**Tertullian**

**Life**

Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, more commonly known as Tertullian of CarthageWritings

Late 2d Century

Fl 197-220

31 extant, 15 lost writings.

Wrote in Latin

Informed responses to Pagans. Good defender of Christianity

There were crazy stories of what the Romans thought of Christians. Baby sacrifice, carnal immorality, atheism and subversiveness.

Tertullian sets out the principle of religious freedom and that Christians must be given fair trials based on facts before they are condemned to death. He contested the stories of the pagans, such as claims of child sacrificing by providing testimony of Pliny that Christians do not commit murder, adultery, and such crimes..

Ended his life joining the Montanists

On Scripture and Tradition, see Chadwick p 45. Read that passage.

The beliefs of Montanism contrasted with Orthodox Christianity in the following ways:

* The belief that the prophecies of the Montanists superseded and fulfilled the doctrines proclaimed by the [Apostles](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Apostles).
* The encouragement of ecstatic prophesying, contrasting with the more sober and disciplined approach to theology dominant in Orthodox Christianity at the time and since.
* The view that Christians who fell from grace could not be redeemed, in contrast to the Orthodox Christian view that contrition could lead to a sinner's restoration to the church.
* The prophets of Montanism did not speak as messengers of God: "Thus saith the Lord," but rather described themselves as possessed by God, and spoke in his person. "I am the Father, the Word, and the Paraclete," said Montanus (Didymus, De Trinitate, III, xli); This possession by a spirit, which spoke while the prophet was incapable of resisting, is described by the spirit of Montanus: "Behold the man is like a lyre, and I art like the plectrum. The man sleeps, and I am awake" (Epiphanius, "Panarion", xlviii, 4).
* A stronger emphasis on the avoidance of sin and on church discipline than in Orthodox Christianity. They emphasized chastity, including forbidding remarriage.
* Some of the Montanists were also "Quartodeciman" ("fourteeners"), adhering to the celebration of [Pascha](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Pascha) on the Hebrew calendar date of 14 Nisan, regardless of what day of the week it landed on. The Orthodox held that [Pascha](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Pascha) should be commemorated on the Sunday following 14 Nisan. (Trevett 1996:202)

Jerome and other church leaders claimed that the Montanists of their own day held the belief that the [Trinity](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Holy_Trinity) consisted of only a single person, similar to [Sabellianism](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Sabellianism), as opposed to the Orthodox view that the Trinity is one God of three persons which Tertullian also had held. There were some who were indeed modalistic [monarchians](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Monarchianism) (Sabellians) and some that were closer to the Trinitarian doctrine. It is reported that these [modalists](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Modalism) [baptized](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Baptism) mentioning the name of Jesus Christ as opposed to mentioning the Trinity. Most of the later Montanists were of the modalistic camp.

**Origen**

**His Life**

Origenes Adamantius.

C 185 - c 254, as a martyr.

Father was a martyr.

Studied philosophers, especially the Platonists.

Great teacher and orator. Castrated himself. Ordained a priest.

**Writings**

Four classes of writings:

[text criticism](http://orthodoxwiki.org/index.php?title=Text_criticism&action=edit&redlink=1)

[exegesis](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Exegesis)

systematic, practical, and apologetic theology

letters.

6000 Writings

 **Why they are not existent**

 **Why we have what we do have**

Hexapla. Linear comparison of Hebrew and Greek translations of Scriptures.

**Teachings**

 **On the Beginning, Incarnation and Apocatastasis**

The unity of the Trinity is emphasized.

 In the Ante-Nicene theology, the nature of the Trinity and its Persons would be fleshed out over time, but was not well defined (though it had been revealed completely in Christ).

The Beginning was rational, the realm of the mind.

The fall.

**Subsection: On the Preexistence of souls.**

Souls cool, and are given a body.

The person is the soul, the body is extra.

 Fallen minds and bodies are immediately placed in bodies

 An incorporeal nature making use of a body.

 We are trying to journey back to being with God.

Freedom and Fate: A classical dilemma. How can you have both?

God’s omnipotence can see the choices the free will make.

 If I break the law, I suffer the penalties.

 God has foreknowledge of our free choices. God reveals Himself.

 Christ makes use of a body. It is unclear how Origen felt about Christ maintaining the body.

Apocatastasis: Returning to the perfection of the beginning. All must be restored, then.

 There must be a greater perfection from which the rational beings can never fall.

Rational beings will always be learning. Perfecting.

The fundamental pattern is a movement from innocence to experience.

**Steps of the Drama of Salvation.**

Three Analogies:

1. Journey.

In life: Virtue to Virtue. Grace to Grace.

In Death: Ascent to Heaven.

2. Maturity.

A dip at the fall.

Inner man becoming more rational, the outer always remaining dust.

Revelation descends to bring us up.

The spiritual dimension sheds its light on our present darkened world.

Growth continues even after death.

 Was Christ’s sacrifice sufficient to take away all sins?

3. Spiritual Warfare.

Against sin. Scripture point to sin being a reality. Warfare against it is evident in Paul.

Against Evil as an entity.

Temptations are there to test what we are, and what we should be (they lead us toward a certain goal by what they are testing.

**As seen by the Fathers, especially Cappadocians**

**Condemnation**

“The charges against Origen boil down to the accusation that his theology was adulterated by his philosophy.”

In all things, he sought to be a son of the church. His writings were errant.

“If we can reason this way (with some sympathy for a philosophical theologian), then perhaps the basic issue in assessing Origen’s work is whether his Platonizing presuppositions are congruent in general terms with the Biblical message. There is certainly room for disagreement with respect to this question. But if we allow Origen his basic premise that there need be no contradiction between Greek and Biblical thought, then our assessment of Origen may be a positive one.” 32-33

The Anathema from the 11th Canon of Second Constantinople (553): “If anyone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius Nestorius, Eutyches and Origen, as well as their heretical books, and also all other heretics who have already been condemned and anathematized by the holy, catholic and apostolic church and by the four holy synods which have already been mentioned, and also all those who have thought or now think in the same way as the aforesaid heretics and who persist in their error even to death: let him be anathema.”

**Excursus on the XV. Anathemas Against Origen. ANF**

**Arianism** is a nontrinitarian belief that asserts that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, but is entirely distinct from and subordinate to God the Father.

**Eunomianism** is a heresy that upheld an extreme form of [Arianism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arianism), which denied not only that Jesus Christ was of the same nature (consubstantial) as God the Father but also that he was of like nature ([homoiousian](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homoiousian)), as maintained by the semi-Arians.

**Macedonianism** is a heresy that, while accepting the divinity of Jesus Christ as affirmed at Nicea in 325, denied that of the Holy Spirit which was seen as a creation of the Son, and a servant of the Father and the Son.

**Apollinarianism** was the heretical belief that Jesus had a human body and lower soul (the seat of the emotions) but a divine mind. Apollinaris further taught that the souls of men were propagated by other souls, as well as their bodies.

**Nestorianism** is a Christological heresy that emphasizes the disunion between the human and divine natures of Jesus.

**Eutychianism** is the heretical belief that Christ's divinity dominates and overwhelms his humanity, as opposed to the Chalcedonian position which holds that Christ has two natures, one divine and one human or the Miaphysite position which holds that the human nature and pre-incarnate divine nature of Christ were united as one divine human nature from the point of the Incarnation onwards.

That Origen was condemned by name in the Eleventh Canon of this council there seems no possible reason to doubt.  I have given in connexion with that canon a full discussion of the evidence upon which our present text rests.  But there arises a further question, to wit, Did the Fifth Synod examine the case of Origen and finally adopt the XV. Anathemas against him which are usually found assigned to it?  It would seem that with the evidence now in our possession it would be the height of rashness to give a dogmatic answer to this question.  Scholars of the highest repute have taken, and do take to-day, the opposite sides of the case, and each defends his own side with marked learning and ability.  To my mind the chief difficulty in supposing these anathematisms to have been adopted by the Fifth Ecumenical is that nothing whatever is said about Origen in the call of the council, nor in any of the letters written in connexion with it; all of which would seem unnatural had there been a long discussion upon the matter, and had such an important dogmatic definition been adopted as the XV. Anathemas, and yet on the other hand there is a vast amount of literature subsequent in date to the council which distinctly attributes a detailed and careful examination of the teaching of Origen and a formal condemnation of him and of it to this council.

 The XV. Anathemas as we now have them were discovered by Peter Lambeck, the Librarian of Vienna, in the XVIIth century; and bear, in the Vienna ms., the heading, “Canons, of the 165 holy Fathers of the holy fifth Synod, held in Constantinople.”  But despite this, Walch (*Ketzerhist*., Vol. vii., p. 661 *et seqq*. and 671; Vol. viij., p. 281 *et seqq*.); Döllinger (*Church History*, Eng. Trans., Vol. v., p. 203 *et seqq*.); Hefele (*Hist. Councils*, Vol. iv., p. 221 *sq*.), and many others look upon this caption as untrustworthy.  Evagrius, the historian, distinctly says that Origen was condemned with special anathemas at this Council, but his evidence is likewise (and, as it seems to me, too peremptorily) set aside.

 Cardinal Noris, in his *Dissertatio Historica de Synodo Quinta*, is of opinion that Origen was twice condemned by the Fifth Synod; the first time by himself before the eight sessions of which alone the acts remain, and again after those eight sessions, in connexion with two of his chief followers, Didymus the Blind and the deacon Evagrius.  The Jesuit, John Garnier wrote in opposition to Noris; but his work, while exceedingly clever, is considered by the learned to contain (as Hefele says) “many statements [which] are rash, arbitrary, and inaccurate, and on the whole it is seen to be written in a spirit of opposition to Noris.”[312](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xii.viii.html#fnf_xii.viii-p4.1)  In defence of Noris’s main contention came forward the learned Ballerini brothers, of Verona.  In their *Defensio dissertationis Norisianæ de Syn. V. adv. diss. P. Garnerii*, they expand and amend Noris’s hypothesis.  But after all is said the matter remains involved in the greatest obscurity, and it is far easier to bring forward objections to the arguments in defence of either view than to bring forward a theory which will satisfy all the conditions of the problem.

 [317](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214/Page_317.html)Those who deny that the XV. Anathemas were adopted by the Fifth Synod agree in assigning them to the “Home Synod,” that is a Synod at Constantinople of the bishops subject to it, in a.d. 543.  Hefele takes this view and advocates it with much cogency, but confesses frankly, “We certainly possess no strong and decisive proof that the fifteen anathematisms belong to the Constantinopolitan synod of the year 543; but some probable grounds for the opinion may be adduced.”[313](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xii.viii.html#fnf_xii.viii-p6.2)  This appears to be a somewhat weak statement with which to overthrow so much evidence as there can be produced for the opposite view.  For the traditional view the English reader will find a complete defence in E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith with regard to Eternal Punishment*?

 Before closing it will be well to call the attention of the reader to these words now found in the acts as we have them:

 “And we found that many others had been anathematised after death, also even Origen; and if any one were to go back to the times of Theophilus of blessed memory or further he would have found him anathematised after death; which also now your holiness and Vigilius, the most religious Pope of Old Rome has done in his case.”[314](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xii.viii.html#fnf_xii.viii-p9.1)  It would seem that this cannot possibly refer to anything else than a condemnation of Origen by the Fifth Ecumenical Synod, and so strongly is Vincenzi, Origen’s defender, impressed with this that he declares the passage to have been tampered with.  But even if these anathemas were adopted at the Home Synod before the meeting of the Fifth Ecumenical, it is clear that by including his name among those of the heretics in the XIth Canon, it practically ratified and made its own the action of that Synod.

 The reader will be glad to know Harnack’s judgment in this matter.  Writing of the Fifth Council, he says:  “It condemned Origen, as Justinian desired; it condemned the Three Chapters and consequently the Antiochene theology, as Justinian desired,” etc., and in a foot-note he explains that he agrees with “Noris, the Ballerini, Möller (R. Encykl., xi., p. 113) and Loofs (pp. 287, 291) as against Hefele and Vincenzi.”[315](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xii.viii.html#fnf_xii.viii-p11.1)  A few pages before, he speaks of this last author’s book as “a big work which falsifies history to justify the theses of Halloix, to rehabilitate Origen and Vigilius, and on the other hand to ‘remodel’ the Council and partly to bring it into contempt.”[316](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xii.viii.html#fnf_xii.viii-p12.1)  Further on he says:  “The fifteen anathemas against Origen, on which his condemnation at the council was based, contained the following points.…Since the ‘Three Chapters’ were condemned at the same time, Origen and Theodore were both got rid of.…Origen’s doctrines of the consummation, and of spirits and matter might no longer be maintained.  The judgment was restored to its place, and got back even its literal meaning.”[317](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xii.viii.html#fnf_xii.viii-p13.1)

I.

If anyone asserts the fabulous pre-existence of souls, and shall assert the monstrous restoration which follows from it:  let him be anathema.

II.

If anyone shall say that the creation (τὴυ παραγωγὴν) of all reasonable things includes only intelligences (νόας) without bodies and altogether immaterial, having neither number nor name, so that there is unity between them all by identity of substance, force and energy, and by their union with and knowledge of God the Word; but that no longer desiring the sight of God, they gave themselves over to worse things, each one following his own inclinations, and that they have taken bodies more or less subtile, and have received names, for among the heavenly Powers there is a difference of names as there is also a difference of bodies; and thence some became and are called Cherubims, others Seraphims, and Principalities, and Powers, and Dominations, and Thrones, and Angels, and as many other heavenly orders as there may be:  let him be anathema.

III.

If anyone shall say that the sun, the moon and the stars are also reasonable beings, and that they have only become what they are because they turned towards evil:  let him be anathema.

IV.

If anyone shall say that the reasonable creatures in whom the divine love had grown cold have been hidden in gross bodies such as ours, and have been called men, while those who have attained the lowest degree of wickedness have shared cold and obscure bodies and are become and called demons and evil spirits:  let him be anathema.

V.

If anyone shall say that a psychic (ψυχικὴν) condition has come from an angelic or archangelic state, and moreover that a demoniac and a human condition has come from a psychic condition, and that from a human state they may become again angels and demons, and that each order of heavenly virtues is either all from those below or from those above, or from those above and below:  let him be anathema.

VI.

If anyone shall say that there is a twofold race of demons, of which the one includes the souls of men and the other the superior spirits who fell to this, and that of all the number of reasonable beings there is but one which has remained unshaken in the love and contemplation of God, and that that spirit is become Christ and the king of all reasonable beings, and that he has created[318](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214.xii.ix.html#fnf_xii.ix-p13.2) all the bodies which exist in heaven, on earth, and between heaven and earth; and that the world which has in itself elements more ancient than itself, and which exists by themselves, viz.:  dryness, damp, heat and cold, and the image (ιδέαν) to which it was formed, was so formed, and that the most holy and consubstantial Trinity did not create the world, but that it was created by the working intelligence (Νοῦς δημιρυργός) which is more ancient than the world, and which communicates to it its being:  let him be anathema.

VII.

If anyone shall say that Christ, of whom it is said that he appeared in the form of God, and that he was united before all time with God the Word, and humbled himself in these last days even to humanity, had (according to their expression) pity upon the divers falls which had appeared in the spirits united in the same unity (of which he himself is part), and that to [319](http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf214/Page_319.html)restore them he passed through divers classes, had different bodies and different names, became all to all, an Angel among Angels, a Power among Powers, has clothed himself in the different classes of reasonable beings with a form corresponding to that class, and finally has taken flesh and blood like ours and is become man for men; [if anyone says all this] and does not profess that God the Word humbled himself and became man:  let him be anathema.

VIII.

If anyone shall not acknowledge that God the Word, of the same substance with the Father and the Holy Ghost, and who was made flesh and became man, one of the Trinity, is Christ in every sense of the word, but [shall affirm] that he is so only in an inaccurate manner, and because of the abasement (κενώσαντα), as they call it, of the intelligence (νοῦς); if anyone shall affirm that this intelligence united (συνημμένον ) to God the Word, is the Christ in the true sense of the word, while the Logos is only called Christ because of this union with the intelligence, and *e converso* that the intelligence is only called God because of the Logos:  let him be anathema.

IX.

If anyone shall say that it was not the Divine Logos made man by taking an animated body with a ψυχὴ῾ λογικὴ and νοερὰ, that he descended into hell and ascended into heaven, but shall pretend that it is the Νοῦς which has done this, that Νοῦς of which they say (in an impious fashion) he is Christ properly so called, and that he is become so by the knowledge of the Monad:  let him be anathema.

X.

If anyone shall say that after the resurrection the body of the Lord was ethereal, having the form of a sphere, and that such shall be the bodies of all after the resurrection; and that after the Lord himself shall have rejected his true body and after the others who rise shall have rejected theirs, the nature of their bodies shall be annihilated:  let him be anathema.

XI.

If anyone shall say that the future judgment signifies the destruction of the body and that the end of the story will be an immaterial ψύσις, and that thereafter there will no longer be any matter, but only spirit νοῦς):  let him be anathema.

XII.

If anyone shall say that the heavenly Powers and all men and the Devil and evil spirits are united with the Word of God in all respects, as the Νοῦς which is by them called Christ and which is in the form of God, and which humbled itself as they say; and [if anyone shall say] that the Kingdom of Christ shall have an end:  let him be anathema.

XIII.

If anyone shall say that Christ [i.e., the Νοῦς] is in no wise different from other reasonable beings, neither substantially nor by wisdom nor by his power and might over all things but that all will be placed at the right hand of God, as well as he that is called by them Christ [the Νοῦς], as also they were in the feigned pre-existence of all things:  let him be anathema.

XIV.

If anyone shall say that all reasonable beings will one day be united in one, when the hypostases as well as the numbers and the bodies shall have disappeared, and that the knowledge of the world to come will carry with it the ruin of the worlds, and the rejection of bodies as also the abolition of [all] names, and that there shall be finally an identity of the γνῶσις and of the hypostasis; moreover, that in this pretended apocatastasis, spirits only will continue to exist, as it was in the feigned pre-existence:  let him be anathema.

XV.

If anyone shall say that the life of the spirits (νοῶν) shall be like to the life which was in the beginning while as yet the spirits had not come down or fallen, so that the end and the beginning shall be alike, and that the end shall be the true measure of the beginning:  let him be anathema.