attempt was made to incorporate the ethics of the philosophers into any Pagan religion. In the days of Cicero, the Twelve Tables had even been eliminated from primary education. There was no conception of sin or of man's responsibility to God for all this life. The father taught his son, under the caption of religion, nothing else than a scrupulous observance of the ritual. In fact, he could not do much else. There was no accepted model of perfection, ^{to which} /to refer his child, among his forefathers, no matter how reverently he might speak of them. The moral standards of his ancestors were far from perfect, though they might in some respects eclipse those of the Olympian household. Assuredly, the gods canonized by the family were not much better or worse than their prototypes in the Roman Pantheon. Cicero and Varro could only say that there is too much agriculture in religion. Plato at least demanded that only an expurgated edition of Homer's 'Iliad', the source book on the lives of the gods, be employed in the schools, Aeschylus in his drama, the 'Choephoroi', attempted to endow Olympus with veracity and ascended to the conception of a universal god, but still retained the legendary concupiscence. Arnobius, a Church Father, defiantly declared: "Yours gods abound in passion; some are drunkards, others are murderers, and multitudes are licentious."¹⁾ Many Church Fathers criticized also the

1), - Op. cit., Vol. VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen.

mystery religions and insisted that they were only schools of corrupt immoral superstitions.¹⁾ At all events, the object of both family and national cult was not to improve man morally, but only to insure material success to him.

Finally, what were the foremost means employed, under domestic worship, to secure the favor, or the peace, of the gods? Certain formulas, as under the national cult, were prescribed by convention or custom for the maintenance of the pax deorum, such as the vow, prayer, lustration, sacrifice, libation, and the ritual. Vows were made since it was thought that the gods would sell their kindness and favor. Therefore, provided the deity would grant the desired matter to the home or the commonwealth, as the case might be, the father, in turn, would bind himself by vow to provide a new statue for the shrine; or the state perhaps promise to build a temple, to dedicate an altar, or to vote a magnificent chariot in which the god should henceforth attend the games. Prayers were said, frequently the one recorded by Tibullus: "Keep me, Lares of my fathers; for ye bred me to manhood when, a tender child, I played at your feet."²⁾ In connection with libations we hear: "Let the deity be worshipped with wine which we bring."³⁾ Lustrations were connected with sacrifices and other ceremonial rites; these were supposed to possess cleansing power. Therefore worshippers were sprinkled with water by means of a branch of laurel or olive and in Rome sometimes by means of the aspergillum. The infant was ceremoniously laved on the day on which the father named it. Mourners were in particular purified in this manner before their return

1),- Idem, Arnobius Against the Heathen, V, 24-30. 2),- Tibullus, 1, 10, 15. 3),- Op. cit., Vol. VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen, VII, 31.

from a funeral. Above all, sacrifices were offered to the gods; these were considered the best means for their propitiation. The offerings for the Lares consisted of lambs and swine. Furthermore incense, gruel, and flesh were given the household gods on the Festival of the Parentalia.¹⁾ Nor was such honor offered only occasionally; the domestic gods were daily worshipped. At midday silence was enjoyed after the first and chief course, and an offering of a part of a salt cake, which stood on a table in front of the hearth, was thrown on the fire from a ~~small~~ small sacrificial plate or dish. Besides, especially so on festival occasions, the images were decorated with wreaths, flowers were placed before the shrine, and incense was burned in honor of the Gods. But whatever was done, was not done haphazard.

The folks of the days of Augustus were all ritualists. For instance, the religio Terminorum or the ceremony of Terminus included the following directions: Garland the boundary stone; build ~~an~~ altar; have the mater-familias, the priestess of the family, carry fire from the hearth of the homestead; let the son of the family hold a basket full of fruits of the earth; let the little daughter shake these into the fire and offer honey cakes; the father is to sacrifice a lamb and a suckling pig and sprinkle the stone with blood; the ceremony is to end with a feast and hymns in honor of holy Terminus. Thus naturally, also the child was taught its family religion. In fact, sons in Greek and Roman homes were supposed to serve as camilli or acolytes. But what we especially note in this connection, precedent determined every step in the ceremony.

Nay, more, the efficacy of the means employed depended upon punctilious conformity to ancestral tradition. Herein consisted the essence of family and of national cult. A priest in the home; or in the

1), - Op. Cit., Vol. VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen, VI, 37.

temple, was only efficient provided he was letter-perfect. Religion, or its rites, was wholly a mechanical or an external affair; it was in the nature of a contract between man and god. If the father in the home, or the commander-in-chief, expected a specified service from the gods, both must keep their account with them in order. Consequently, to insure the efficacy and potency of the means, man must under all circumstances conserve and faithfully reproduce and reenact the sacred forms and ceremonies according to the ways of the fathers. Says Cicero, "Or if a player has halted, or a flute-player has made a sudden pause,..... or if the aedilis has blundered by a single word or sacrificial-cup, then the games have not been performed correctly, and these mistakes are atoned for, and the minds of the immortal gods are appeased by repetition."¹⁾ What, at that time, was prayer? According to Wissowa:²⁾ "Prayer..... is not so much an independent act of piety, as rather the oral declaration which of necessity must go with every religious act and offering, a declaration which renders the religious legal transaction on the part of the mortal perfect, and, if uttered in the correct form, compels the divinity (called upon) to take an active interest in the matter." What, at that time, was rite and ritual? Ritus, says Festus, "is an established manner in performing sacrifices."³⁾ Furthermore, the efficacy of prayer and sacrifice was ever dependent upon an approach to the right god by such means. Thus, for instance, only if Faunus be propitiated, will flocks grow fast, if this goddess, will the child grow rapidly, if that goddess, will the ailment vanish. Conformity, then, to tradition was the prime requisite; it alone made the means efficacious. Any improvement

1),- De Haruspicum Responso, '23, quoted in 'Testimonium Animae' by Sihler, p. 351. 2),- 'Religion and Kultus der Roemer,' p.353, quoted in 'Testimonium Animae' by G. Sihler, p.353. 3),-Quoted in same, p. 346.

of the moral state of man, the conscience of the worshipper, was no concern of religion. In short, in place of piety, petrified, lifeless formalism prevailed; a form of magic, supposed to work ex opere operato, ruled in religion.

Consequently, many devices dictated by superstition were also employed by the family. What else were such gambling schemes as turning up a page in a sibylline book or consulting the oracle of Delphi in Greece or of Praeneste in Italy, in order to secure chance guidance for any enterprise? What else were auspices and auguries, namely, divination by reading the flight of birds, the phenomena of the sky, or the entrails of animals? Will the gods by such chance measures enable us to know their will in case of chronic disease, or childlessness, in case of draught or failure of crops? Why should misfortune await us if a strange black dog enters the house? Why consider it a good omen when we find a raven at our right and a crow, or a woodpecker at our left? Why should a child at its birth be liable to vexation from Silvanus, or evil, and mischievous woodland spirits, and why in particular should it take three men to strike the door sill respectively with axe, pestle, and besom to prevent their entrance? Why should an amulet or the bulla aurea about the neck prove a peculiar defensive armor of childhood against the imaginary evil eye? Why, in the wedding procession, should a torch of whitethorn, moreover, carried by none other than a boy whose parents were both living, particularly protect against a fancied hostile magic? Why, in order to prevent a dead man's return, should it be peculiarly necessary to carry him out of the house feet foremost? ^{likewise, for this same reason,} Why must/all funeral rites be punctiliously observed and finally the home be ceremoniously purified? After all, not all members of the family could be buried, exactly as this custom prescribed. In the course of generations, some male member might be reported as lost after an engagement in war or upon a shipwreck at sea.

On that account some spirits would necessarily remain unburied according to Pagan conception, in consequence would still, disconsolately and with an evil will, be roaming about over the earth. Hence the Roman Festival of Lemuria was celebrated on the ninth day of May to avert any possible danger from the living members of the family. But why, on that occasion, should the father of the family at midnight walk in his bare feet, spit out black beans without looking backwards, and exactly nine times recite the charm: "With these I redeem me and mine"? Why, ^{furthermore,} after clanking brazen vessels, should he be able to dismiss the spirits of the dead with the formula, again nine times repeated: "Depart ye Manes of my fathers?" Assuredly, also family religion was overlaid with superstition. Neither its purely conventional means, nor ritualistic conformity, nor superstitious schemes of mere chance could positively assure even material, if no higher, happiness to the family. At all events, it was nothing but a superstition. Though it survived the national cults, it likewise was a failure. As regards its nature, it was polytheistic and morally imperfect; as to its purpose, it was materialistic and external; as to its means, it was formal and superstitious. The religious life of the family failed to supply the foremost and highest needs of the home. Instead of bread it provided a stone; instead of a fish, it gave a serpent; instead of an egg, it offered a scorpion.

Christianity, in turn, supplied those fundamental elements which heretofore had totally been lacking in the religious life of the family, and thus, in consequence, transformed the home in every direction. It signally differed from Greek and Roman external religion in point of form, as to end or aim, and as to the means necessary to realize the end. In fact, in this respect the Christian religion excelled in every way all religions of the Pagan world. Hence to come under the influence of this religion, necessarily resulted in vital changes in the life of the

individual and the family, in the conversion of a Pagan into a Christian and of his house into a home. What exactly was Christianity, in contrast to Greek and Roman domestic and national cult, in order so to effect the whole life of man and of the family? What was it as to form, end, means effective to reach the end, and particularly as to the resultant changes in the religious life of the family?

As to form, Christianity was unique; it stood in a class by itself. Indeed, as the Church Fathers in their apologies sufficiently emphasize, it was not one of many religions; it was the only religion.¹⁾ Indeed, it must be a universal religion and as such in the end supplant all other religions. Consequently, it was not to be limited to the narrow sphere of the home, as the Greek and Roman domestic cult, and act as a subservient appendage to family life. Nor was it to be geographically limited and play the part of some national religion. In short, it was to be a religion for all nations the world over. Furthermore, it was not, as formerly the Greek religion, merely to interpenetrate or succumb to a fusion with Pagan religions. There could be no such syncretistic union; there could be no exchange of elements and consequent modification of parts. At best only resemblances between the new and the old might be discovered. In short, the new religion must not merely infuse, but entirely supplant the old.²⁾

But why this uncompromising attitude toward all other religions during the early Christian era? Christianity insisted that it not merely contained, as the old Greek and Roman Paganism, a few kernels of truth amid a world of filth and rubbish. It declared itself, as to form,

2), - Op.cit., Vol. VII, Lactantius, Divine Institutes, IV, 28-30.

1), - Op. cit., Vol. VII, Lactantius, Divine Institutes, I, 19; Vol. VIII, Recognitions of Clement, V, 30-35.

to be the whole truth and nothing but the truth.¹⁾ Consequently, since all this Graeco-Roman superstition must be falsehood,²⁾ not even unionism could be practiced, i.e., no one could be or remain a member of one or several mystery religions and at the same time also of the Christian religion. Such an affiliation would bar from Holy Communion and invite discipline. Neither could anyone live both the Pagan and the Christian life. The hypocrisy of the ^{Dr.} Jeckyl and Mr. Hyde type could only disgrace the new religion and, if persisted in, end in the excommunication of the offender. External connection no longer determined membership; it must, henceforth, be unity both in faith and life. But where was the proof of the truth of Christianity? It was unique particularly in this respect: it could point, for its origin, to a divine revelation³⁾ and, for its purity and perfection, to the monotheistic character of its Deity and to the sublime morality, both as exemplified and ~~exam~~ commanded by its God and Founder. So much at least also the Graeco-Roman religion claimed for itself, namely, to be heaven-sent, though Homer and Hesiod as well as their disciples, Emmius and Virgil, were responsible for its theogony; it insisted on age and on an origin in hoary antiquity.⁴⁾ However, the Christian religion, on the other hand, made good its claim to a divine origin. It was specifically unique, in contrast with Paganism, in that it was monotheistic and morally perfect, both as to the life and the teachings of its Founder and Exemplar.

1), - Op. Cit., Vol. VII, - E 1), - Idem, Vol. VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen, III, 36-44; Book IV - V. 2), - Idem, Vol. V, Cyprian, Treatise I, On the Unity of the Church, Vol. I, Irenaeus, Against Heresies, I, 10; Vol. III, Tertullian, The Shows. 3), - Op. Cit., Vol. IV, Origen, De Principiis, IV, 1-7. 4), - Op. cit., Vol. VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen, II, 71-76.

The Christian religion was monotheistic. There was no supreme head of a group of gods, or anything in the nature of a family of divinities. God, instead, was one in essence though triune in persons. The position of the early Church in this respect is markedly summarized in the words of the Athanasian Creed: "The God-head of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is one; the Glory equal, the majesty coeternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, such is the Holy Ghost So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three Gods, but one God. The Father is made of none; neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but preceeding." "The whole three persons are coeternal and coequal. So that in all things, as aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped." ¹⁾ Furthermore, concerning Christ, in whom God revealed Himself to man, the Church in particular said: "We also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man of the substance of His mother, born in the world; perfect God, and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father as touching His Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching His Manhood; who, although he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking the Manhood into God; One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity

1), - Op.Cit., Vol.VII, Athanasian Creed, p. 366-67. Vol. V, Treatise of Novatian concerning the Trinity, ch.1-8,29; Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. , Augustine, On the Trinity.

of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ."¹⁾ The Church thus emphasized a unity in the Trinity in the strongest terms whilst it insisted that Christ was "true God, born of the Father from eternity, and also true man, born of the virgin Mary".

Furthermore, the Christian religion was morally perfect both in the life and teachings of its Founder and Exemplar. It possessed the exceptional advantage, in contrast with the immorality of Pagan mythology, to be able to point to the sinless life of Christ as an incontrovertible evidence of its excellence. The Church Fathers, certainly, did not fail to refer their Pagan opponents to the absolute purity of the Christian Deity. In particular, however, they directed them, for the purity of their faith, to the sublime life of its Founder²⁾ and to the loftiness of His moral ideals,³⁾ all unexcelled by Heathenism. The Church Fathers urged such upon/traducers as Celsus the inability of Christ's opponents to find a flaw in His character; they asked them to parallel in their literature not only the love which Christ displayed in the face of calunnny, but also the love which He demanded of His disciples, the love of man, i.e., of enemy as well as of friend, a love, moreover, manifested in humility, patience and charity, All virtues foreign to Pagan religion. So, then, the Christian faith, compared with Paganism, was unique in character in that it taught that the Lord God was one Lord and also absolutely pure, as was evident especially in the life and word of Christ. Early Christianity certainly also taught that God, as regards His nature was eternal,

1),- Nicene Church Fathers, Vol. VII, Athanasian Creed, p.367. Vol. V.
Treatise of Novatian concerning the Trinity, ch.9-28. 2),- Op.cit., Vol.III,
Tertullian, Apology 17,21; Vol.IV, Orogen Against Celsus, 1, 67; VI, 54,56;
Vol.VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen, II, 1,4. 3),- Op.cit., Vol.III, Tertullian,
Apology, ch. 30,36,37,39, Vol.VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen,I, 60-65.

omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, holy, just, faithful, benevolent, merciful, and gracious; that the one true God, as regards the universe, was both transcendent and immanent, its Creator, Preserver, and Sovereign; and that, as regards man, what the triune God would be to all, He was to His Children, their Father, Savior, and ^{their} Comforter. Likewise the Church Fathers declared that the Scriptures, as to their origin, were divinely inspired¹⁾ and that, as for internal evidence, the prophecies concerning the Messiah of the Old Testament and the miracles of Christ in the New Testament²⁾ attested the divine character of Bible. Whilst, in turn, all these elements might be adduced as proof of the uniqueness of the Christian religion, The Church Fathers, in their conflict with Pagan religion, naturally employed, as their most important topics, theology in the narrow sense, Christology, and Christian ethics, since these doctrines in particular conspicuously accented the unique and pure character of their faith.

What, next, was Christianity in such contrast as to its aim? Its primary purpose was not to insure an economic gain to an individual or family. Greek and Roman national as well as domestic religion might recommend itself to man as a materialistic cult and hence, in the interest of some commercial enterprise or the material welfare of some family, attempt by superstitions devices to foretell the future, to avert misfortune, and to obtain the assistance of the gods. But the interests of Christianity were not so narrow. The Christian religion

1), - Op.Cit. Vol. IV, Origen de Principiis, IV, 1-7.

2), - Op.Cit., Vol. VI, Arnobius Against the Heathen, 1, 44-56; Vol. IV, Origen Against Celsus, I, 2; Vol. III, Tertullian, An Answer to the Jews,

did not chiefly confine itself to the material aspect of life. Its ~~end/and/aim~~ was more than money, it proposed to effect the whole life of man and thus as well his home and society. Nevertheless, it also maintained that the way to prosperity led through the Church, in ~~order~~ other words, that a belief in its principles would insure peace and harmony to the world, love of fellowmen and brotherly consideration of their material welfare, but above all peace and harmony as the necessary preconditions to prosperity.

Again, the primary ideal of the Christian religion was not aesthetic. At least it was not above all else concerned about a beautiful body. Greek genius however, gave especial consideration to the body. In fact both Greek and Roman spend much of their time at the gymnasium and the public baths. The latter in particular were even visited by men and women promiscuously. They might believe themselves devotees of beautiful and the nude. In truth they reveled in the sensual. Moreover, Greek and Roman religion provided ample opportunity in its temples for the 'adoration' of the sensual. Undoubtedly, physical beauty, because in Antiquity almost the inseparable companion of the sensual, occupied a front pew at many Pagan religious exercises. Naturally, the early Church did not place such an emphasis upon the ~~ma~~ nurture of the body. It certainly recognized the fact that the body in view of its passions was no mean factor in the life of man, indeed, that without attention to the body and its desires man might readily make shipwreck of his life. On that very account the Church gave first consideration to the soul and its powers. It sought for balance and harmony, not merely in architecture, but what was of far greater value, in the life structure of man himself. It ~~prop~~osed to, and successfully did, harness all the natural desires of man his physical raw material, so that these, put to their appropriate

use, as for instance the sexual passion, might yield him the intended blessing and the greatest possible return in service. The Ante-Nicene Church did not in general look for any Stoic ataraxy through the suppressions of desire. It sought through the intelligent employment of all powers both of the body and the soul, moreover at worthwhile tasks, avoiding above all idleness, to find satisfaction in service, a provision for self, a service for the fellowman, and work in behalf of the cause of Christ. Under the circumstances a love of the beautiful was not eliminated by the Church; it was only assigned its proper place in the life of man. It was made to serve man, not to dominate all his other interests. Witness the Church architecture of the Nicene and early Post-Nicene period, for example the Basilica, ^{an} adaptation of the Roman public hall, and the Byzantine structure, which successfully employed ^{for} its own purpose the dome of Indian origin. Witness its symbolism as found in the Catacombs, for instance, Christ, the Good Shepherd. Witness its liturgical service by which hundreds in unison rendered worship to Christ. Indeed, the Church had a place for the beautiful. However, it would not permit beauty to occupy the center of man's thought and life.

Furthermore, to realize such balance, the Church in contrast to Paganism, assigned morality, though not the first, yet a dominant, place in the life of man, his family, and ^esociety. In Greece and Rome both domestic and national religion had never inculcated morals. Though there were priests, there were no preachers. To make man virtuous was thought no more the function of a priest than of a physician. His business in State and family comprised the punctilious observance of magical formula. The Church, in turn, amalgamated the two spheres: moral culture and

religion. Yet its object was not merely to make man respectable or externally virtuous. It had no use for a whited sepulchre filled with sullen bones. It desired to see not merely the outside, but above all the inside, of the cup clean and serviceable. Its goal, in the life of man and his family, was not a superficial moralism. Even morality in its program was secondary.

In short, the Christian religion was more than a material cult, more than intent upon man's bodily welfare; it was more than ethics; it was above all else a spiritual religion. The mystery-religion, as the Graeco-Phrygian and the Graeco-Egyptian, might inspire a certain awe and secure for itself, through its symbolic mysticism, a certain fascination and mental devotion from man. The Christian religion, however, was more than a cult. The Church, wanted to see more than a mental devotion and belief. It proposed, in the first place and above all else, to make man a disciple of Jesus Christ. It desired more than all else to discover a sincere faith in Jesus, as the Savior from sin and condemnation, in man's heart. The Church taught, confessed, and believed that, once this faith took lodgement in the heart of man, a clean moral life would necessarily follow. It would do all to make man a believer, because then, as in the case of a good tree, good ~~of~~ fruit ~~will~~ of necessity be seen. Otherwise the heart is simply minus faith, and the individual proven a hypocrite. The end of the Christian religion, then, was primarily, not to make man righteous, but to make man a believer in Jesus as his Savior so that, through this faith and solely for Christ's sake, God the Father might declare the sinner righteous. In this manner the Church proposed to, and actually did, regenerate not only the individual, but whole families. Thus it transformed the home in all its aspects, its economic, moral, social, educational, and religious aspects.

But after all, by what means did the Church accomplish its task, and create a faith which would manifest itself in love toward God and man, in the heart of the individual? Its instrument was the Word of God. Pagan religion had no system of doctrine nor a preacher to convey a moral or religious message to the public. It attempted, instead, to realize its purpose by such means as the sacrifice and libation, the vow and prayer, auspices and augury, accompanied by a scrupulous conformity to the prescribed ritual. The Church, on the other hand, eliminated all these measures as means to an end, for the ~~xxx~~ creation of faith on Jesus. Its altar never saw any fire or a slain animal. The Church believed that, in view of the all-sufficiency of Christ's blood-atonement, no means whereby man might offer ~~God~~ service or sacrifice, ^{To God} were henceforth necessary in order to appease the wrath of God over man's sins. In other words, it interpreted Christ's life and death as securing a full salvation from sin and condemnation and, moreover, a salvation applicable to all men. Hence only one type of means needed to be employed, a means that would convey, as from God, the message of salvation to man. Hence the Church stressed the proclamation of the word of God. However, that man might accept its message of salvation, as found in the Gospel, it prepared man for such reception by means of the law of God. Consequently, the Church in the Word of God possessed two powerful levers to accomplish its purpose and to secure man as a loyal disciple of Jesus. On the side of the law, as a preparatory measure, were the concepts of sin and eternal condemnation. Pagan religion had only a vague notion of sin and retribution. The Christian religion even spoke of the enormity of little sins and of a final scrutiny

of the whole life of man which would embrace its every detail, also any weakness of character as well as any infraction of duty, and thus inexorably end in a minute personal retribution by divine justice. On the side of the Gospel as a means of grace were the concepts of a complete salvation from sin and hell by Christ's life and death, a universal redemption of man, a perfect reconciliation of the sinner with his God through faith in Jesus, and finally the assurance of man's adoption into the divine family as a child of God through the sacrament of Baptism. However, both law and gospel proved themselves efficient means only so long as their respective offices in the conversion of man were not confused. At times a Church Father apparently believed that the work of Christ in the salvation of man had to be supplemented by so-called good works performed by man. At least the means necessary to man's justification, or the forgiveness of his sins, were confused with those making for his sanctification, that is, respectively Christ's work in the reconciliation of man and God with man's work in the manifestation of a transformed or new life from a loyalty to Jesus. In fact, law and gospel were somewhat confused even by Tertullian and Augustine, though protagonists of the doctrine of justification. Augustine in particular spoke of evangelical counsels, such as fasting and praying, as necessary aids not merely to sanctification, but to salvation. At least he referred to the salvation of man as not effected until he evidenced his faith in good works, or in obedience to the evangelical counsels concerning fasting and ~~pr~~ praying. But despite such defects the Church possessed in the Word of God a powerful means whereby effectually to transform man and the family.

Unfortunately, Theodosius I (379-395) granted the privileges of a state religion to Christianity. He, for instance, exempted bishops from obedience to civil tribunals and committed the infamy of first establishing inquisitors of the faith. In 389 he demanded, in an edict, the acceptance of the orthodox faith by all his subjects. Prior to this time he had prohibited the public sacrifices of heathen worship. In consequence of this change in the status of the Christian religion an unassimilated, unconverted, and insufficiently catechized multitude entered the Church in order through their membership to secure position and power for themselves in the realm. Above all, through this misalliance of Church and State the monarchic bishopric was fostered and supported, a most detrimental product since, as a consequence, the autonomy of the individual congregation was lost. Moreover, in particular its right to pass judgment on the faith and morals of its membership was henceforth not regained until the Reformation. Consequently after the fourth century, discipline, ritual, and dogma were subject to the decision of the bishop.

Nevertheless, what meanwhile in the early Church were the changes effected by Christianity in the religious life of many a Greek and Roman family?

Above all else, the father no longer occupied a unique position as priest. He no longer acted as intermediary between the members of the family and the gods, the lares and penates. Reconciled through faith in Christ's sacrifice with God, the members of the family, i.e., also the wife, child and slave, had in their own right direct access to ^{God} the Father. Of course, the father directed the family worship of the home congregation. However, many Christian women, especially wives of heathen husbands, or widows, approved themselves most credibly as missionaries in, and shepherds of, their household. They labored also among their slaves in behalf of their spiritual wellbeing. There were family devotions in the atrium on the ordinary and festival days, but these were held minus the shrine with its images and minus the sacrifices. Daily exercises were had in connection with the noonday or the evening meal. At these exercises prayer might be jointly spoken, such as the Lord's Prayer, a prayer said ex corde, or a prescribed form of prayer read by the father. As a rule a Scripture lesson was also read, at times discussed, and hymns sung. Prayers were substituted for the libations at meals. On a Sunday afternoon the morning's sermon was reviewed. At other times both the Old and New Testament, homilies, books, and treatises on religious topics, perhaps on controversial subjects, provided ample food for thought. Especially the Holy Scriptures were widely circulated among the early Christians.¹⁾

Children were given due attention. They were faithfully brought to baptism²⁾; parents, especially the father, were expected to have them

1),- A. Harnack, Ueber den privaten Gebrauch der heiligen Schriften in der alten Kirche. 1912.

2,- Op.cit., Vol. VII, Apost. Const., VI, 15

memorize the Ten Commandments, a few Psalms and prayers. They were likewise required intelligently to instruct them in these parts, as also in the Lord's Prayer and Bible History. For centuries parents were themselves thoroughly equipped for this work by the Catechumenate.¹⁾ Only upon neglect of the Catechumenate by the Church, parents likewise became negligent and needed urging in this respect. To that end Chrysostom in a booklet on the education of children also provided a chapter on 'How a father should tell his children the stories of the Bible.'²⁾ Finally a word on the burial of the dead. The Christian dead were laid away amid appropriate exercises which included a funeral address and hymns. Palms and olive branches were carried in the processions, as symbols of victory and joy. Paid mourners, however, were omitted. The remains were never cremated, but laid away ^{in a grave,} as was Christ's body, ~~in a cave,~~ in some places, as in Italy and Africa, ~~however,~~ in catacombs. It is here in particular, ^{that the religious life of the} in the mass of inscriptions and symbols, ^{family is reflected,} above all the scope of evangelical thought and the value which faith assumed in the opinion of its members. For instance, the lamb, the good shepherd, the vine, the rock, the light refer to the Redeemer, the dove to the Holy Spirit, and a ship to the Church. Frequently we meet with Ichtys (meaning fish) which, separated into its Greek letters, reads: Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Savior. A specifically Roman doctrine, such as purgatory and the mass are only referred to in inscriptions from the latter part of the fifth century.

1), - See the catechical discourses of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Augustine; in Ante-Nicene Church Fathers, and Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.

2), - Chrysostom 'De Educandis Liberis', Liber Aureus, English is 'The Miscellaneous Writings' of John Evelyn. 1825.

It is otherwise quite significant that innumerable inscriptions point to Jesus as the great Mediator, Redeemer, and Friend. Also in this era, as in the Pagan, we no longer read on some tomb of a mother's despair in any inscription, such as the following: "O relentless fortune, who delightest in cruel death, why is Maxentius so suddenly snatched from me?" Instead we find expressions of hope, peace and resignation and hence may read: 'Vivis in Deo' 'Vive in Aeterno;' 'In pace Domini dormis.' That such sentiment actually dominated the home we may also gather from various other prevalent customs. When, for instance, the time for lighting the candles approached, this eventide hymn could be heard:

Serene light of the Holy Glory
Of the Father Everlasting,
Jesus Christ:
Having come to the setting of the sun,
And seeing the evening light,
We praise the Father and the Son,
And the Holy Spirit of God.
It behooveth to praise Thee,
At all times with holy songs,
Son of God, who hast given light; 1)
Therefore the world glorifieth Thee.

1),- Op.cit., Vol. II, p.298

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I

EARLY CHRISTIANITY

1. The Origin of Paul's Religion.

Bacon, Benjamin W. Jesus and Paul. 1921.

Machen, J. Gresham. The Origin of Paul's Religion. 1925.

2. Its Non-Jewish Sources.

Clemen. Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources. 1912.

Brueckner, M. Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christologie.
1903. p. 102 f.

Schuerer. Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes. III. pp.268-290.

3. Its Non-Pagan Sources.

Brueckner, M. Der Sterbende und aufstehende Heiland. 1908.

Farnell, L.R. The cults of the Greek States. Vol. III. 1907.

Hepding. Attis. 1903.

Kennedy. St. Paul and the Mysteries. 1913.

Reitzenstein, R. Die Hellenistische Mysterienreligion nach
ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen. 1920.

Showermann. The Great Mother of the Gods. 1907.

Heinrici. Die Hermesmystik und das Neue Testament, 1918.

Kroll, W. Article "Hermes - Trismegistos" in Pauly-Wissowas
Real-Encyclopaedie der classischen Altertums/wissenschaft.
XV, 1912. pp. 791-823.

Reitzenstein, R. Poimandres. 1904

4. The Teachings of the Church Fathers.

Franks, Robert S. History of the Doctrine and Work of Christ.
Vol. 1. p. 11-143.

Harnack, A. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. 1809-10.

Sihler, Ernest G. From Augustus to Augustine. 1923.

II

THE GREEK AND ROMAN FAMILY.

Donaldson, J. Woman, Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome.

Goodsell, Willystine. A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution. 1923. pp. 78-179.

Guhl, E. and Koner, W. The Life of the Greeks and Romans, Described from Antique Monuments. Tr. From the Third German Edition. 1876.

Hruza, Ernst. Beitrage zur Geschichte des griechischen und roemischen Familienrechtes. 2 Vols.

Monroe, Paul. Source Book in the History of Education for the Greek and Roman Period.

Putnam, Emily. The Lady. Ch. I and II.

Samter. Familienfeste der Griechen und Roemer.

Seignobos, Charles. History of Ancient Civilization. Tr. by H. Wilde and J. A. James.

Sihler, E. G., Testimonium Animae, or Greek and Roman Before Jesus Christ. 1908.

Westermarck, E. The History of Human Marriage. 3 Vols. 1901.

Willamowitz - Moellendorf und Niese B. Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen and Roemer.

Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities. Articles on Adulterium, Amphidromia, Divortium, Matrimonium, Adulterium, Connubium, Dos, Emancipatio, Familia, Lustratio, Manus, etc.

III

THE GREEK FAMILY.

Aristophanes. 1. Lysistrata. 2. Ecclesiazucae.

Aristotle. Nichomachian Ethics, Bk. VIII, ch. 12. Jowett Tr.
Politics, Bk. I, Jowett Tr.

Euripides. Medea, Gilbert Murray Tr.

Plato. The Republic. pp. 455-467. Jowett Tr.
The Laws. pp. 294-347.

Plutarch. Lives. Vol. 1, pp. 80-83, 147-148, 150. Bohn Classical
Library. 1908.

Becker, W. A. Charicles. Exursus to Scene I, II, III, and XII.

Bluemner, H. The Home Life of Ancient Greece. Tr. by Alice Zimmern.
pp. 129-183, 202-208.

Farnell, L. R. The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion.

Habert, O. La Religion de la Grece. Antique.

Hyde, Walter W. Greek Religion and its Survivals. 1923.

Mahaffy. Social Life in Greece, pp. 146-150, 224-227.

Murray, G. Five Stages of Greek Religion. 1925.

St. John, James A. The History of the Manners and Customs of Ancient
Greece. 3 Vols. 1842, Vol. I, pp. 107-164, 369-401; Vol. II, pp. 1-28, 75-
125.

Symonds, J. A. Studies of the Greek Poets.

Tucker, T. G. Life in Ancient Athens, 1906. Ch. 12-19, 21, 23.

Wright, F. A. Greek Social Life. 1925.

THE ROMAN FAMILY.

Catullus. Carmina, LVI, LXL, LXLII.

Juvenal, Satires, II, VI, XLV

Pliny, The Younger. The Letters. Bosanquet Ed. 1900.

Plutarch. The Education of Boys. Ed. By W. H. Super.

Lives. Vol. I - III. Bohn Library. 1908.

Bender, Hermann. Rom und Roemisches Leben im Altertum.

Carter, Jesse C. The Religious Life of Ancient Rome. 1911.

Ferrero, Guglielmo. The Women of the Caesars. 1911.

Fowler, W. Warde. Roman Ideas of the Deity in the Last Century before
the Christian Era.

Fowler, W. Warde, The Religious Experience of the Roman People. 1911.

Friedlaender, L. Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte der Roemer in
in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine. 10 te auflage.
Vol. I - IV. 1921.

Glover, T. R. The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. Tenth
Edition. 1923.

Halliday, Wm.R. The Pagan Background of Early Christianity. 1925.

Halliday, Wm. Reginald. Lectures on the History of the Roman Religion
from Numa to Augustus. 1922.

Johnstone, Harold W. The Private Life of the Romans. Ch. I, III, VIII.

Leffingwell, G. W. Social and Private Life at Rome in the Time of Plautus
and Terence, 1918.

Marguardt, Joachim. Das Privatleben des Roemer. 1886.

Mommsen, Th. Roemisches Strafrecht.

Preston, Harriet W. and Dodge, Louise, The Private Life of the Romans.

Rogers, H. L. and Harley, T. R. Roman Home life and Religion. 1923.

Rosbach, A. Untersuchungen ueber die roemische Ehe. 1853.

Tucker, T. G. Life in the Roman World of Nero and St. Paul.

Ch. IX, X, XVI, XVII.

Wissowa, Religion und Kultus der Roemer.

V

THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY

The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Ed. by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Revised by A. Cleveland Coxe. 1908.

Vol. I - IX.

I. The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus.

II. Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras. III Tertullian.

IV. Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Commodianus,

Origen. V. Hippolytus, Cyprian, Novatian. VI. Methodius,

Arnobius. VII. Lactantius, Teaching of the Apostles, The

Apostolic Constitutions, Liturgies. VIII. Recognitions of

Clement, The Clementine Homilies.

The Nicene and Post-Nicene Church Fathers. Ed. by Philip Schaff.

Series I. Vol. I - VIII. Augustine. II. The City of God,

Christian Doctrine. III. On the Holy Trinity, Doctrinal

Treatises, Moral Treatises, On the Good Of Marriage. V. On

Marriage. IX. Chrysostom. His Letters.

Series II. Vol. III. Theodoret, Rufinus, IV. Athanasius,

Letters. V. Gregory of Nyssa, on Virginity. VI. Jerome, Letters.

VII. Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazienzen. VIII. Basil.

IX. Hilary of Poitiers, John of Damascus. X. Ambrose.

XIV. The Seven Ecumenical Councils.

Encyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.

Edited by McClintock and Strong. Articles on Betrothal, Marriage, Divorce, etc.

Alzog, John. Manual of Universal Church History. Vol. I.

pp. 64 - 100, 236-269, 652-739.

Ayer, Joseph C. A Source Book for Ancient Church History. 1913.

Bosanquet, Bernard. The Civilization of Christendom. Ch. II.

Brace, C.L. Gesta Christi, or a Humane Progress under Christianity.

Carr, Arthur. The Church and the Roman Empire. 1889.

Doellinger, Joh. J. I. Heidentum und Judentum. Vorhalle zur Geschichte des Christentums. 1857. pp. 54-342, 457-733.

Fisher, E. The Beginnings of Christianity. 1886.

Harnack, A. Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten. 1890.

Hatch, Edwin. The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church. Seventh Edition. 1898.

Howard, George. History of Matrimonial Institutions. Vol. I. pp. 291-299, 324-332.

Karlowa, O. Roemische Rechtsgeschichte. 1885-1911.

Koehler, J.P. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. pp. 1-143.

Lea, Henry C. History of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church. 1907.

Lecky, Wm. E.H. History of European Morals from Augustine to Charlemagne. 1913. Vol. II, pp. 20-34, 316-327, 336-347, 350-358.

Matthews; Shailer. The Social Teachings of Jesus.

McGiffert, A.C. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.

Neander, History of the Christian Church. Tr. by Joseph Torrey.

Vol. I. pp. 249-283.

Paulsen, Friedrich. System der Ethik. 1906. Vol. I.

Rogers, Arthur K. A Student's History of Philosophy. pp.157-159.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. Vol. II. pp. 367-414.

Vol. III. 242-250.

Theiner, Johann Anton und Augustin. Die Einfuehrung der erzwungenen

Ehelosigkeit bei den christlichen Geistlichen und ihre

Folgen. 1845. Vol. I.

Troplong, M. De L'Influence Du Christianisme Sur Le Droit

Civil Des Romains. 1843.

Uhlhorn, G. Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism.

Uhlhorn, G. Christliche Liebestaetigkeit. 1882. Band I.

Westermarck. Edward A. The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas.

Two Vol. 1906.

Codex Justinianus. Ed. by P. Krueger. 1888 (Corp jur. civ. Vol. II.)

Digesta. Ed. by Th. Mommsen. (Corp. jur. civ. Vol I.)

Institutiones. Ed. by P. Krueger.

Novellae. Ed. by R. Schoell and G. Kroll. 1895. (Corp. jur. civ. Vol. III.)