



universität
wien

DISSERTATION

Titel der Dissertation

„Unitas in Latin Antiquity: the Contribution of Cyprian“

Verfasser

Erik Thaddeus Walters, S.T.L., S.T.B., B.A.

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Doktor der Philosophie (Dr.Phil.)

Wien, 2010

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 092 337

Dissertationsgebiet lt. Studienblatt:

Klassische Philologie - Latein

Betreuerin ODER Betreuer:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Kurt Smolak, Dr. phil.

PREFACE

What is in a word? The ascetic analysis of a single word may seem to be of interest initially only to the philologist's exhaustive dissection of a language and its historical development for its own sake. Throughout the first chapter of the Book of Genesis its author philosophizes and theologizes that God speaks and various phenomena come into being¹. The first century CE's author of the Gospel of John develops this concept further in the very first line of that message: «in the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God»². Applying both abstract ideas contained in the sacred Hebrew and Christian canonical corpus to the historical Jesus of Nazareth, Jerome deduces around the turn of the fifth century CE in the prologue to his *Commentary on Isaiah* that «ignorance of the Scriptures is ignorance of Christ»³. Almost a millennium and a half later Bertrand Russell opines in a work co-authored with Alfred North Whitehead that «the study of grammar, in my opinion, is capable of throwing far more light on philosophical questions than is commonly supposed by philosophers»⁴. His former student, a satellite member of the Vienna Circle of logical positivists, and a sympathizer to metaphysics, Ludwig Wittgenstein, muses that philosophy constitutes «a battle against the bewitchment of our intelligence by means of language»⁵.

The present thesis is concerned with neither demonstrating nor deconstructing the validity of any particular philosophical system, theological method, religious creed, or administrative organization of any religious denomination. This thesis is concerned neither with Aristotelian logically fallacious appeals *ad auctoritates* philosophical, theological, or

¹ «And God said...and it was so», “Gen 1,” *The Holy Bible: The Old Testament*, Ignatius Press, 1-2.

² “Jn 1,1,” *The Holy Bible: The New Testament*, Ignatius Press, 83.

³ «ignorantia scripturarum ignorantia Christi est», *PL 24,17*.

⁴ B. Russell, *Principia Mathematica*, §46.

⁵ L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations/Philosophische Untersuchungen*, §109.

otherwise, nor with Kantian synthetic *a priori* judgments whose truth and validity remain demonstrably uncertain and inconclusive. This present thesis' genesis, development, and conclusions propose that any field of abstract theoretical research, especially within the humanities and in particular philosophy and theology, demands that students of those academic fields incorporate the tools and discipline of philology within their own research.

The academic labels «philosophy» and «theology» warrant of their students a fundamental comprehension and application of the meaning inherent in those words, lest those who engage in such studies arrive at presumptuous and inaccurate if not erroneous conclusions. In other words, as philosophy is literally the study of the «love (*philos*) of wisdom (*sophia*)», and similarly theology is the study of the «word (*logos*) of God (*theos*)», then those same academic fields would seem to demand unequivocally the study of philology, i.e. the «love of words», or better yet one word at a time, in order to meet their purported objectives, viz. wisdom, God, and – for the Christian – the word of God incarnate. Wherever such fundamentals are found wanting, so too may be uncertain the foundation of any intellectual enterprise undertaken. Thus has come to pass the genesis of this present thesis.

As a heavy afternoon downpour drenched the heart of Rome, Italy in early 2001, about twenty students from one of that city's pontifical universities' baccalaureate programs in theology gathered as usual in a dimly lit salon of a *palazzo* connected to a baroque church for their weekly Tuesday seminar course, a synthetic survey of patristic theology and its twentieth century interpretation via the *ressourcement* movement⁶. The centuries-old walls of that *aula* thundered for three hours with questions and challenges as professor and students analyzed and debated Christian theology's most ancient extant treatise on the nature of the Christian Church as such (the study of ecclesiology and by extension ecumenism), i.e. the mid-third century's *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* (On the

⁶ Following the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries' archeological, historical, and philological resurgence of interest in the classics and particularly the patristics (Harnack, Hartel's *CSEL*, Krautheimer, Migne's *PL*, Newman, etc.) there emerged the *ressourcement* movement (some of whose most prominent contributors include Hans Urs von Balthasar, Yves Congar, Jean Danielou, and Henri de Lubac), which was not so much an effort to re-evaluate roughly 1,500 years of philosophical systems and theological methods (Augustinian, Greek-Orthodox, Bonaventurian, Thomistic, Scholastic, Lutheran, Calvinist, Zwinglian, Suarezian, and especially neo-Thomistic and Rahnerian) in light of the patristic sources which constitute the very basis of these and any other Christian theological methods, but an attempt to thoroughly re-examine the *ipsissima verba* of the Patristics, a.k.a. Church Fathers, themselves.

Oneness/Unity of the Catholic Church) authored by the Christian bishop of Carthage, Cyprian, in the 250's CE. The class remained quagmired by the same obstacle that has befuddled both classical philologists as well as Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic theologians for centuries, viz. the existence of two versions of chapter four of the aforementioned work. One version includes phrases unprecedented in Latinity like «*cathedra Petri*» (chair of Peter) and «*primatus Petri*» (primacy of Peter) while such phrases are absent in the other version.

The lively discussion's goal was to better understand how early Christianity really envisioned the Church to be constituted, i.e. as embodied by the Catholic petrine/papal paradigm, or by the varying degrees of autocephalic and oligarchic ecclesiology as envisaged by Orthodox and Protestant confessions. At the end of the day there remained two camps in the field: one subscribing to the Catholic petrine/papal ecclesiological paradigm and the other supporting a more autocephalic-Orthodox/oligarchic-Protestant position. A problem, however, lay in the fact that both sides argued their respective positions utilizing the very same treatise. Although the professor suggested that both versions of the chapter in question had been authored by Cyprian, he himself was unable to demonstrate conclusively which text, if either, is authentically Cyprianic. Moreover, the significant textual alterations and deletions seemed to indicate a substantial change in the philosophical, theological, or at the very least ecclesiological thought of the ante-Nicene North African Church Father. The class adjourned amicably, each participant seemingly justified in maintaining certain presuppositions as to what Cyprian intended because that which Cyprian actually wrote ultimately remained uncertain and inconclusive.

Blame can be laid neither at the feet of the professor nor of the students. They had unknowingly and quite easily followed the same pattern that many scholars employ still today regarding any discussion of Cyprian's thought, as will be presented in the following thesis. Such does not console, however, those who desire to determine definitively what Cyprian actually wrote and intended, much less those who are interested in clarifying the age-old debate regarding various assemblies' claims to be that unique church inaugurated by the historical Jesus of Nazareth.

The first of two dilemmas becomes clear: 1) determine which version (if either) of the fourth chapter of Cyprian's *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* was written by the mid-third century North African bishop. Only then can one embark upon any accurate and meaningful assessment of Cyprian's thought. Textual research of manuscripts relevant to that end conducted in the early twentieth century has determined the Cyprianic authenticity of

both versions of the text in question. Subsequent scholarship, however, which almost universally agrees upon the Cyprianic authenticity of both versions, continues to arrive at very different conclusions concerning Cyprian's ecclesiology. How and why such is the state of Cyprianic scholarship are questions obvious enough. More revealing is the answer.

Prior to the early twentieth century's research determining the Cyprianic authenticity of both versions of the text in question, the debate over Cyprianic ecclesiology remained at a stalemate with Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic each finding argumentative support in Cyprian for their respective ecclesiologies. Scholars of all spectra well know such an ancient authority is essential to illuminating and fundamentally shaping the millennia-old debate as to which ecclesiological theory is most authentically Christian for three reasons: 1) the native north-African Christian bishop Cyprian was neither from Rome nor in Rome, and so cannot be dismissed as petrinely/papally partisan; 2) Cyprian was executed during the Valerian persecution of 257-258CE, over twenty years before Diocletian's *supplicatio*/persecution (c. 281CE), over thirty years before the birth of the future Emperor Constantine (c. 287CE) and over fifty years before the latter's accession to the throne in Rome as *Augustus-Imperator* (311CE), and so his thought cannot be dismissed as having been influenced by any *Zeitgeist* ushering in an unprecedented Christian epoch susceptible to secular political pressure; 3) similarly Cyprian died over sixty-five years before the uncontested *Imperator* Constantine convened the very first ecumenical council in Nicaea in 325CE, and so his ante-Nicene status is immune from accusations of ecclesial partisanship.

Cyprian as bishop of Carthage was a successor to the Apostles in that halcyon age of Christianity that lived by the law of survival and martyrdom. Like other ante-Nicene Church Fathers, Cyprian did not enjoy the luxury of abstractly philosophizing, theologizing, or ecclesiologizing in an amicable ambient unfamiliar with the very real consequences of professing the Christian creed in a hostile world that issued exile, torture, and execution for such confessions. Rather than inducing inconsistent or impulsive assertions in his thought, the immediate reality of his environment was conducive to expostulating logically precise and profound reflections on subjects pertinent during his episcopacy, most especially the nature of the Church.

Demonstrating Cyprian's ecclesiology to be either democratically oligarchic, collegially autocephalic, petrinely monarchic, or contradictory and inconsistent has been understandably a heated debate among Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic scholars for centuries. Many scholars have interpreted Cyprian's ecclesiology as one that is at variance with their

own personal religious denominational confessions. In spite of all of the study and debate surrounding Cyprian, no real consensus has been achieved as to what really is his thought. The reason is rather simple, and so the second dilemma becomes apparent: 2) how best to analyze and determine Cyprian's thought on the nature of the Church?

Christian theology's very first ecclesiological treatise, Cyprian's *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*, is not concerned primarily with Church governance or authority. Instead the treatise's title itself incorporates the ablative case of the term «*unitas*», which occurs 233 times in 20 authors and one Christian Church council in all of extant classical Latin literature from its first appearance in the non-Christian Marcus Terentius Varro in the early to mid-first century BCE through the Christian Lactantius in the early fourth century CE. During those four centuries Cyprian of Carthage is responsible for 101 occurrences of the term. This one author alone, whose Christianity, episcopacy, and extant literary works were forged in little more than a decade, accounts for almost half of the term's usage in all of classical Latin literature. The preponderance of a particular word in a single author merits philological analysis for its own sake. Moreover, as this word is the focal point of centuries-old debate surrounding Cyprian's ecclesiology, such a study at the very least should illuminate if not definitively determine the author's thought on the nature of the Church. Yet, no thorough study of the very word that fuels the debate has ever been undertaken.

This thesis proposes three major premises: 1) there is no contradiction but only logical continuity in the meaning and use of the term «*unitas*» throughout all of Latin literature from its first occurrence in the first century CE through the early fourth century CE; 2) the pre-Constantinian/ante-Nicene Christian authors' use of the Latin term «*unitas*» is entirely based on the non-Christian Latin authors' employment of the same term with no developments save the concept's application to Christian Trinitarian doctrine; 3) Cyprian's ecclesiological theory grounded in the concept of «*unitas*» contends that communion with the bishop of Rome is essential to and a requisite for being in communion with the one Church, which is based not on notions of authority, governance, jurisdiction, or power but on Cyprian's philosophical and theological understanding of the oneness/unity of the trinity, to which theologians refer as the divine economy. What really makes Cyprian unique is that he is the first to apply this concept thoroughly to the church, which concept again is manifest already in the philosophical thought of the non-Christian authors antecedent to Tertullian, who in turn for the first time in Latin literature applies this concept theologically to the divine trinity.

Such is the major conclusion of this thesis, and such a proposition should interest anyone who has even the slightest familiarity with the mid-third century North-African bishop of Carthage, the centuries-old debate surrounding his thought on the nature of the Church, and the ancient Latin non-Christian roots of what would become Christian theology. This conclusion has been reached following a philological analysis not only of Cyprian's use of the Latin term «*unitas*» – an unprecedented study, or at least a study apparently nowhere heretofore published – but of each of the 233 occurrences of the term «*unitas*» throughout classical Latin literature until the Constantinian age.

Besides providing a necessary concrete framework, the reason is two-fold for the historical period selected for this study, i.e. from the first appearance of the term in Varro in the early first century BCE through Lactantius in the early fourth century CE. Firstly, such an historical period respects the parameters of a philologist's study of classical Latin, as opposed to the Latin of late antiquity, the early medieval, medieval, renaissance, etc.. While unarguably approaching the cusp of late antiquity, the Latin of the Christian authors analyzed in this thesis, in particular the third century's Tertullian and Cyprian, is classical. Secondly, and as already intimated, the pre-Constantinian and ante-Nicene age of the Church remains that unique cradle of Christian thought, Greek and Latin, Eastern and Western, unequivocally preserved from accusations of ecclesial politics or secular subterfuge. Untainted by varying degrees of both benign and malignant Eastern-Western/Greek-Latin ecclesial-secular cohabitation following the Edict of Milan in 313CE and the Council of Nicaea in 325CE, the pre-Constantinian and ante-Nicene age remains the only common ground where the same unbiased objective conclusions can be attained by the archaeologist, the historian, and the philologist disimpassioned by religious ideological differences and the philosopher and theologian who seek to reconcile such differences, provided that all such themselves remain impartial in the course of their research.

The goals of this thesis are three-fold: 1) the systematic presentation of every instance of the term «*unitas*» in classical Latin literature from its first occurrence in the first century BCE through the early fourth century CE; 2) the demonstration of continuity of meaning of the term «*unitas*» within the same historical period; 3) the demonstration of continuity in Cyprian's thought without change, confusion, or contradiction in his deliberate employment of the term «*unitas*».

An indirect goal must be added, which regards the audience addressed in this thesis. While the nature of and methodology employed in this thesis are philological, there is an historical, philosophical, and theological

context and background that hopefully have been rendered digestible for those who are familiar with some of the tangents discussed but may lack a formal preparation in these particular academic disciplines. Some may suggest that recent decades have witnessed the replacement of scholars imbued with a profound universal knowledge of a plethora of academic fields by specialists trained in one particular esoteric area of research. This thesis hopefully demonstrates that the research of students of philology is essential to the work of the humanities and especially their more theoretical academic disciplines like philosophy and theology, providing the latter with constructive foundations that help distinguish real ideas from abstract idealism and unconstructive ideologies in their endeavors to delve and apply metaphysical musings within the material world. May students of the entire gamut of the humanities, especially archaeology, art history, history, literature, philology, philosophy, and theology enjoy a greater degree of mutual appreciation, collaboration, and inter-reliance in their pursuits of determining the truth within their respective fields.

INTRODUCTION

The *Corpus Cypriani* is quantitatively quite manageable: thirteen treatises and eighty-one letters totaling 1,019 pages of Latin text in the *CCL* series⁷. Well over half of Cyprian's writings, and subsequently his thought, is contained in his letters⁸, which are rather discursive and not in their nature systematic presentations. The complete *corpus* really must be studied, therefore, to obtain a proper *sensus Cypriani*. Perhaps the various interpretations of Cyprian's thought on the nature of the Church are the result of different approaches to studying his literary *corpus*. Strangely, in all of the research of manuscripts, limited philological analyses, textual comparisons, publications, and discussions over the past century, there has not appeared any systematic philological analysis of Cyprian's use of the term «*unitas*»⁹, even though Carthage's premier bishop employs the term

⁷ The *Corpus Cypriani* is much more manageable than the several thousand pages of the *Corpus Augustini* or *Hieronymi* or even the 1,445 pages of the *Corpus Tertulliani* in the same series. Also, not included in this calculation of the *Corpus Cypriani* are the pages recording the proceedings at the Seventh Council of Carthage over which Cyprian presided in April of 256. Cyprian's *Ad Quirinum*, though considered a treatise in both the *CCL* series and the CUA's *Fathers of the Church* series, is counted as a letter in the description of the *Corpus Cypriani* by G.W. CLARKE, «*Dissertatio Biographica/Chronologica de Cypriani Vita ac Scriptis*», 690. Also, the *Vita Cypriani* by Pontus, a deacon at Carthage, as well as the *Acta Proconsularia* are ancient sources written about Cyprian's life and death immediately following Cyprian's martyrdom but obviously not included in the *Corpus Cypriani*, i.e. those writings authored or co-authored by Cyprian or letters sent to Cyprian. Those writings contained in the *Corpus Pseudo-Cypriani* are not considered part of the *Corpus Cypriani* in either the *Migne* or *CCL* series.

⁸ Of the eighty-one letters in the *Corpus Cypriani* fifty-nine are penned by Cyprian alone while another six are signed by both Cyprian and other bishops. The remaining sixteen are addressed from others to Cyprian. Cf. G.W. CLARKE, «*Dissertatio Biographica/Chronologica de Cypriani Vita ac Scriptis*».

⁹ The English translation of the term «*unitas*» usually is rendered literally «the state of being one, oneness, unity» and figuratively «unity of sentiment, agreement». Cf. the entry «*unitas*» in LEWIS – SHORT (L&S), *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1984. This present thesis questions the philological legitimacy of the second and figurative definition of the term «*unitas*», i.e. meaning «unity of sentiment, agreement».

101 times in his writings¹⁰. The present thesis attempts such a study in four parts.

The first part explores the history of debate surrounding the Cyprianic authenticity of the two versions of Cyprian's *De Unitate*¹¹, followed by a survey of subsequent scholarly interpretations of Cyprian's thought in light of the former. While permitting an examination that renders an accurate and thorough presentation representative of a variety of scholarly opinions on both the texts' Cyprianic authenticity and the interpretation of Cyprian's thought, the scope of this thesis prohibits an exhaustive study of either.

The second part presents in two chapters a philological analysis of every instance of the term «*unitas*» in all extant classical Latin literature removed from the Cyprianic context and Cyprian himself from the term's initial appearance in the first century BCE through the early fourth century CE. The first chapter presents the ten non-Christian authors' use of «*unitas*», who employ the term sixty-five times, and the second chapter does likewise with the four Christian authors not contemporary with Cyprian, in whose writings the term appears forty-three times with thirty-two occurrences in Tertullian alone. Each chapter concludes with a synthetic summary of the meaning of «*unitas*» as presented therein.

The third part studies every instance of the term «*unitas*» in the Cyprianic context, viz. the four Christian authors contemporary with Cyprian, the *Corpus Pseudo-Cypriani* (Pseudo-Cyprianic writings), and the Seventh Council of Carthage in 256CE, in which texts the term is found twenty-four times.

The fourth part explores in three chapters Cyprian's own use of the term «*unitas*»: 1) *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*; 2) the *Epistulae Cypriani* (Cyprian's letters); 3) the only other three of Cyprian's eleven treatises besides *De Unitate* in which he uses the term, viz. *De dominica oratione*, *De bono patientiae*, and *De zelo et livore*¹². Both the demonstration of continuity of meaning in the use of the term «*unitas*» throughout the four centuries surveyed in this thesis and a synthesis of Cyprian's theory of «*unitas*» is attempted in conclusion.

¹⁰ The term occurs an average of once for every ten pages of Latin text as in the *CCL* or more than once for every letter or treatise of Cyprian.

¹¹ *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* is referred to as *De unitate* throughout this thesis.

¹² The term appears twenty-seven times in *De Unitate*, sixty-five times in the *Epistulae*, and nine times in these three treatises.

PART ONE

Status Quaestionis: History of Controversy

Cyprian of Carthage is potentially the most important source for the Christian ecumenical movement's goal: «*ut unum sint*». Such a phrase removed from its context, as it is, can become susceptible to gross misunderstanding and, thus, misinterpretation. Cyprian never understood the Church's «*unitas*», or «oneness/unity»¹³, to be merely a fraternity of

¹³ With the exception of direct quotations of other authors the term «*unitas*» is translated as «oneness/unity» throughout this thesis. Such an English translation seems necessary to convey completely the full meaning of the Latin term. Bévenot observes that «*unitas*» can be translated either as «“oneness,” which underlines uniqueness (thus denying the possibility of a multiplicity of churches)...or...“unity,” which primarily signifies coherence and denies division», cf. M. BÉVENOT, *The Lapsed...*, 74-75.

Most authors, including Bévenot, translate «*unitas*» with the single word «unity». Referring to *De Unitate* Bévenot explains «the purpose of the treatise is perhaps better represented by “Unity,” which has the advantage of being the traditional title, whereas “Oneness,” though representing the more basic idea contained in *unitas*, would be a novelty», cf. ID., *The Lapsed...*, 74-75. What Bévenot asserts to be «novelty» for the aesthetical sensibilities of popular English diction in the 1950's has been introduced in this treatise. Such has been done only for the sake of achieving precision and preserving – in Bévenot's own words – «the more basic idea contained in the term» and avoiding confusion in meaning.

«*Unitas*» then as now potentially is translated as «unanimity», expressed by Cyprian in the Latin as «*unanimitas*» or «*unianimitas*» meaning «unanimity» and not «oneness/unity» (cf. L&S under the entries of the aforementioned Latin terms). One example of such translation that seems to lead potentially to misunderstanding and confusion is «*sacramento unanimitas*» (CCL III C, 339), which appears as «sacrament of unity» in both the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (cf. A.C. COXE – J. DONALDSON – A.C. ROBERTS, 339) and the CUA series (cf. R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Letters (1-81)*, 173).

Part Four of this thesis further demonstrates the meaning of «*unitas*» as both «oneness» and «unity» simultaneously and, consequently, the decision to render consistently the Latin term in English translation here as «oneness/unity». The problem

mutual concord whereby such oneness/unity is generated and realized by man agreeing to disagree or by being a human accomplishment alone. Such oneness/unity is already a given as it comes from God himself and is sustained by him, as Cyprian relates quoting the full text of Christ's prayer: «Father, grant that as [You] and I are one, thus may these be one, also, in us»¹⁴. Cyprian certainly recognizes God's respect for man's freedom in his choosing to remain or not to remain in God's oneness/unity. Nevertheless, such divine oneness/unity is not in any way diminished or compromised by man's choice. Man stands to injure only himself by remaining outside such oneness/unity, which derives from God himself¹⁵.

Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic scholars have argued for centuries about authority in the Church: whence comes authority, where does authority reside, and how, by whom, and to what extent is such authority exercised? The debate seems to have accomplished stalemate at best, alienation at worst. Why? Some seem to imply that the question and debate are tautological:

The primacy of the church of Rome makes it the lynchpin in ensuring ecclesial communion according to Catholic theology: for there to be unity, all churches need to be fully in communion with the church of Rome. Yet, it is the question of what being in communion with the church of Rome means and how the authority proper to the office of its bishop is exercised in practice that is a point of ecumenical contention. It is precisely the question of papal primacy that prevents many Christian churches from being in full communion with the church of Rome. Aware of this John Paul [in his papal encyclical *Ut unum sint*] called for church leaders and theologians “to engage with me in a

of the translation of this term in scholarly works addressing the subject seems particular to the English language, as the terms «*unité*» in French, «*Einheit*» in German, «*unità*» in Italian, and «*unidad*» in Spanish, all mean both «oneness» and «unity» simultaneously.

¹⁴ «...*pater, da ut quomodo ego et unum sumus, sic et hi in nobis unum sint*», cf. CCL III C, 584.

¹⁵ One of the Second Vatican Council's *periti* who assisted in drafting *Lumen gentium*, G. Philips, interprets Cyprian as conceiving the Church's oneness/unity to derive from the Triune Godhead itself. Cyprian states in *De dominica oratione* (to be revisited in Part Three, Chapter Five) that the «greater sacrifice to God is our peace and fraternal concord and a people united from the oneness/unity of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit» («*Sacrificium Deo maius est pax nostra et fraterna concordia et de unitate Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti plebs adunata*», cf. CCL III A, 105). Philips states «*La préposition latine “de” évoque à la fois l'idée d'imitation de celle de participation: c'est “à partir” de cette unité entre Hypostases divines que se prolonge “l'unification” du peuple: en s'unifiant, celui-ci participe à une autre Unité, si bien que pour saint Cyprien l'unité de l'Église n'est plus compréhensible sans celle de la Trinité*», in G. PHILIPS, *L'Église et Son Mystère...*, 91.

patient and fraternal dialogue on this subject, a dialogue in which, leaving useless controversies behind, we could listen to one another”¹⁶.

Others propose that the question and debate are misplaced:

The question of primacy is not in the first place about the nature of church government – ecclesial «monarchy» versus ecclesial «oligarchy» or ecclesial «democracy». Rather...the question of primacy is above all about the nature of church unity. Echoing the constitution *Pastor aeternus* of Vatican I, the constitution *Lumen gentium* of Vatican II states that the Bishop of Rome is the «perpetual and visible principle and foundation of unity» of the Church. Similarly *Ut unum sint* sees the Bishop of Rome as «the first servant of unity». When the encyclical speaks of «the power» – including the power to «declare *ex cathedra* that a certain doctrine belongs to the deposit of faith» – it places that «power» partly at the service of unity: «With the power and the authority *without which such an office would be illusory*, the Bishop of Rome must ensure the communion of all churches». Clearly, the issue of papal power is important – so much so that many Churches outside the Catholic Church perceive the way papal power is dogmatically defined and ecclesiastically practiced in the Catholic Church as one of the main stumbling blocks to unity. Yet the importance of papal power derives from the nature of the church unity it is designed to serve. Though some cynically-minded theologians may disagree, the order of entailment clearly goes from a given conception of ecclesial unity to a given «office» of unity, and not the other way around¹⁷.

Why does ecumenical dialogue become so difficult upon entering a discussion of what constitutes or does not constitute the essential nature and structure of the Church? Why do tensions become increasingly exacerbated when such discussion approaches what may best be described as the collegial-petrine dichotomy? Why has Cyprian of Carthage in particular, the undeclared Doctor of Ecclesiology *par excellence*, been such a controversial figure since the time of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation? R.J. Halliburton makes the following observation.

Perhaps sometimes we have allowed our anxiety for federation to obscure the [ancient Church] Fathers’ insights into the nature of the Church’s unity; for even when from time to time the association between the churches breaks down, there remains always the possibility which not infrequently becomes a reality, that the churches retain their identity and therefore in one and a real sense, their unity¹⁸.

¹⁶ G. DUNN, «Cyprian and the Bishops of Rome: Questions of Papal Primacy in the Early Church», 2.

¹⁷ M. VOLF, «Trinity, Unity, Primacy...», 172-173.

¹⁸ R.J. HALLIBURTON, «St. Cyprian’s Doctrine of the Church», 198.

The ante-Nicene North African Father Cyprian of Carthage seems a most qualified source for providing ancient insight and testimony to such debates. Cyprian, the personification of «common ground», is one of the Church Fathers most revered by Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic alike. His pre-Constantinian and ante-Nicene status inoculates him from accusations that his thought is contaminated by secular or ecclesial politics and partisanship.

1.1 The End of the Beginning of the Controversy

The twentieth century experienced a resurgence of interest in the ecclesiology of Cyprian of Carthage (c. early 200's-258) following the significant results of monumental research conducted during the first half of the twentieth century primarily by John Chapman (1865-1933) and Maurice Bévenot (1897-1980). Chapman's interest in Cyprian's ecclesiology spiked at the close of the nineteenth century with the publication of a then regarded definitive and still most impressive study of the third century north-African bishop by a compatriot of a different confession.

Edward White Benson (1829-1896), the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, reinforced in a seemingly decisive manner what was regarded in the Anglican confession as the predominant «Cyprianic theory of the Episcopate»¹⁹. Benson's own words, though lengthy, seem most advantageous and appropriate to convey faithfully such an interpretation of Cyprian's theory of Church oneness/unity.

The College of Bishops, then, is the very form and substance of the inherited free government, advising by resolution, commanding by mutual consent, yet not even when unanimous constraining a single dissentient bishop....Did the theory of Cyprian demand or lead up to or suggest a single center of Church Government – at Rome or elsewhere?...Did the theory...suggest that this see [Rome] was a centre of *authority* or *jurisdiction* to the Church at large?...Did the theory of the *Oneness* of the Church involve that there should be One See whose influence embraced all other sees analogously? That there should be a Bishop of Bishops? The only possible answer is that this conception, so far from being verified or supported by Cyprian's theory, contradicts that theory, has overthrown it in practice, and tends to obliterate it....The very mention of the supremacy of one Pontiff, or the universality of one jurisdiction, is the precise contrary of the Cyprianic statements. The form of government for the whole Church which these enunciate is that of a Body – its whole episcopate.

¹⁹ J. CHAPMAN, *Studies on the Early Papacy*, 28, published previously as «Professor Hugo Koch on St. Cyprian», *Revue Bénédictine* 27 (1910), a reply to Koch's response to the provocative research of Chapman already mentioned.

This is a representative Body. Its members, appointed for life by free election, represent each one diocese. They give their judgment by suffrages. They have no power of delegation, for Christ constituted *them* to govern, – not to appoint governors. Purity of conduct was essential to the continuance of any one of them in his authority. No minority among them could be overborne by a majority, in a matter of administration, even though it were so grave a question as that of Rebaptism. If all but one voted one way, that one could not be overruled in the direction of his diocese....In what then constituted the unity of a body so constituted? It was a practical unity, a moral unity, held together by its own sense of unity, by «the cement of mutual concord»....A bishop could not then resist their united voice without hardihood, but if he did, he was unassailable unless viciousness or false doctrine were patent in his life or teaching. In that case the allegiance of his flock was to be withdrawn²⁰....The divine reality of such their unity...the authority and power

²⁰ Benson supports this idea of withdrawing one's allegiance from such a bishop with reference to Cyprian's *Ep.* 68.3 (hereafter references to Cyprian's *Epistles* will be given according to the Oxford numbering sequence, i.e. that found in *CCL*), though evidence supporting Benson's claim in the letter does not seem clear. The bishop in question in the letter, a certain Marcianus, has been excommunicated not merely because of «viciousness or false doctrine..patent in his life or teaching», something potentially construed as ongoing, but *ipso facto* that he has lapsed (a *moral* transgression effecting simultaneous excommunication for which, perhaps, «viciousness..patent in his life» is a late-Victorian synonym and, thus, mortally sinful, but certainly not a doctrinal defect) during the Decian persecution. Subsequently he is rendered impotent in imparting sacramental grace, as for example occurred with the bishops Basilides and Martial in Spain, also (cf. *Ep.* 67; E.W. FASHOLÉ-LUKE, «Christian Unity: St. Cyprian's and Ours», 316-317).

Cyprian affirms the inhabitants of the Iberian peninsula in abandoning their sinful prelates as otherwise they will contaminate themselves with the contagion of sin by communicating with such unlawful bishops and priests. Again, however, this is only after Basilides' and Martial's grave transgression and scandal of having lapsed during Decian's *supplicatio* and the bishops' *de facto* inability to confect valid sacraments. The gravity of such a moral transgression has placed them outside the Church and consequently outside the realm of the One Spirit and One Baptism, which discussion constitutes the bulk of *De Unitate*.

Regarding Benson's claim that Cyprian supports a community's disassociation from its bishop in the event that the latter were to preach «false doctrine» seems uneasily reconciled with Cyprian's *ipsissima verba*. In such an event Cyprian holds that the presumably orthodox bishops must «do no harm to nor impose law upon anyone when each one in charge has the free judgment of his will in the administration of the church». The Latin reads «*nec nos uim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, quando habeat in ecclesiae administratione voluntatis suae arbitrium liberum unusquisque praepositus*» (*Ep.* 72,3 *CCL* III C, 528). Why else would Cyprian make such a statement unless implicitly couched were a tacit approbation of agreeing to disagree? For a more thorough discussion of the aforementioned bishops losing their episcopal authority via apostasy cf. P. BATIFFOL, *Primitive Catholicism*, 375-378; J.P. BURNS, *Cyprian the*

committed is the same to each several apostle....Peter's successors are nowhere mentioned or hinted at by Cyprian as necessary to the Church's Unity. But the successors of the other Apostles are. And of them it is said that the power given by Christ to them, in equal measure with S. Peter, passed on to the churches which they established, and to the bishops who everywhere succeeded them. A headship attributed to the successors of one among them would simply ruin at once the whole theory of the unity and of the authority which subsisted in the *copiosum corpus sacerdotum* – the *episcopatus unus, episcoporum multorum concordie numerositate diffusus*. And this is Cyprian's theory. Yet again, as that Body might not rule any one bishop, it follows *a fortiori* that any one bishop could not rule that Body. It is plain that such pretension could never be set up without violating the principle and essence of Cyprian's theory. This theory could not even coexist with the theory of a dominant centre. The two views are mutually exclusive²¹.

Such a declaration could not fail to provoke Chapman, who had been received into the Catholic Church from the Anglican confession on 7 December 1890 at London's Oratory before being ordained a Benedictine priest only two years before the posthumous publication of Benson's work in 1897²². In Benson's defense he had been following a then three hundred-year old accusation that papalist forgers had concocted «interpolated» editions of Cyprian's *De Unitate*²³.

1.2 The Beginning of the Controversy

The seemingly «interpolated» edition first appeared publicly during the Council of Trent's discussion on whether episcopal authority is derived «*de iure divino*» (from divine law) or «*de iure pontificio*» (from pontifical/papal law)²⁴. Those supporting the latter argument desired to bolster their position with citations from Cyprian as a most ancient authority testifying to the petrine claims of the Roman See. At the same time the editor and publisher Paulus Manutius was chosen to print Vatican editions of ancient documents, the first of which would be Cyprian's writings²⁵. Latino Latini was one of the mid-sixteenth century's foremost

Bishop, 141-142; W.H.C. FREND, *The Rise of Christianity*, 353-354; T.G. JALLAND, *The Church and the Papacy*, 171-172.

²¹ E.W. BENSON, *Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work*, 191-197.

²² G.R. HUDLESTON, Preface to *The Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman, O.S.B.*, 7.9.

²³ For a discussion of the history of these «interpolated» editions cf. P. BATIFFOL, 366; E.W. BENSON, 200-221; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate: Chapter 4 in Light of the Manuscripts*, pp.2-5, T.G. JALLAND, 162-164.

²⁴ E.W. BENSON, 211.

²⁵ E.W. BENSON, 209.

scholars and the editor employed to restore Cyprian's text to its original state in accord with the desires of Charles Borromeo, anticipating the twentieth century's *ressourcement* by almost four hundred years²⁶.

While preparing the critical text Latini discovered that portions of Chapters 4 and 5 of *De Unitate* were noticeably absent in some medieval manuscripts, particularly phrases that were distinctively petrine in their tone²⁷. To explain the disparity Latini hypothesized copyists' marginal notes for purposes of commentary and interpretation had been incorporated creating a fuller text and were later misconstrued as forming part of the original Cyprianic text²⁸. Against Latini's advice Manutius published the fuller, or so-called «interpolated», version of *De Unitate* in his edition of Cyprian's writings in 1563, consequently inciting the former to withhold his approval, his annotations, and his name from any association with the edition²⁹. A footnote attached to the end of Manutius' edition of Cyprian is not lost on Benson. «It is not strange if pious and catholic interpretations, and true meanings, be applied to the writings of the ancient fathers unto always preserving the unity of the Church, by which nothing was more desirable to Blessed Cyprian in [his] writing. Otherwise no end of heresies and schisms»³⁰.

There followed for the next three centuries two types of editions: those including the fuller «interpolated» version of *De Unitate* (Pamèle and Rigault both in Antwerp, 1568 and 1648 respectively; Maran, Paris, 1726) and those excising the supposed «interpolations» (Fell and Pearson, Oxford, 1682; Hartel, Vienna, 1868, a.k.a. *CSEL*)³¹. Hartel's comparative analysis and systematic numbering of several manuscripts containing *De Unitate* determined there to be three families of manuscripts: 1) those with fuller «interpolated» versions; 2) those lacking the heavily petrine overtones and, thus, free of «interpolations»; 3) those in which the «interpolated» version immediately precedes or proceeds the «non-interpolated» or non-petrine version³². Although the manuscripts of this

²⁶ E.W. BENSON, 209; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 2.

²⁷ P. BATIFFOL, 366; E.W. BENSON, 209-212; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 2.

²⁸ E.W. BENSON, 209-212; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 2.

²⁹ E.W. BENSON, 210.

³⁰ «Nec est alienum si priscorum patrum scriptis piae & catholicae adhibeantur interpretationes, & veri sensus, ad conservandam semper Ecclesiae unitatem, qua B. Cypriano nil fuit in scribendo optabilius. Alioque haereseum & schismatum nullus finis» reprinted in «Appendix C» in E.W. BENSON, 545.

³¹ M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 2-3; P. BATIFFOL, 366.

³² P. BATIFFOL, 367. In spite of his own research Hartel's critical edition contained only the version without the petrine overtones.

last family date back to the eighth or ninth centuries, both Hartel and Benson regarded the only authentic Cyprianic text to be the non-interpolated or non-petrine version, the others constituting, as Benson remarked, a «forgery [and] a Papal aggression upon history and literature»³³.

1.3 The Beginning of the End of the Controversy

Chapman, recently received into the Catholic Church and even more recently ordained a Benedictine priest, vigorously undertook the task of investigating those other manuscript traditions, which had been discovered by Hartel and just as quickly ignored and dismissed by both him and Benson. In spite of the latter's assertions, Hartel's research confounded any suggestion that a Tridentine, Renaissance, or even late medieval papalist *saboteur* had injected non-cyprianic petrine claims not original to *De Unitate* into the manuscripts. Perpetuated they may have been, but certainly not introduced.

Chapman determined that there never really was a question of medieval or even patristic interpolations of concepts foreign to Cyprian's thought³⁴. He determined that the so-called «interpolation» was nothing of the sort. Rather the confusion arose from the «conflation» of two distinct texts existing side by side in a variety of manuscripts actually dating back to the Patristic Age itself, at least to Pope Pelagius II (584-9)³⁵. Both versions are traceable to a family of manuscripts from the late third century and were written by none other than Cyprian himself³⁶.

Chapman demonstrated that forgery here is, though possible, highly improbable, that all of the ideas contained in both versions are paralleled throughout Cyprian's other writings, and that the language and style do not

³³ E.W. BENSON, 219. Note of this is made, also, by P. BATIFFOL, 366; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 4.

³⁴ After having analyzed a considerable number of manuscripts available in England's libraries containing St. Cyprian's famous *De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate*, Chapman published the results of his studies as «*Les Interpolations dans le traité de S. Cyprien sur l'Unité de l'Eglise*» in *Revue Bénédictine* 19 (1902), 246-254.357-373; 20 (1903), 26-51; and as «The Order of the Treatises and Letters in the Manuscripts of St. Cyprian» in *The Journal of Theological Studies* IV (1902-1903), 103-123.

³⁵ M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 6-9; P. BATIFFOL, 369.

³⁶ P. BATIFFOL, 366 note 1.370; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 6-7; J. CHAPMAN, 36-39. According to Batiffol and Bévenot, Harnack endorsed Chapman enthusiastically in his *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1903, 1.262-263.

allow for any other authorship³⁷. Chapman theorized Cyprian to have composed first the longer *Textus Receptus* (TR), lacking certain petrine overtones, in response to the schism of Novatus and Felicissimus in Carthage itself³⁸. Cyprian, responding to the schism of Novatian against Cornelius in Rome, then reworked *De Unitate* into the *Primatus Textus* (PT), in which Cyprian incorporates markedly petrine phrases like «*cathedra Petri*» and «*primatus Petri*»³⁹.

1.4 Growing Consensus

Pierre Batiffol agreed with Chapman on the Cyprianic authenticity of both versions but inverted Chapman's order theorizing that Cyprian first penned the PT as a response to the Novatianist schism at Rome and later modified it as the TR to «render its bearing more universal»⁴⁰.

Thirty years after the publication of Chapman's research a third theory regarding the chronology of Cyprian's two versions of *De Unitate* was introduced. D. van der Eynde agreed with Batiffol that Cyprian penned the PT version first, but suggested that Cyprian excised the petrine overtones «*cathedra Petri*» and «*primatus Petri*» during his disagreement with the

³⁷ P. BATIFFOL, 369-370; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 6-10; J. CHAPMAN, 36-39. At the time of course there were authors who argued against authenticity of the PT including J.H. Bernard, *Cyprianic Doctrine of the Ministry*, 1917, 250-253; O. Casel, *Pastor Bonus*, 1914, 312-314; H. Koch, «Cyprian und der Römische Primat», *Texte und Untersuchungen XXXV*, 1910, Heft 1; E.W. Watson, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1904, 432ff; more recently P.A. Gramaglia, «Cipriano e il primato romano», *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura religiosa* 28, 1992, 185-213. The success of these authors' argumentation against Chapman seems wanting in light of the quality and quantity of subsequent scholarship, most especially that of Bévenot. For a more thorough bibliography cf. either J. Le Moyne, «Saint Cyprien est-il bien l'auteur de la rédaction brève du "De Unitate" chapitre 4?», *Revue Bénédictine*, 1953, 70-115, or F. CORSARO, «Il Primato di Pietro e della Chiesa Romana nel "De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate" di Cipriano», 445-454.

³⁸ P. BATIFFOL, 370-373; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 5-7; J. CHAPMAN, 39 note 1.

³⁹ P. BATIFFOL, 370-373; M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate...*, 5-7; J. CHAPMAN, 39 note 1. Cyprian appears to be the first author to associate explicitly «*primatus*» with Peter, cf. T.G. JALLAND, 165.

⁴⁰ P. BATIFFOL, 372-373. Bévenot mentions that T. A. Lacey concluded likewise but independently of Batiffol, cf. M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 19. Incidentally, regarding Batiffol's monumental work already cited, Harnack reluctantly and not without qualification conceded that «it established that the Catholic concept of the infant Church is the true one, i.e. that Christianity, Catholicism, and Romanism are, in the light of history, perfectly identical» reproduced by P. Batiffol in his introduction to the fifth French edition of his work already cited, x.

bishop of Rome, Stephen, sometime after the year 255, otherwise known as the «baptismal controversy»⁴¹. Shortly before his death Chapman agreed with van der Eynde upon learning of the latter's theory⁴².

1.5 Controversy Becomes History

The research of Maurice Bévenot in the mid-1930's galvanized Chapman's revolutionary discoveries regarding the Cyprianic authenticity of both versions of *De Unitate*⁴³. Bévenot concluded with Batiffol and van der Eynde, though by essentially different reasoning, that Cyprian authored *PT* first and agreed with Batiffol that the treatise's first version was occasioned not by the schism of Novatus and Felicissimus at Carthage in 251 but by the Novatianist schism at Rome that same year⁴⁴. Bévenot's conclusion regarding the chronological priority of *PT* to *TR* is substantiated by a textual comparison of the internal evidence of the entire *corpus Cypriani*. Scholars have accepted almost universally his research and conclusions⁴⁵.

⁴¹ D. van der EYNDE, «*La Double Édition du "De Unitate" de S. Cyprien*», 19.23.

⁴² Chapman had said earlier «Until another theory is propounded, I imagine mine holds the field. But it depends entirely on circumstantial evidence, and is therefore liable to be dethroned if a better or equally satisfactory hypothesis is suggested» in J. CHAPMAN, 39.

A few months before his death Chapman commented to B.C. Butler regarding van der Eynde's theory: «There is the real solution of the problem over the famous double readings in St. Cyprian's *De Unitate*: it inverts my solution» as in M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's «De Unitate»*...12-13; B.C. Butler, letter to «The Tablet», 2 December 1933, 724; *Downside Review* LII, 1934, 4-5.

⁴³ Bévenot continued and completed Chapman's research with a thorough study of all the extant manuscripts (about 150 as indicated by the former) either by travelling to their various locations throughout England, France, Italy, and Switzerland or by reviewing photographs of manuscripts located in Germany and Spain. Bévenot's research, findings, and conclusions were published as *St. Cyprian's De Unitate: Chapter 4 in Light of the Manuscripts*, Burns, Oates, & Washbourne Ltd., London, 1938, for which study the Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana conferred the doctoral degree in sacred theology upon him.

⁴⁴ M. BÉVENOT, *St. Cyprian's De Unitate*..., 62.66.77.

⁴⁵ Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic alike as will be seen in the following sections. Two examples of the few scholars who are not in agreement: supporting the authenticity of *PT* only is J. Ludwig, «*Primatworte*», *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen* 19, 1952, 20-36; responding to Ludwig and supporting the authenticity of *TR* only is J. le Moyne, *op. cit.* in note 29, also attested by G.S.M. WALKER, *The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian*, 23.88 notes 25 and 26. M. BÉVENOT, who obviously does not agree with Ludwig, responds rather convincingly to the objections of Le Moyne, who offers no rebuttal, throughout his article already cited «*Primatus Petro Datur...*».

1.6 Controversy Abated Is Another Created: Concord Brings Discord

Two questions remain. When and why did Cyprian alter his own treatise on the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church, deleting in particular the phrases «*cathedra Petri*» and «*primatus Petri*»? Seventy-four of Cyprian's eighty-one letters are datable to the year or even the month based on their internal evidence, and the other seven are datable to at least a particular period of Cyprian's decade long episcopate⁴⁶. Yet the *TR* of his *De Unitate* remains technically datable only to some time after the composition of the *PT* during the Novatianist schism at Rome following the election of Cornelius as bishop there on 5 March 251 but obviously before Cyprian's death on 14 September 258⁴⁷.

Like van der Eynde before him Bévenot maintains that Cyprian altered *De Unitate* during the baptismal controversy with Stephen⁴⁸. Bévenot suggests that Cyprian altered the text because Stephen was using *De Unitate* in a way that misinterpreted and misrepresented Cyprian's intentions⁴⁹. This interpretation does not seem to focus on the reasons and

⁴⁶ G.W. CLARKE, 691ff.

⁴⁷ For dates cf. G.W. CLARKE, 706-709. Also, there is no absolutely conclusive evidence that Cyprian wrote the *PT* before the *TR*.

⁴⁸ M. BÉVENOT, *Cyprian: «De Lapsis» and «De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate»*, xv.

⁴⁹ M. BÉVENOT, *Cyprian: «De Lapsis»...*, xv; ID., introduction to *St. Cyprian: the Lapsed, the Unity of the Catholic Church*, 7. Cyprian addresses the opening of the Council of Africa at Carthage on September 1, 256 at the height of the dispute with Stephen over the baptism of heretics: «...[we] judging no one or banishing anyone from the right of communion if he opines differently. For no one sets himself up as a bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical terror forces his colleagues unto the need of obeying». The Latin reads: «...neminem iudicantes aut a iure communicationis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit» (PL 3, 1053-1054A). Bévenot interprets Cyprian here as implying Stephen. The phrase «bishop of bishops» could be directed at Stephen as suggested, also, by P. BATIFFOL, 391. This is based purely on speculative conjecture and presumption. The phrase could refer just as easily to Cyprian himself as noted by T.G. JALLAND, 177 note 1. Concerning himself with the affairs of the Church well beyond Carthage, Cyprian urges Stephen to no avail that the latter insert himself in the problems of the Church in Arles, cf. *Ep.* 68; T.G. JALLAND, 169. Then, Cyprian instigates the Church in León and Astorga to withdraw from their bishop against the judgment seemingly already made by Stephen that their formerly lapsed bishop remain, cf. *Ep.* 67; T.G. JALLAND, 171-172. Some have interpreted his passion for fraternal concord to be impatience, cf. T.G. JALLAND, 172. Several have conjectured that Cyprian could have been interpreted by other north-African bishops as overbearing, especially those few who seemed intrigued by if not in agreement with Stephen and not Cyprian over the debate regarding the validity of heretical baptism, cf. P. BATIFFOL, 381-391; J.P. BURNS,

106-112; W.H.C. FREND, *The Rise of Christianity*, 355; T.G. JALLAND, 176-178; CYPRIANUS, *Ep.* 70,1; 71; 73.

Mutual support for the theory that Cyprian is not referring to the bishop of Rome finds precedence in Tertullian, also. Tertullian states «The supreme pontiff, who <is> the bishop of bishops, clearly edicts: “I remit the sins of adultery and fornication to the ones have performed penance”» («*Pontifex scilicet maximus, quod <est> episcopus episcoporum, edicit: “Ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta paenitentia functis dimitto”*»)) in TERTULLIANUS, «*De pudicitia*», I.6, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1324-1325. Previous scholars (Harnack, Koch, Batiffol, van der Eynde) argued that Tertullian was referring to the bishop of Rome, Callixtus, who was attacked by Hippolytus for remitting such sins. Subsequent scholarship, however, has demonstrated that Tertullian, already an extreme Montanist and at odds with the church in Carthage, composed *De pudicitia* around 210 and, subsequently, before Callixtus was elected bishop of Rome in 217. Just as any bishop was referred to affectionately as «*papa*», so too both sarcastically and respectfully as «*pontifex maximus*» and «*episcopus episcoporum*». For more cf. J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 234-235, 313; T. D. BARNES, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1971, 55, 247.

Similarly, Tertullian remarks in the same treatise regarding the bishop in question (again *not* the bishop of Rome but rather of Carthage) «I now seek from your judgment from where you usurp this law of the church [i.e. forgiveness of mortal sins]? If because the Lord will have said to Peter: “Upon this rock I will build my church, to you have I given the keys of the heavenly kingdom,” or: “whatever you will have bound or loosed on earth, will be held bound or loosed in the heavens,” you therefore presume the power of a thing needing to be bound and loosed to be derived unto you, that is to every church akin to Peter? Of which sort are you, subverting and commuting the Lord’s manifest intention conferring this personally to Peter? “Upon you,” he says, “I will build my church,” and: “to you will I give the keys,” not to the church, and: “whatever you will have loosed and bound,” not what they will have loosed and bound» («*De tua nunc sententia quaero, unde hoc ius ecclesiae usurpes. Si quia dixerit Petro Dominus: “Super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, tibi dedi claves regni caelestis,” vel: “quaecumque alligaveris vel solveris in terra, erunt alligata vel soluta in caelis,” idcirco praesumis et ad te derivasse solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam? Qualis es, evertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem? “Super te,” inquit, “aedificabo ecclesiam meam,” et: “dabo tibi claves,” non ecclesiae, et: “quaecumque solveris vel alligaveris,” non quae solverint vel alligaverint*») in TERTULLIANUS, «*De pudicitia*», XXI.9-10, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1327. Three significant insights are to be made: 1) That Tertullian anticipates such an argument from a bishop indicates that at least some, if not many bishops were indeed assuming such a power unto themselves, be they at Carthage, Caesarea, or Rome, based on the passage from Mt 16; 2) Tertullian denies such a power not to the bishop of Rome (although that is a logical inference) but to another bishop (probably Agrippinus of Carthage) and the many churches; 3) Tertullian refers «to every church akin to Peter», indicating that the notion of churches being in communion specifically with Peter was already in Tertullian’s time considered significant, if not necessary. Ironically, not Tertullian’s support for but rather his argument against such a notion betrays the church of 200CE to

ramifications of their heated debate as a possible motive for Cyprian's alteration of *De Unitate*. Rather Bévenot seems to formulate hypotheses without any evidence from Cyprian himself about how Stephen may or may not have been taking Cyprian's words out of context and reading meanings of undue authority into the latter's treatise⁵⁰.

Others suggest that Cyprian altered his treatise precisely because of his disagreement with Stephen over the validity of heretical baptism and the permanence of sacred orders, i.e. what would later become the great debate between the Donatists and Augustine regarding the efficacy of sacraments *ex opere operantis* or *operato*⁵¹.

J.P. Burns in a recent study suggests that Cyprian made *two* revisions of *De Unitate* consequently producing three versions. Cyprian wrote the *TR* first for the schism of Felicissimus at Carthage, and in the same year altered it for the Novatianist schism at Rome creating *PT*, consequently revisiting Chapman's original theory of the chronology of versions⁵². Burns concludes, also, that Cyprian substantially altered the text a second time

have been well aware of fundamental debate regarding communion with Peter as being an essential component of the church.

Finally, lest there be any mistake in thinking that Tertullian favored an autocephalic episcopacy *versus* a petrine monarchy *versus* a democratic oligarchy, Tertullian offers his final assessment of the bishops and the church. «And therefore the church will indeed forgive sins, but the church of the spirit through a spiritual man, not the number of bishops church. For the law and judgment is of the Lord, not of the servant; of God himself, not of the bishop/priest» («*Et ideo ecclesia quidem delicta donabit, sed ecclesia spiritus per spiritalem hominem, non ecclesia numerus episcoporum. Domini enim, non famuli est ius et arbitrium; Dei ipsius, non sacerdotis*») in TERTULLIANUS, «*De pudicitia*», XXI.17, in *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1328.

⁵⁰ Not his usurpation of undue authority but Stephen's presumed allowance of a *de facto* lapsed bishop to remain as such is what angered Cyprian, who regarded such a bishop as having lost the grace of orders, or at least the power to effect valid sacraments (cf. *Ep.* 67; T.G. JALLAND, 172). Cyprian earlier had pushed Stephen to intervene in the matter in Arles. Moreover, the presumption without evidence from Cyprian or Stephen to support the idea that Stephen was somehow misinterpreting Cyprian's *De Unitate* is made also by O. CULLMAN, *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, 161; A. NICHOLS, *Rome and the Eastern Churches*, 157.

The presumption is made from a letter to Cyprian written by the bishop of Cesarea, Firmilian, which insinuates that Stephen was claiming such an authority during the baptismal controversy (*Ep.* 75). However, any correspondence from Stephen attesting to that fact has been lost. In any event Cyprian never even insinuates that the bishop of Rome misinterpreted his treatise, *De Unitate*, other than protesting that he himself is not a «bishop of bishops», which very well may refer to Cyprian himself.

⁵¹ T.G. JALLAND, 177; F. CORSARO, 453-456; J. DANIELOU, 201.

⁵² J.P. BURNS, 95. Also maintaining that *De Unitate* was intended first for the schism at Carthage is C.A. BOBERTZ, «The Historical Context of Cyprian's *De Unitate*», 111.

during the baptismal controversy with Stephen at which time he removed the petrine phrases⁵³.

Stuart G. Hall – even more recently and in disagreement with Burns – reaffirms both van der Eynde's and Bévenot's conclusions that both versions of *De Unitate* indeed were authored by Cyprian and that the *PT* does in fact precede the *TR*⁵⁴. Hall introduces yet another adjustment in the chronology of the two versions and their intended audiences proposing that the *PT* originally addressed the schism of Felicissimus and Novatus at Carthage while the later *TR* was aimed at the clarifying the confusion among the African bishops following the Novatianist schism at Rome⁵⁵.

While scholarship now appears to arrive at incontrovertible consensus regarding the Cyprianic authenticity of both versions of *De Unitate*, and continued clarification of chronological sequences within the Cyprianic *corpus* is warranted, any potentially meaningful assessment of Cyprian's thought *in se* seems increasingly uncertain or absent in scholarly literature on the subject. Where does this leave and what does this mean for Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity?

1.7 Change, Confusion, Contradiction, or Continuity?

1.7.1. Problems Ignored?

Benson maintained that Cyprian's is «a practical...moral unity held together by its own sense of unity...[and that] a headship...of one among them [i.e. the bishops] would simply ruin...the whole theory of the unity...[which] could not even coexist with the theory of a dominant centre»⁵⁶. Benson insisted that there was absolutely no change in Cyprian's thought. Contradiction was impossible as the petrine version of *De Unitate*, which by Benson's own admission would otherwise give rise to a serious contradiction in Cyprian's thought, was clearly a papalist forgery. Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity exhibited a certain continuity of thought in Benson's opinion. But what kind of oneness/unity is this? How solid is a supposedly divinely established oneness/unity that ultimately agrees to disagree⁵⁷? Some suggest a «precarious unity» indeed⁵⁸.

⁵³ J.P. BURNS, 95.162.

⁵⁴ S.G. HALL, «The Versions of Cyprian, *De Unitate* 4-5: Bévenot's Dating Revisited», 138.

⁵⁵ S.G. HALL, 139.

⁵⁶ Cf. pp. 15-16.

⁵⁷ BENSON, 195. Benson's interpretation seems to derive partially from Cyprian's statement regarding the prerogative of bishops at the Seventh Council of Carthage: «one cannot be judged by anyone any more than one himself can judge another»

Is Benson's really a fair assessment of Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity? While agreeing that Benson's indictment of papalist forgery has been overturned irrefutably, some like E.W. Fasholé-Luke still argue in favor of Benson's opinion of Cyprian's notion of oneness/unity almost *verbatim*.

Just as the bishop is the focus of the local church, the *collegium episcoporum* is the centre of the universal Church....Cyprian never envisaged a «bishop of Bishops» as the visible head of the Church; he held that all bishops were equal and that they are responsible to God alone for their actions. Indeed, his theory of unity of the universal Church excludes the possibility of a dominant centre⁵⁹.

J.N.D. Kelly appears to paraphrase Benson, also. The former attempts to avoid the contradiction Benson foresaw by introducing nuances.

The episcopate considered as a whole and in its individual members...is the God-given principle of unity in the Church....Moreover, the bishops...form a college...one and indivisible....Hence the Church is founded on the bishops...“united and held together by the glue of...[their] mutual cohesion”;...each bishop is entitled to hold his own views and to administer his own diocese accordingly, and...the principle of charitable respect for each other's opinions must be maintained...[The *PT*] supports the collegiate conception of the episcopate which Cyprian advocates elsewhere, only adding that St. Peter was the *starting-point* and *symbol* of unity⁶⁰...[and it] does

(«*tamque iudicari ab alio non possit quam nec ipse potest alterum iudicare*» in *PL* 3, 1054A); also from the same council Cyprian's assertion that «no one sets himself up as a bishop of bishops, or...forces his colleagues unto the need of obeying»; also referring to bishops in *Ep.* 72: «each one in charge has the free judgment of his will in the administration of the church».

⁵⁸ BATIFFOL, 394.

⁵⁹ So argues thirty years after Bévenot's research E.W. FASHOLÉ-LUKE, «Christian Unity: St. Cyprian's and Ours», 319. Others seem to paraphrase Benson on Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity. J.N.D. KELLY, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 204-205.

⁶⁰ Cyprian nowhere in the *PT* refers to Peter as a «symbol», as will be seen in Part Four, Chapter Three. Kelly provides no references from Cyprian for the assertion that Peter was a «symbol» of unity, an idea repeated but not referenced by Burns: «Peter remained the foundation and symbol of unity but the authority conferred upon him was actually the gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon the Apostles in their role as the apostolic college....The African bishops of the third century...grasped Peter as a symbol of unity but understood the Petrine office only at the local level» in J.P. BURNS, 162.165. So does Burns interpret Cyprian's theory of the episcopate being «the foundation of the unity and unicity of the church» *Id.*, 164. Cullmann claims that Cyprian believes Peter to be a «sign» of unity, cf. O. CULLMAN, 161, note 11.

not...necessarily conflict with his general teaching...that the Church's unity is to be found in the consensus of the collective episcopate⁶¹.

H.B. Drobner and J. Quasten seem to be in agreement that Cyprian conceives the Church as a federation of churches presided over by the senatorial episcopal college, which body itself guarantees the oneness/unity of the Church⁶². According to Quasten Cyprian conceives no primacy of power or jurisdiction in the bishop of Rome, but that the «*cathedra Petri*» is the «*ecclesia principalis*» and the «origin of the *unitas sacerdotalis*»⁶³. J. Quasten suggests that Cyprian sees the whole episcopate addressed in Mt 16,18, and that the bishops are bound together «by the laws of charity and concord...[rendering] the Church universal a single body»⁶⁴.

J. Meyendorff, like J.N.D. Kelly, tries to reconcile the potential contradiction Benson saw in Cyprian's theory and develop the idea of the origin of episcopal/sacerdotal oneness/unity that Quasten sees in Cyprian's chair of Peter. Meyendorff sees in Cyprian's thought that «the *one* episcopate originated in the ministry of the apostle Peter» which includes the «*cathedra Petri*» on which all the bishops sit⁶⁵. Both in his interpretation of Cyprian's theory as well as his own ecclesiological theory Meyendorff allows for a «primate» in the episcopal college holding «the place of Peter...occupied, according to general agreement, by the bishop of Rome»⁶⁶. Since this primate is equal to the other bishops, however, he can «just like his brethren become unfaithful to Peter's faith in making the community, over which he presides, abandon communion of faith with

⁶¹ J.N.D. KELLY, 204-206.

⁶² H. DROBNER, *Patrologia*, 244. Interpreting *De Unitate* Drobner applies a curious nuance to the college of bishops in relation to the chair. Unlike other scholars Drobner says not that the bishops sit on the one «*cathedra Petri*», but that they together «stand» before the chair of Peter, communion with which is the criterion of the true Church. The effect of the relationship between the bishops and the chair on the episcopate itself remains unexplained.

⁶³ J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 374-376. Quasten does not indicate who occupies the one «*cathedra Petri*», the «origin of *unitas sacerdotalis*».

⁶⁴ J. QUASTEN, 375.

⁶⁵ J. MEYENDORFF, *Rome, Moscow, Constantinople*, 14. Cyprian would seem to understand, also, that there is only one chair in each church on which only one bishop sits. This was the whole point of his writing *De Unitate* among other things to defend the rightful bishops against the pretenders to the throne, Novatus, Felicissimus, and Novatian. In attempting to resolve one contradiction Meyendorff seems to introduce another. P. Batiffol agrees that this is how Cyprian conceives of the «*cathedra Petri*», but *ipso facto* sees this as an error in Cyprian's thought, cf. P. BATIFFOL, 363-364.

⁶⁶ J. MEYENDORFF, *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, 10-11.

other churches»⁶⁷. This is because the bishop of Rome enjoys neither «juridical power over the other bishops» nor «infallibility»⁶⁸.

K. Schatz maintains that Cyprian conceived every bishop to possess the petrine power and to be the successor of Peter, who «embodied the original unity of the Church and the episcopal office»⁶⁹. The episcopate, subsequently, «could be turned *against* Rome»⁷⁰. The relationship between

⁶⁷ J. MEYENDORFF, *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, 11.

⁶⁸ J. MEYENDORFF, *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, 75.

⁶⁹ K. SCHATZ, *Papal Primacy*, 20. Similarly in agreement seems to be W. Henn with reference to *Ep. 33,1*: «These passages show that the title “successor to Peter” would have been understood by Cyprian as applying primarily to bishops» in W. HENN, *The Honor of My Brothers*, 26. In this letter Cyprian uses the grammatical construction «*Inde...ut*» to demonstrate Peter as that «thence; from which» the arrangement/ordination of bishops and the plan of the Church flow through the changes of times and successions (*per temporum et successorum vices*) «in order that» the bishops are that upon which the Church is constituted. The construction seems to imply a certain progression of the Church’s plan and the «*ordinatio episcoporum*» in time and/or place from a particular starting point or principle through some particular process of «successions» of time and/or of office. Cf. *CCL III B*, 164.

⁷⁰ K. SCHATZ, 20. Schatz misinterprets Cyprian’s *Ep. 68,3* as referring not to a petrine office of primacy but to the episcopate alone in stating: «For that reason...is the large body of bishops...joined by...the chain of unity so that» («*Idcirco enim...copiosum corpus est sacerdotum...unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut*» in *CCL III C*, 465) if legitimate bishops become heretics the orthodox bishops can gather together the Lord’s flock. While Cyprian may not here specifically say that the bond of unity necessarily includes the origin of oneness/unity, i.e. Peter, he does not illogically deny this or say anything that would contradict the necessity of such a communion. Moreover, the «bond of oneness/unity» is identified as the Church’s oneness/unity itself in *De Unitate*, cf. note 174.

Schatz is incorrect in suggesting that Cyprian desired Marcianus’ removal as bishop because Marcianus, like Novatian, permanently excommunicated the *lapsi*. «St. Cyprian’s primary objection to the followers of Novatian was that they had created a new starting point; and they had done this not merely by teaching heretical doctrine, but primarily by setting up a bishop of their own choice in a see which was already occupied by someone else. It was not that Novatian had been invalidly consecrated (though [there had been doubt to that effect])...it was rather that he claimed to possess the *episcopatus*...which...was already held in totality (*in solidum*) by the existing bishop of the see. It could not be shared; like the Creator, like the Godhead, like the Church it was indivisible. It derived as it were from a single source, epitomised; and hence to oppose those who held it, or to depart from them was (as St. Optatus was later to assert) tantamount to opposing St. Peter or deserting St. Peter», in R.J. HALLIBURTON, 197.

Marcianus did excommunicate permanently the *lapsi*, which was for Cyprian reprehensible. Cyprian desired the former’s removal, though, because Marcianus «joined himself to Novatian and [*ipso facto*] broke away from the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church and from the consensus of our body and episcopate/priesthood»

the role of Rome and the episcopate in Cyprian's mind exists in a *status permixtus* at best⁷¹.

1.7.2 Problems Inevitable?

Writing about the same time as Benson, Harnack forms a much different opinion than the former based on the same information afforded by what

(«*Novatiano se coniunxerit et a catholicae ecclesiae unitate atque a corporis nostri et sacerdotium consensione discesserit*», cf. *Ep.* 68,1 CCL III C, 463). The occasion for Cyprian's composition of this letter is not the unbending heretical doctrinal position of a bishop. This would mean a contradiction in Cyprian's thought, which maintains an attitude of agreeing to disagree, cf. note 12 and *Ep.* 72,3 (CCL III C, 528).

The problem is that the bishop in question, Marcianus, is heretical in Cyprian's mind because he has entered communion with the schismatic anti-bishop, Novatian, consequently ingesting poison and the same result for himself, viz. *de facto* excommunication. Novatian's and Marcianus' doctrinal position is not primarily the problem, though Cyprian's optimistic hope that bishops can agree to disagree is beginning to test his own patience and resolve.

«Cyprian was compelled by his special circumstances to identify them [i.e. heresy and scism], but he united this identification with the greatest liberality of view as to the conditions of ecclesiastical unity (as regards individual bishops). Cyprian did not make a single new article an “*articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*”. In fact he ultimately declared – and this may have cost him struggle enough – that even the question of the validity of heretical baptism was not a question of faith», A. HARNACK, *History of Dogma*, 93 note 1. Cyprian «dealt with the problem of schism by *equating* it with heresy, and denied the title of Christian to any who separated from his church. He could do so because of his complete conviction that Christ was present with him and not with his opponents» in G.S.M. WALKER, *The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian*, 57.

Cyprian's understanding of the efficacy of sacramental grace and the effect of mortal sin on sacred orders means that the bishop, Marcianus, enjoys no longer juridical or sacramental *potestas* via his loss of the grace of orders, which cannot be restored. In other words, because Marcianus has committed mortal sin in entering communion with the schismatic anti-bishop Novatian he is a heretic and is no longer a bishop, cf. A. HARNACK, *History of Dogma*, 89.

Consequently, the one episcopate from which Novatian and Marcianus are excommunicated must provide the sheep with a shepherd. Moreover, formal excommunication by a bishop was not necessary «before a sinner was excluded from the Church. The lapsed were automatically cut off», i.e. *ipso facto* having lapsed, J.E. LYNCH, «The Limits of *Communio* in the pre-Constantinian Church», 184.

⁷¹ On the contrary some see in Cyprian's theory that the north-African bishop realizes that the episcopate requires a «guardian», which Cyprian sees in the «office of the bishop of Rome», cf. A. NICHOLS, *Rome and the Eastern Churches*, 157-158. Others insist that this office is precisely what Cyprian understood to be the «*cathedra Petri*». The one bishop of Rome alone that sits on the throne there is the «guardian» of the one episcopate, and he enjoys a primacy of power and authority in the one Church, cf. M. MACCARRONE, «*Sedes Apostolic – Vicarius Petri*», 275-276.

were considered then the authentic Cyprianic texts. While Harnack agrees that Cyprian conceives the Church and her oneness/unity to be firmly founded upon the episcopate, his conclusion is quite different from Benson's.

A special importance attaches to the Roman see, because it is the seat of the Apostle to whom Christ first granted apostolic authority in order to show...the unity of the Church that rests on them; and...from her historical origin, the Church of this see had become the mother and root of the Catholic Church spread over the earth. In a severe crisis [i.e. the schism of 251 at Carthage]...Cyprian...appealed to the Roman Church which made it appear as if communion with that Church was in itself the guarantee of truth⁷².

Harnack suggests that Cyprian denied the privileges he had formerly afforded the bishop of Rome during the baptismal controversy with Stephen⁷³.

Chapman, whose research inspired the twentieth century's flurry of interest in the third century's north-African bishop, ultimately did not hold Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity and its relationship with the episcopate in particular in the highest estimation.

As councils have no compelling force, as the Pope need not be obeyed, unless one happens to agree with him [all part of Cyprian's theory for Chapman], there is no remedy left for disorder. Yet Cyprian has complete confidence in the divine ordination of Church unity, and in the moral unanimity of bishops «glued together». I fear it was the shortness of his experience which made it possible to put forward a theory which no one has ever held before or since. This is why I think «St. Cyprian's theory of the episcopate» is of no importance except for his own biography. No one else has ever held it, and Cyprian himself held it only as a practical determination: «I will be master in my own diocese», and did not push it to its ultimate results; he did not see where it must lead and he did not apply it to other bishops. It is just when we realize how strongly Cyprian felt about this authority of bishops that we see how important are his admissions and his silences on the subject of Rome⁷⁴.

Had untimely death not prevented him from developing van der Eynde's theory that Cyprian altered *De Unitate* during the baptismal controversy, perhaps Chapman would have interpreted and esteemed differently the idea of oneness/unity in Cyprian.

Batiffol is of the same opinion as Chapman, but the Frenchman optimistically reflects on the brighter side of the apparent contradiction in

⁷² A. HARNACK, 86-88.

⁷³ A. HARNACK, 88.

⁷⁴ J. CHAPMAN, 44-45.

Cyprian's thought than the Englishman, disappointed understandably by the same seemingly inevitable contradiction posed by Cyprian's theory pushed to its ultimate end.

The subordination of such disagreements [e.g. baptismal controversy] to the duty of remaining united, and the realization of the absolutely sacred and imperative character of this duty was...strong enough to end all conflicts, in the time of Cyprian...a profound and heartfelt sentiment springing from the Christian faith. Hence the baptismal controversy served to manifest in Catholicism its theoretical and living unity...[and] recalled also its Apostolic, and therefore legitimate, origin [i.e. the «Roman primacy» in Batiffol's words]⁷⁵.

Bévenot suggests that Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity depends on how «centre of unity» and Rome's position «as in some sense the centre» are to be understood⁷⁶. Bévenot draws a helpful analogy between the Church and an «international business organization» whose «secretariate», or «centre», is located in «Geneva»⁷⁷. Commerce is conducted in and «administrative directives are issued by» the center, whose rulings are «generally» accepted by the «national bodies belonging to that organization»⁷⁸. A charismatic «secretary general» who is sensitive to the whole organization's concerns will be revered as an «authority»⁷⁹. No directive issued can be imposed by the center upon an unwilling member, and all such directives are subject to revocation «at the next General Assembly»⁸⁰. In practice Cyprian allowed much more power and authority to the Roman See than his notion of oneness/unity theoretically permitted⁸¹. Bévenot echoes Chapman and Batiffol.

Cyprian's...theory of Church unity – viz. that it was preserved by the concord of bishops and that this was in turn guaranteed by the Spirit – was but an approximative schematization of the living reality, the Church, which he had only come to know rather late in life. That solid reality...contained elements which his theory failed to include, and the hard facts of the baptismal

⁷⁵ BATIFFOL, 400. Cullmann observes that if Cyprian's words «the chief church whence the sacerdotal unity has arisen (*ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*)» (*Ep* 59,14) refer to the Roman See itself, i.e. «that Jesus with the words 'you are Peter' founded *this* church, then Cyprian's exposition could scarcely be regarded as *entirely* consistent and unified» in CULLMANN, 161 note 11.

⁷⁶ M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 34.

⁷⁷ M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 34.

⁷⁸ M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 34.

⁷⁹ M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 34-35.

⁸⁰ M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 35.

⁸¹ M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 35.

controversy showed that his theory was inadequate. There his theory broke down completely. He fiercely tried to maintain it at the time, yet he never carried it to its logical conclusion, which was to cut off Stephen and all who agreed with him from the unity of the Church⁸².

Cyprian's thought for Bévenot can be understood only in light of the tension between the former's theory of oneness/unity and its practical application when confronted with the sort of doctrinal disagreement that effected precisely the nature, essence, and structure of the Church herself, i.e. the baptismal controversy.

N. Afanassieff seems to agree with Bévenot and appears to reconcile successfully part of Meyendorff's idea that all of the bishops occupy the chair of Peter with Maccarrone's insistence that Cyprian saw only the bishop of Rome seated on his own chair. Afanassieff suggests that the bishops enjoy the power of the chair by participation or «by the mediation of Rome» whose bishop is the «direct heir of Peter» and *de facto* would seem to enjoy more than a primacy of mere honor⁸³. Afanassieff conceives Cyprian consequently as setting himself up for a logical fall.

According to his doctrine there should have really been one single bishop at the head of the Universal Church. He was unwilling to place the Bishop of Rome outside the *concors numerositas* of bishops and yet the place given by him to the Roman Church did raise it above the «harmonious multitude». The ideal «Peter's throne» occupied by the whole episcopate became confused in Cyprian's mind with the actual throne occupied by the Bishop of Rome. According to Cyprian, every bishop occupies Peter's throne...but...[t]he bishop of Rome is the direct heir of Peter. Hence Cyprian's insistence that the Church of Rome is the root and matrix of the Catholic Church. Being so keenly aware of the Church's factual life, Cyprian could not deny that the See of Rome held a preponderant position: but he...[would not] make the Bishop

⁸² M. BÉVENOT, «*Primatus Petro Datur...*», 35; cf. also ID., *The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church*, 6-8, in which Bévenot states on p. 6 of that work: «That unity, in his theory, was constituted simply by the union of bishops among themselves».

⁸³ N. AFANASSIEFF, «The Church Which Presides in Love», 64. Afanassieff believes that while Cyprian sets in motion the arguments toward assigning Rome a unique power, he draws no clear conclusions about the See of Rome, that «*ecclesia principalis, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est*», ID, 64-65. Meyendorff would seem to conceive of the bishop of Rome as enjoying precisely and nothing more than such a primacy of honor. Rome's bishop presides «over a very great and very ancient Church» and preserves «by succession the teaching of Peter and Paul», cf. J. MEYENDORFF, *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, 75. Since all the bishops sit on the chair of Peter the one episcopate enjoys infallibility as opposed to a special and unique power of infallibility enjoyed by one bishop alone who holds a unique office. Of course problems arise simultaneously with disagreements in attempting to determine which party is right, or rather which party enjoys infallibility.

of Rome head of the episcopate. The bishop of Rome undertook to relieve him, and draw the necessary conclusions himself⁸⁴.

J. Danielou suggests that while Cyprian holds Rome's primacy in his theory of oneness/unity, he himself is not certain of its extent, especially if such an office encroaches on the lawful prerogatives of the local bishop⁸⁵. The resulting «ambiguity» and confusion in Cyprian's thought explains why both the Donatists and Augustine championed him in the fourth century⁸⁶.

1.7.3 *Problems Inexistent?*

Like Drobner and Quasten W.H.C. Frend maintains that Cyprian, most concerned about the oneness/unity and indivisibility of the Church, saw such oneness/unity «expressed through a federation of episcopally governed communities» headed by autonomous bishops⁸⁷. Frend contends, however, that Cyprian not only conceived of the origin of oneness/unity as being in Peter, but consequently that his successor as bishop of Rome held a primacy that demanded communion with him and the church there, i.e. with the origin of oneness/unity⁸⁸.

R.J. Halliburton elaborates in greater detail on the same points raised by Frend. The former's observations seem worthwhile quoting in full.

St. Cyprian's teaching concerning the oneness of the origin of the church and its present unity is to be directly compared with the Fathers' continual emphasis on the one source of all creation and the unity of the Godhead. For it would be...erroneous and indeed illogical to suggest that the Church begins from twelve, i.e. has twelve starting points...it is therefore of cardinal importance for the sake of the unity of the Church to demonstrate that wherever the Church is found dispersed throughout the world, it always goes back to this one, common, and single source. The corollary to this would seem to be that on account of the uniqueness of their generation the churches are (ontologically speaking) identical with one another; and that it is this identity which together with their common origin effects their unity and is the cause of their living in harmony with one another and not its result...St. Cyprian taught unity as fervently and uncompromisingly in his theology of the church as the Fathers did in every other department of their thinking. But it is noticeable that he did not consider the Church to be one by process of the assembling together of all the local churches in a harmonious federation, any

⁸⁴ N. AFANASSIEFF, 64-65.

⁸⁵ J. DANIELOU, *The Christian Centuries...*, 201-202.

⁸⁶ J. DANIELOU, 201.

⁸⁷ W.H.C. FREND, *The Early Church*, 100.

⁸⁸ W.H.C. FREND, *The Rise of Christianity*, 352.

more than others [*sic*] believed the Trinity to be One by the joining together in concord of the three Persons, or indeed that the episcopate was a synodical gathering of all the bishops. The One was, and is, from the very beginning, from which the many proceeded and still proceed; and the many are One both by their common origin and by reason of their identity with one another. So that just as the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; so too *a* church is in a sense *the* church; and perhaps we might even say that *a* bishop embodies in himself all that pertains to the episcopate⁸⁹.

1.7.4 *Back to the Beginning*

A more recent study on Cyprian and his thought revisits the *concors numerositas episcoporum* interpretation of Benson. Burns suggests Cyprian first employed the concept of the Church's oneness/unity to justify the oneness/unity of the episcopate in combatting the schisms at Carthage and Rome in 251⁹⁰. Eventually during the baptismal controversy Cyprian inverted the order as «the unity of the flock...required the unity of coordinated and collaborative action» of the episcopate⁹¹. Cyprian regarded Peter only as a symbol of the Church's oneness/unity and conceived a petrine office only in the local bishop, from which it follows that the episcopate is the foundation of the Church's unity⁹².

In Cyprian's theory, the unity of the church and the unity of the episcopate were dialectically related. The episcopate existed for the sake of the church and must be one because the church was one. The church functioned as one because the episcopate was one; its structures of unity beyond the local level were those of episcopal collegiality⁹³.

⁸⁹ R.J. HALLIBURTON, 196-198.

⁹⁰ BURNS, 163.

⁹¹ BURNS, 163-164.

⁹² Henn seems to share this opinion by stating in reference to *Ep. 66,8*: «What holds the 'catholic' church around the world together is precisely the unity of faith and love between bishops» in W. HENN, *The Honor of My Brothers*, 26-27. Cyprian here employs a construction similar to that in *Ep. 33,1* (cf. note 59) that seems to indicate Peter as a component essential to the Church Catholic. «Peter, upon whom the Church had been built, teaching and showing by the name of the Church...[that] the Church does not depart from Christ, and they are the Church...[who are] united to the bishop...from where (*Unde*) you should know...[the nature of the Church to be] one, Catholic...not rent or divided but...everywhere connected and conjoined with the glue of bishops cohering with one another» («*Petrus, super quem aedificata fuerat ecclesia, ecclesiae nomine docens et ostendans quia...ecclesia tamen a Christo non recedit et illi sunt ecclesia, plebs sacerdoti adunata ecclesia...Vnde scire debes...quae catholica una est scissa non sit neque diuisa, sed sit utique conexas et cohaerentium sibi inuicem sacerdotum glutino copulata*», CCL III C, 443).

⁹³ BURNS, 164.

Burns' study is countered with still another. F. Corsaro's interpretation of the *corpus Cypriani* concludes that the north-African bishop regarded the primacy of the Roman See as much more important and vital as a «moral force» in the Church than many would care to admit⁹⁴.

Geoffrey D. Dunn's even more recent approach attempts to determine Cyprianic thought on oneness/unity by examining the relationship between the early Christians and the bishop of Rome as evidenced in the Cyprianic corpus.

The argument in these pages is that just who the successor of Peter was and, therefore, what the relationship between the church of Rome and other churches entailed, as found in Cyprian's writings, is not identical with what today Catholic dogma teaches. The ecclesiology Cyprian espoused and which operated among third-century bishops has been modified since that time. Further, his correspondence reveals some of the earliest attempts by a Roman bishop to claim an expanding authority and thus to begin the process that has resulted in the current situation⁹⁵.

Finally, and in commemoration of the 1,750th anniversary of the Cyprianic epoch, the most recent reexamination and resummarization of *De Unitate* and the controversy surrounding its composition is the Bévenot-inspired work produced as the 500th volume in the *Sources Chrétiennes* ongoing series⁹⁶.

1.8 A New Beginning?

At the end of over a century of research, then, scholars still do not seem to enjoy a *concors numerositas* in their interpretations of Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity. Halliburton remains convinced that Cyprian's theory maintains the logical necessity of Peter as the origin of the Church's oneness/unity based on the Trinity itself. Frend speculates that only the deaths of Cyprian and Stephen prevented either significant clarification in the former's theory of oneness/unity and sacramental theology or plain

⁹⁴ F. CORSARO, 456. «*Il Papa d'Africa...non è lontano dal riconoscere il prestigio unico e la forza morale che emanano da Roma, da quella Roma 'onde Cristo è Romano'.*» While succinct this summary does little justice, perhaps, to the thorough argumentation that brings the author to this conclusion. In agreement with the content of this conclusion is G.S.M. WALKER, 30.

⁹⁵ G. D. DUNN, «*Cyprian and the Bishops of Rome: Questions of Papal Primacy in the Early Church*», 3.

⁹⁶ P. MATTEI, M. POIRIER, P. SINISCALCO, *Cyprien de Carthage: L'Unité de l'Eglise (De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate): Texte Critique du CCL 3 (M. Bévenot)*, Les Editions du Cerf 29, Bd Latour – Maubourg, Paris, 2006.

schism, which itself could have been a clarification of sorts. Danielou suggests that the confusion in Cyprian's theory permits two diametrically opposed sacramental theologies («*ex opere operantis*» and «*ex opere operato*») to find argumentative support. Drobner and Quasten do not seem to address the textual changes in *De Unitate* and the potential changes in Cyprian's thought. The only continuity in Cyprian's thought according to scholars like Chapman, Bévenot, and Afanassieff lies in Cyprian's seeming ideological changes that potentially lead to confusion and/or contradiction in his theory of oneness/unity. Others like Benson, Meyendorff, Schatz, and Burns find continuity in Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity by seeming to ignore certain principles Cyprian held.

Dunn introduces a novel hermeneutic in resolving the dilemma.

...there is a warning to both those who wish to deny and those who wish to support modern papal primacy not to read the ancient evidence out of its own context. I am going to argue that the best way to read that evidence correctly is to look at not just what was said about how the early Christians understood the bishop or Rome but how the early Christians actually related to that bishop in practice....It is this approach, I believe, that justifies yet another consideration of the topic of Cyprian and the papacy, one that may appear to have been exhausted⁹⁷.

Cyprian's theory, then, seems to remain a tragically failed thought experiment rent by change, confusion, and contradiction. Any continuity Cyprian's thought otherwise might enjoy consequently is reduced to a mere consistency in his apparent errors. Will scholarship eventually and simply agree to disagree on the first Church Father who offered some semblance of an ecclesiological theory, the origin of which is in Cyprian's understanding of oneness/unity?

While a comparison and assessment of each of the aforementioned scholars' opinions on Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity could be made here, nothing more than merely one more opinion, no matter how well argued, would be the result. A real understanding of Cyprian's theory gleaned from a philological analysis of Cyprian's use of the term «*unitas*» itself is potentially a new way to establish what Cyprian may have intended philosophically, theologically, and, consequently, ecclesologically.

⁹⁷ G. D. DUNN, «*Cyprian and the Bishops of Rome: Questions of Papal Primacy in the Early Church*», 4,6.

1.9 Final Considerations

Before proceeding to the philological analysis of the term «*unitas*» in classical Latin literature from the first century BCE through the fourth century CE and Cyprian in particular, an observation of Bévenot seems appropriate.

The symmetrical arrangement of balanced clauses, the constant pleonasm (for Cyprian when striving to be eloquent will always use two words in preference to one), the alliteration, the rhyme, the poetical diction, the forced metaphors and combinations of incongruous words, and all the artifices of style are to be found...To get his point across, Cyprian will pile words one on top of another, regardless of the nuances between synonyms, or else he shares a lapidary dictum – which may sound good, but will not always stand up to close analysis. The general effect is powerful, and his thought reveals itself as strong and often beautiful. But given this *genre* of writing, it is particularly dangerous to isolate particular sentences or phrases from their context, or to build up a system from such phrases gathered from disparate contexts, and call it Cyprian's «thought». His Christianity was indeed his life, and he judged all things in its light: this he could do without having any all-embracing preconceived system, and it did not preserve him from occasional inconsistencies⁹⁸.

In spite of what may be interpreted as a seemingly surreptitious *a priori* negation of further philological research into the present dilemma leading to potentially significant clarifications, and with Bévenot's *caveat* and Dunn's «warning» carefully in mind, such judgments cannot but be confirmed or questioned at the conclusion of this thesis.

⁹⁸ M. BÉVENOT, *The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church*, 10.

PART TWO

«Unitas» in the Latin Authors Removed from the Cyprianic Context

CHAPTER ONE

The Non-Christian Authors

2.1.1 Varro (116-27BCE)

The first occurrence in all of Latin literature of the term «*unitas*» appears in a work appropriately titled *De lingua latina* (on the Latin language) by Marcus Terentius Varro. Varro was a prolific writer known especially for his studies on language and grammar, though most of his works were lost after Marc Antony confiscated his property following Julius Caesar's assassination⁹⁹. Born in Rieti north of Rome in the Sabine mountains, Varro became capital triumvir, quaestor, and eventually Pompey's proquaestor and legate after having studied grammar and philosophy in his youth. Caesar pardoned Varro, a supporter of Cato, Cicero, and Pompey,

⁹⁹ Biographical information is from P. FRACCARO, «Varrone, Marco Terenzio» in *Enciclopedia Italiana (EI)* XXXIV, 1013-1015.

after the civil war and charged Varro with the reorganization and superintendence of Rome's library system. In his explanation of the relationship between a root word and its derivatives, Varro notes that two unrelated names like «Priam» and «Hecuba» or «would indicate no oneness/unity»¹⁰⁰ of idea¹⁰¹. The substantive and origin «Aemilius» and its genitive form «Aemilii» would imply a relationship of identity between the two names¹⁰². This oneness/unity of identity, according to Varro, is like that shared between a «source» (*fons*) and a «stream» (*rivus*)¹⁰³. This is the only occurrence of the term «*unitas*» in Varro.

2.1.2 Celsus (c. early first century CE)

Aulus Cornelius Celsus wrote encyclopedia during the reign of the Emperor Tiberius¹⁰⁴. The possibly Gallican-born writer's tractates on agriculture, rhetoric, warfare, and especially medicine are esteemed especially for their clarity of thought and expression. Though called the «Cicero of doctors», Celsus' style is more similar to the word economy of Julius Caesar.

Celsus employs the term «*unitas*» three times in his medical manual *De medicina*. Following a graphic description of the symptoms and effects of diarrhea, Celsus prescribes a homeopathic medicinal recipe should behavioral modifications like horse back riding prove unsuccessful in bettering the bowels. After having placed a variety of fruits including crab apples, pears, and pomegranates into a jar, Celsus instructs to boil all of the ingredients together until «the things having been liquefied curdle together into a oneness/unity», and assures that the «taste is not unpleasant»¹⁰⁵.

Celsus next offers remedies for eye troubles such as conjunctivitis and ophthalmia. Before prescribing more severe treatments, Celsus shares another recipe for an eye salve made from egg yolks, wine, and honey. The

¹⁰⁰ «*nullam unitatem adsignificaret*» in VARRO, VIII,2 in G. GOETZ – F. SCHOELL, ed., *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina Quae Supersunt*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1910, 126.

¹⁰¹ VARRO, *De lingua latina*, VIII,1 in G. GOETZ – F. SCHOELL, ed., *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina Quae Supersunt*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1910, 126.

¹⁰² VARRO, VIII, 4 in G. GOETZ – F. SCHOELL, ed., *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina Quae Supersunt*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1910, 126.

¹⁰³ VARRO, VIII, 4-5 in G. GOETZ – F. SCHOELL, ed., *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina Quae Supersunt*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1910, 126.

¹⁰⁴ Biographical information is from E. BIANCHI, «*Celso, Aulo Cornelio*» in *EI* IX, 675-676.

¹⁰⁵ «*liquata in unitatem quondam coeant...Id gustu non insuave est*» in CELSUS, *De medicina*, IV,26,6 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Celsus, «De Medicina», I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1948, 442.

concoction is to be applied gently to the eye with a soft wool cloth only after these ingredients have been so mixed together «where a oneness/unity has been made»¹⁰⁶.

Advising how best to suture a variety of ulcers and fistulae with reinforced thread, Celsus counsels to create «a double or triple line so having been twisted, that a oneness/unity has been made in it», i.e. a thread doubled or tripled on itself to create a stronger stitch¹⁰⁷.

2.1.3 *Scribonius Largus* (c. 1-50CE)

Scribonius Largus was a physician from Rome¹⁰⁸. His employment in the service of the Emperor Claudius brought him to the British Isles during the Romans' campaign there. Scribonius employs the term «*unitas*» twice in *Compositiones*, his only surviving work, while describing methods of preparing, mixing, and applying medicines. «And where when they will have scalped with the stroke of a hair, gradually mixing turpentine, then a oneness/unity of all things is made»¹⁰⁹. «Where a oneness/unity of all things has been made with a mortar, the medicament is combined with the honey having been skimmed off, pills of a great quantity are formed»¹¹⁰.

2.1.4 *Columella* (c. early to mid-first century CE)

Born in Cadiz, Spain at the turn end of the first century CE, Lucius Iunius Moderatus Columella, a tribune in the imperial army's sixth legion, is most famous for his works on agriculture in Syria and Italy¹¹¹. Pliny the Elder and Palladius regarded Columella, who employs the term «*unitas*» five times, as an authority on farming and tending vineyards.

¹⁰⁶ «*Ubi facta unitas est*», CELSUS, *De medicina*, VI,6,K in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: *Celsus*, «*De Medicina*», II, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1953, 192.

¹⁰⁷ «*Linum duplex triplexve sic tortum, ut unitas in eo facta sit*», CELSUS, *De medicina*, VII,4,4 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: *Celsus*, «*De Medicina*», III, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1953, 310.

¹⁰⁸ Biographical information is from W. D. ROSS, «*Scribonius Largus*» in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 965.

¹⁰⁹ «*et ibi cum concalverint ictu pili, terebinthinam paulatim miscere, donec omnium unitas fiat*» in SCRIBONIUS LARGUS, *Compositiones* 75 in S. SCONOCCHIA, ed., *Scribonii Lari Compositiones*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1983, 42.

¹¹⁰ «*Ubi omnium unitas mortario facta est, melle despumato medicamentum comprehenditur, deinde formantur pilulae viciae magnitudinis*» in SCRIBONIUS LARGUS, *Compositiones* 88 in S. SCONOCCHIA, ed., *Scribonii Lari Compositiones*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1983, 47.

¹¹¹ Biographical information is from A. CALDERINI, «*Columella, Lucio Giunio Moderato*» in *EI* X, 905-906.

Following a thorough explanation of the variety of sheep found throughout the Mediterranean in the seventh book of *De re rustica*, Columella offers advice on how to procure any particular breed of sheep through a process of color analysis. The buyer, who may be unfamiliar with the delicate intricacies and potential fraud involved in sheep trade, is advised to buy unshorn sheep «by which oneness/unity of color may become better visible»¹¹². This is essential to ensuring that future generations of sheep be free of color impurities as «paternal marks frequently continue in the offspring»¹¹³.

Columella explains how and when best to plant and cultivate a variety of herbs and vegetables in the eleventh book. Columella observes that once asparagus sprouts, its roots «are entangled with one another and form almost a oneness/unity»¹¹⁴.

The twelfth book explores several ways to create preservative agents. Columella provides a recipe for a kind of pitch that requires mixing together all of the ingredients including sea water with a wooden spatula in an uncovered tub exposed to sunlight until «they dissolve in the pitch and be a oneness/unity»¹¹⁵. Another recipe is offered for rendering a brand of pitch produced in Liguria more suitable for preserving wine. Various ingredients and pitch contained in separate jars must be poured into one jar and this jar turned over but not stirred. Once the contents have been cured with the pitch «and they will have made almost a oneness/unity» they can then be poured back into the original jar and finally stirred together with a wooden ladle¹¹⁶.

In the ninth book of *De arboribus* Columella provides a method for grafting and rooting grape vines of different species so that one bush may produce a variety of different grapes. He instructs that several vineshoots be tied tightly together, inserted compactly into a clay tube or horn, and then rooted in the ground. With proper watering and fertilizing and when

¹¹² «quo melius unitas coloris appareat», in COLUMELLA, *De re rustica*, VII,3,2 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: *Columella, «De re rustica»*, II, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1954, 238.

¹¹³ «paternae notae plerumque natis inhaerent», in COLUMELLA, *De re rustica*, VII,3,2.

¹¹⁴ «inter se implicantur et quasi unitatem faciunt», in COLUMELLA, *De re rustica*, XI,3,43 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: *Columella, «De re rustica et De Arboribus»*, III, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1955, 154.

¹¹⁵ «in pice colliquescant, et unitas fiat», in COLUMELLA, *De re rustica*, XII,22,2 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: *Columella, «De re rustica et De arboribus»*, III, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1955, 242.

¹¹⁶ «et quasi unitatem fecerint», in COLUMELLA, *De re rustica*, XII,24,3 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: *Columella, «De re rustica et De arboribus»*, III, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1955, 246.

«the shoots will have cohered together among themselves, with a oneness/unity having been made after two or three years»¹¹⁷, then the new stalk should be cut off at its most solid point and promptly re-rooted, creating one grape vine stalk that will produce various species of grapes.

2.1.5 Seneca (c. 4BCE to 65CE)

Lucius Annaeus Seneca, the second son of his father by the same name, was born in Córdoba in Spain in either 8 or 4BCE¹¹⁸. While still a youth a maternal aunt brought him to Rome where he studied grammar and rhetoric. A weak constitution necessitated a sojourn in Pompei and in Egypt, and after having recuperated Seneca began a public career in his mid-thirties with the quaestura in 31 or 32CE. Falling out of favor with Caligula, whose jealousy of Seneca's growing popularity as an eloquent orator inspired the emperor to seek the former's assassination, Seneca devoted himself completely to the study of literature and philosophy. At the height of his career rumor of adultery with the deceased Caligula's sisters constrained Emperor Claudius to exile Seneca to Corsica in the autumn of 41. Though the latter protests to the contrary, this banishment took a toll on Seneca, who finally returned to Rome after his conspirators' demise in 49 and quickly became praetor and confidant of Agrippina. Studies abroad in Athens were prevented after Agrippina charged Seneca with tutoring her son and future Emperor, Nero. After ordering assassins to stab his mother to death near Naples, Nero was convinced that Seneca, too, was plotting his death. Nero ordered his mentor to commit suicide, with which the latter complied at the age of seventy in April of 65, less than six months after the Emperor had executed a group of arsonists, i.e. the Christians, declared public enemy number one for having set fire to Rome. Regarded as one of antiquity's more prolific authors writing on a variety of topics, Seneca's writing exhibited a tension between pragmatism and idealism. His sometime discursive style of composition gained admirers and critics alike¹¹⁹. Seneca employs the term «*unitas*» eighteen times, more than any other non-Christian author.

Reflecting on what ultimately makes one happy in *De vita beata*, Seneca suggests nothing less than «the highest good to be concord of the soul.

¹¹⁷ «*post biennium aut triennium facta iam unitate*», in COLUMELLA, *De arboribus*, IX,2 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Columella, «De re rustica et De arboribus», III*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1955, 372.

¹¹⁸ Biographical information is from A. BELTRAMI, «*Seneca, L. Anneo*» in *EI XXXI*, 372-375.

¹¹⁹ Cf. the opinion of Gellius following.

Indeed where agreement and oneness/unity will be, there will have to be the virtues. Vices disagree»¹²⁰.

Writing to his nephew, Lucilius, on a number of moral and ethical subjects, Seneca employs the term «*unitas*» twice. «Out of this thing, then, is the order and sequence of things joined together and a oneness/unity of life will have been embarked upon through the upright thing»¹²¹. «I ponder from time to time what indeed can be understood, if the image be real; for this, which has brought forth for instance out of which copy, has impressed its form with all things, so that those things come together into a oneness/unity»¹²².

Commenting in *De beneficiis* on the necessity that humans live among one another, Seneca warns «Take away this society, and you rend asunder the oneness/unity of the human race, by which life is sustained»¹²³.

Seneca makes greatest advantage of the term «*unitas*» in his discussion of atmospheric phenomena, especially lighting and thunder, and the nature of air in the second book of his *Naturales quaestiones*, in which he employs the term thirteen times. He begins «and first this is needing to be presumed the atmosphere to be among these bodies by which there is a oneness/unity»¹²⁴. Seneca explains himself further: «a composite is the touching of two bodies joined between each other, continuity is the uninterrupted joining of parts among each other. Oneness/unity is continuity without a composite»¹²⁵. Explaining that such abstract concepts

¹²⁰ «[S]ummum bonum esse animi concordiam...virtutes enim ibi esse debebunt, ubi consensus atque unitas erit. Dissident vitia» in SENECA, *De vita beata*, VIII,8,6 in T. E. PAGE – et al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca: Moral Essays II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1958, 120.

¹²¹ «Ex hoc autem rerum ordo seriesque contexitur et unitas vitae per rectum itura» in SENECA, *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*, LXVI,35 in E.H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Epistulae Morales II: Books LXVI-XCII»*, V, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1970, 22,24.

¹²² «Puto aliquando ne intelligi quidem posse, si imago vera sit; haec enim omnibus, quae ex quo velut exemplari traxit, formam suam impressit, ut in unitatem illa competant» in SENECA, *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*, LXXXIV,8 in E.H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Epistulae Morales II: Books LXVI-XCII»*, V, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1970, 280.

¹²³ «Hanc societatem tolle, et unitatem generis humani, qua vita sustinetur, scindes» in SENECA, *De Beneficiis*, IV,18,4 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Moral Essays»*, III, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1958, 242.

¹²⁴ «...et hoc primum praesumendum inter ea corpora quibus unitas est aera esse» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,2,1 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones»*, I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 100.

¹²⁵ «...et comissura est duorum coniunctorum inter se corporum tactus, continuatio est partium inter se non intermissa coniunctio. Unitas est sine comissura continuatio» in

really exist and can be evidenced in explaining natural phenomena, Seneca declares «Therefore, it behooves you concede out of these things which certainly escape the senses, other things will be apprehended with reason, there to be in which things a oneness/unity of bodies»¹²⁶. Seneca emphasizes that he is not referring to such as «bodies having been united»¹²⁷, but rather that «if when I will have said one thing only, remember me not to refer to number, but to the nature of a body cohering not by external assistance but by its own oneness/unity. Atmosphere is out of this thing having been noted of bodies»¹²⁸. Seneca observes that while the atmosphere's oneness/unity itself is indivisible, and while «it separates [the heavens from the earth] because it intervenes between; it joins because through this [atmosphere] there is agreement between the two»¹²⁹.

Seneca asserts that anything and everything in the universe necessarily has a oneness/unity. «However, whatever is a part having been born in any other thing has oneness/unity. For nothing is born without oneness/unity»¹³⁰.

Seneca explains that dynamic tension is a necessary component of oneness/unity. «For there is never effort lest through the oneness/unity

SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,2,2 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones»*, I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 102.

¹²⁶ «*Ergo concedas oportet ex his quoque quae sensum quidem effugiunt, ceterum ratione prenduntur, esse in quibusdam unitatem corporum*» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,2,3 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones»*, I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 102.

¹²⁷ «*unita corpora*» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,2,4 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones»*, I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 102.

¹²⁸ «*Si quando dixero unum, memineris me non ad numerum referre, sed ad naturam corporis nulla ope externa sed unitate sua cohaerentis. Ex hac nota corporum aer est*» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,2,4 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones»*, I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 102.

¹²⁹ «*Separat, quia medius intervenit; iungit, quia utrique per hunc interse consensus est*» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,4,1 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones»*, I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 104.

¹³⁰ «*Habet autem unitatem quicquid alicuius rei nativa pars est. Nihil enim nascitur sine unitate*» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,4,2 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones»*, I, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 104.

having been joined together, because the parts must agree unto tension and confer strengths»¹³¹. Seneca continues.

However oneness/unity being in the atmosphere can be understood out of this, that our bodies cohere among themselves. For what is that which hold that which is spirit? What is that by which our soul is moved? What is the reason for this other than tension? What tension lest out of oneness/unity? What oneness/unity lest what be in the atmosphere? For what other than oneness/unity and tension of spirit produces slight crops and fruits of the earth and thrusts forth mighty trees and stretches out in branches and lifts them into the heights¹³²?

Arguing against both the Epicurean notion of pockets in the air and water that permit passage of objects and that the atmosphere should be broken down into particles to be studied, Seneca makes a comparison of the atmosphere to water. «For there is a similar facility of waters, nor is there doubt concerning the oneness/unity of them, which so receive bodies so that they always flow contrary to the bodies having been received»¹³³.

Seneca treats the formation and nature of the earth's bodies of water in the third book. Discussing the origins of the waters on the earth Seneca remarks «Already, however, from the first day of the world, when it separated out of formless oneness/unity into this state, when it was decreed earthly things are immersed»¹³⁴.

Seneca's *De clementia*, an exhortation to his former pupil and future arbiter of death, the emperor Nero, includes the final instance of the term

¹³¹ «Numquam enim nisi contexti per unitatem corporis nisus est, cum partes consentire ad intentionem debeant et conferre vires» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,6,2 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones», I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 106,108.

¹³² «Esse autem unitatem in aere vel ex hoc intellegi potest quod corpora nostra inter se cohaerent. Quid enim ist aliud quod teneat illa quam spiritus? Quid est aliud quo animus noster agitur? Quis est illi motus nisi intentio? Quae intentio nisi ex unitate? Quae unitas, nisi haec esset in aere? Quid autem aliud producit fruges et segetem imbecillam ac virentes exigit arbores ac distendit in ramos aut in altum erigit quam spiritus intentio et unitas?» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,6,6 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones», I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 110.

¹³³ «Nam aquarum quoque similis facilitas est, nec de unitate illarum dubium est, quae sic corpora accipiunt ut semper in contrarium acceptis refluant» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, II,7,2 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones», I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 110.

¹³⁴ «Iam autem a primo die mundi, cum in hunc habitum ex informi unitate discederet, quando mergerentur terrena decretum est» in SENECA, *Naturales quaestiones*, III,30,1 in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones», I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971, 292.

«*unitas*» found in his writings. Seneca emphasizes the necessary office of the emperor in preserving the essential nature and integrity of the Roman empire.

For this one is the bond, through which the republic coheres, this one the vital breath, which these many thousands draw, themselves would be being for themselves nothing lest a burden and prey, if that mind of the emperor be taken away....This fall will be the destruction of the Roman peace, this will drive the fortune of many peoples into ruins; this people will be free from that danger only so long as it will know how to apply the reins, which if when it shall have torn away or by some misfortune it will not suffer itself to be replaced, this oneness/unity and this coherence of the mightiest empire will break up into many parts, and the same will be the end of this city's needing to rule, which will have been needing to be obeyed¹³⁵.

2.1.6 Pliny the Elder (23/24-79CE)

Gaius Plinius Secundus was born in Como near Milan between the years 23 and 24CE and subsequently was a contemporary of Celsus, Columella, and Seneca¹³⁶. Pliny wrote on practically everything composing volumes of information in a quantity unprecedented in either the Greek or Roman world. A variety of government appointments allowed him to travel extensively including posts as a cavalry officer in Germany, procurator in Belgium, in Narbonne in France, in Taragona in Spain, and in Africa, and in Rome itself he was made prefect of the flotilla of Misenum. This last assignment brought him to the towns of Herculaneum and Pompei along the southern Italian coast, where he was killed in the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in 79CE. His sense of duty no less than his curiosity and insatiable appetite for learning about natural phenomena, leading to his reputation for devouring all that he read, prevented him from leaving his post there. Pliny introduced a new vocabulary in the Latin language in his descriptions and explanations of Greek art, science, and culture. Among other studies his geographical descriptions of the known world became a

¹³⁵ «*Ille est enim vinculum, per quod res publica cohaeret, ille spiritus vitalis, quem haec milia trahunt nihil ipsa per se futura nisi onus et praeda, si mens illa imperii subtrahatur...Hic casus Romanae pacis exitium erit, hic tanti fortunam populi in ruinas aget; tam diu ab isto periculo aberit hic populus, quam diu sciet ferre frenos, quos si quando abruperit vel aliquo casu discussos reponi sibi passus non erit, haec unitas et hic maximi imperii contextus in partes multas dissiliet, idemque huic urbi finis dominandi erit, qui parendi fuerit*» in SENECA, «*De clementia*», III,2,1-2 in F. PRECHAC, ed., *Sénèque: De La Clémence*, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2003, 17-18.

¹³⁶ Biographical information is from F. ARNALDI, «*Plinio il Vecchio*» in *EI* XXVII, 548-549.

standard reference through the Renaissance. Pliny employs the term «*unitas*» nine times.

The fifth book of his monumental work explores world geography. In his account of north-Africa and Egypt Pliny employs the term «*unitas*» to describe the point of convergence between several rivers flowing from the one principle Nile River, which functions as the source and origin of those diverging branches. «[T]he extent [of the Nile is] from the oneness/unity of the river whence it first branches on the side into the Canopicus [River] to the west...[and] into the Pelusiacus [River] to the east»¹³⁷.

Pliny provides a thorough geographical description of the vast and meandering Caucas mountain range, which is referred to by various names according to the peoples that inhabit any given portion. Where valleys occur, which may be mistaken as ruptures consequently forming different mountain ranges, Pliny insists «even where it opens with the name of “Gates,” nevertheless vindicating itself a oneness/unity»¹³⁸.

The seventh book is an anthropological examination of the many peoples of the world. Discussing racial and genetic differences and similarities, Pliny provides an anecdote about a slave trader’s attempt at defrauding Marc Antony. «Toranius sold to Antony, already a triumvir, boys, one trans-Alpine and the other having been born in Asia, as twins: so great was the oneness/unity»¹³⁹. Discovering the salesman’s ruse after hearing two very different accents from the slaves, Antony was persuaded further by Troianus that the lack of any consanguinity or racial similarity made the pair all the more unique and exotic.

Pliny describes flora and fauna and especially trees in his sixteenth and seventeenth books. Excluding variations in the leaves of the poplar, ivy, and croton, «to each in its own genus a oneness/unity of foliage remains», i.e. all other species of tree maintain a consistency in their leaf structure¹⁴⁰.

¹³⁷ «*Mensura ab unitate alvei, unde se primum findit in latera ad Canopicum [a river] ostium...ad Pelusiacum...est*» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, V,9,§48. E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Pliny, «Naturalis historia», II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1947, 254.

¹³⁸ «*...etiam ubi dehiscit seque populis aperit, Portarum tamen nomine unitatem sibi vindicans*» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, V,27,§99 in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Pliny, «Naturalis historia», II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1947, 294.

¹³⁹ «*Toranius mango Antonio iam triumviro eximios forma pueros, alterum in Asia genitum, alterum trans Alpibus, ut geminos vendidit: tanta unitas erat*» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, VII,12,§56. T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Pliny, «Naturalis historia», II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1947, 542.

¹⁴⁰ «*Foliorum unitas in suo cuique genere permanet*» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, XVI,35,§85. T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Pliny, «Naturalis historia», IV*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1952, 442.

Similar to Columella's advice Pliny, too, offers methods for grafting trees. Where one has already cut a hole on the surface of a tree trunk, Pliny instructs to excise from another tree a piece of bark of equal size already bearing a growth bud and precisely and tightly fit the new piece into the existing cavity «so that there is no place for scarring and a oneness/unity is readily made receiving neither moisture nor air; nonetheless, however, better with a bandage and a bond»¹⁴¹.

Reviewing a variety of historical developments within the governance of Rome in the thirty-third book, Pliny recounts the reconfiguration of the equestrian order and new legislation on the right to wear a ring. «Finally in the ninth imperial year of Tiberius the equestrian order came into a oneness/unity, and during the consulship of Caius Asinius Pollion and Caius Antistius Veteris in the 775th year of the founding of the city a decree was established with regard to the authorization of rings»¹⁴².

Before proceeding to a discussion of stone and earthenware in the thirty-fifth book, Pliny laments the replacement of paintings throughout private and public establishments in Rome with marble work and gold tiling. He recounts the development of inlaid marble patterns introduced during the reigns of Nero and Claudius so as to soften the visual impact of large areas of a solid color «by inserting markings, which are not in the surfaces, to diversify the oneness/unity»¹⁴³.

Finally, Pliny discusses precious metals, gems, and stones in the thirty-seventh book. Green emeralds «of the ingenuity of artisans are all cut with a six-angled shape, due to dullness with a oneness/unity the muted color is enhanced by the reflection of anglesness»¹⁴⁴. Later Pliny describes the practice of some cunning gem-cutters who cut away portions of variegated

¹⁴¹ «ut cicatrici non locus sit et statim fiat unitas nec umorem nec adflatum recipiens; nihilominus tamen et luto munire et vinculo melius» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, XVII,26,§118. T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: Pliny, «*Naturalis historia*», V, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1950, 82.

¹⁴² «Tiberii demum principatu nono anno in unitatem venit equester ordo anulorum auctoritati forma condita est C. Asinio Pollione C. Antistio Vetere cos. Anno urbis conditae DCCLXXV» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, XXXIII,8,§32. T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: Pliny, «*Naturalis historia*», IX, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1952, 26.

¹⁴³ «maculas, quae non essent in crustis, inserendo unitatem variare» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, XXXV,1,§3. T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: Pliny, «*Naturalis historia*», IX, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1952, 262.

¹⁴⁴ «Poliuntur omnes sexangula figura artificum ingeniis, quoniam hebes unitate surda color percussu angulorum excitetur» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, XXXVII,20,§76. T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., Loeb: Pliny, «*Naturalis historia*», X, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1952, 224.

stones «to arrive unto a oneness/unity» and render the gems more marketable¹⁴⁵.

2.1.7 *Frontinus* (c. 30CE-104)

Sextus Iulius Frontinus enjoyed a variety of high-level government appointments including both *praetor urbanus* and *consul suffectus*, a post he held three times, in Rome and later governor of Britain in the late 70's CE¹⁴⁶. Known for manuals on military ethical code, discipline, and the strategic utilization of military officers, Frontinus employs the term «*unitas*» once in his work *De aquis urbis Romae*, written while serving as the chief water works engineer (*curator aquarum*) – perhaps his most important post – at the turn of the second century CE.

Frontinus instructs that masonry repairs to Rome's aqueduct system should not necessitate interrupting the water supply and flow. However, particular attention should be paid to the season of the year in which repairs are undertaken. The proper time of year is from the first of April through the first of November excluding August. Moderate weather that avoids severe heat or frost is essential that masonry work «properly absorb out of the structure and be made more strongly into a oneness/unity»¹⁴⁷

2.1.9 *Quintilianus* (c. 30-35CE to c. 100)

Marcus Fabius Quintilianus was born in Calahorra, Spain (ancient Calagurris), possibly the son of a rhetor¹⁴⁸. Quintilianus' education both in Rome and elsewhere became his life's work, rendering him a renowned teacher and occasioning employment as such by more than a few emperors including Galba and Domitian.

The only two instances of the term «*unitas*» in Quintilianus occur once in the *Declamationes maiores* and once in the *Declamationes minores*¹⁴⁹. Scholarship technically regards the former as *pseudo* and the latter as

¹⁴⁵ «*ad unitatem excidere*» in PLINIUS, *Naturalis Historia*, XXXVII,74,§195. T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Pliny, «Naturalis historia»*, X, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1952, 322. There is a textual discrepancy that sees present in some manuscripts «*novitatem*» instead of «*unitatem*».

¹⁴⁶ Biographical information is from G. C. WHITTICK, «*Frontinus, Sextus Julius*», in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 448.

¹⁴⁷ «*ut ex commodo structura combibat et in unitatem corroboretur*» in FRONTINUS, *De aquis urbis Romae*, II,123, in M. B. MCELWAIN, ed., *Loeb: Frontinus Stratagems and Aqueducts*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1980, 454.

¹⁴⁸ Biographical information is from R. G. AUSTIN, «*Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius*», in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 907.

¹⁴⁹ Information on these two works is from M. WINTERBOTTOM, «*Declamtionones Pseudo-Quintilianae*», in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 317.

dubium, as the date and authorship cannot be determined and the style is not typically Quintilian. Nevertheless, for consistency's sake the term's usage in this context has been included here.

A passage in the *Declamationes maiores* recounts the devastating effects of a flood in a particular area, the people are forced to migrate elsewhere and recreate a new life in an uninhabited area, described as «an indiscreet oneness/unity having been made»¹⁵⁰. The *Declamationes minores* asks «What is more just than the inheritance having been agreed upon having the agreement of one alone? For this is the oneness/unity of society»¹⁵¹.

2.1.9 Gellius (c. 130CE-c. 180)

Some suggest the grammarian, Aulus Gellius, to have hailed from North Africa, though by the time he received the toga he was certainly sojourning in Rome¹⁵². Gellius studied grammar, logic, geometry, and religious law in Rome and Athens, and he became most famous for his studies and treatises on grammar. Gellius' was a clear Latin of halcyon Republican days with precision in meaning, harmonizing word economy with beauty of expression. The grammarian consequently favors the Latin of Vergil and despises that of Nero's tutor, Seneca, to whom Gellius refers as an «inept and stupid man»¹⁵³. Gellius explores a broad range of topics from philosophy to philology in his major work *Noctes Atticae*. Explaining that certain words have only either a singular or plural form, Gellius employs the term «*unitas*» once, referring to the «oneness/unity of a singular number»¹⁵⁴, i.e. the oneness/unity of one¹⁵⁵.

¹⁵⁰ «*indiscreta unitas facta est*» in QUINTILIANUS, *Declamationes maiores*, XIII,2 in L. HAKANSON, ed., *Declamationes XIX Maiores Quintiliano Falso Ascriptae*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart 1982, 267.

¹⁵¹ «*Quid est iustius quam compositum patrimonium habere condicionem unius? Societatis hoc enim est unitas*» in QUINTILIANUS, *Declamationes minores*, 320,5 in D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, ed., *M. Fabii Quintiliani Declamationes Minores*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart 1989, 229.

¹⁵² Biographical information is from V. USSANI, «Gellio, Aulo» in *EI* XVI, 485-486; P. K. MARSHALL, «Gellius, Aulus» in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 459-460.

¹⁵³ «*homo ineptus et insubidus*» as in V. USSANI, 485.

¹⁵⁴ «*singularis numeri unitatem*», in GELLIUS, «*Noctes Atticae*», XIX, 8, 12 in T. E. PAGE – et al., ed., *Loeb: The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius III*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1952, 374.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. L&S where under the entry «*singularis*» the meaning of this term in the context of grammar *per se* is «*of or belonging to unity, singular*».

2.1.10 Marcus Junianus Justinus (third or early fourth century CE)

The only historical information on Marcus Junianus Justinus is that he lived at the cusp of the fourth century CE, and abridged the more famous Pompeius Trogus' forty-four book history, *Historiae Philippicae*, into an epitome with a series of prologues introducing each book entitled *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*¹⁵⁶.

Pompeius Trogus was born in the late first century BCE and died in the mid-first century CE¹⁵⁷. Trogus hailed from the Narbonensis province in ancient Gaul. While his treatises on wildlife were utilized by Pliny the Elder, Trogus primarily is noted for his *Historiae Philippicae*, which is an extensive historical survey from the rise and fall of ancient Greek and Middle Eastern kingdoms through Caesar's and Augustus' conquests of Gaul and Spain respectively. The term «*unitas*» occurs twice in this work.

Trogus recounts in his second book an ancient debate between the Egyptians and the Scythians as to which race was more aboriginal. The Egyptians argued that a favorable climate throughout their land necessitated that humans naturally inhabited that region earlier than other more arid or colder parts of the earth. The Scythians rebutted that such an argument seems absurd as nature produces a plethora of plant and animal life appropriate to a region's respective climate. Moreover, the higher elevations of the mountainous Scythia would have been the first lands to appear after the great flood. «Besides, if there once was a oneness/unity of the world, of which now are many parts, whether in the beginning of things floods of waters kept the lands hidden, or whether fire, which also generated the world, occupied all parts, of the one or the other of the beginning, the Scythians stand out as the origin»¹⁵⁸.

In his Prologue to the thirty-third book of Trogus' history, Marcus Junianus Justinus employs the term «*unitas*» to introduce Trogus' exposition of the period of war between the Romans and the Macedonians and the latter's dissolution as a confederation of city-states at the hands of the Romans, following the former's victories over the Carthaginians during the Punic Wars: «A battle having arisen among the Achaeans and the Lacedaemonians [i.e. Spartans], the citizens of Achaia having been driven

¹⁵⁶ O. SEEL, «*Praefatio*» in *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi Accedunt Prologi in Pompeium Trogum*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1985, i.

¹⁵⁷ Biographical information is from A. H. McDONALD, «*Trogus, Pompeius*» in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1096-1097.

¹⁵⁸ «*Ceterum si mundi, quae nunc partes sunt, aliquando unitas fuit, sive inluvies aquarum principio rerum terras obrutas tenuit, sive ignis, qui et mundum genuit, cuncta possedit, utriusque primordii Scythas origine praestare*» in MARCUS JUNIANUS JUSTINUS, *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi, Liber II* in O. SEEL, 17.

out from the oneness/unity of [their] body»¹⁵⁹. Trogus describes in the thirty-third and thirty-fourth books the Romans' duplicitous strategy in instigating infighting among the Macedonians, realizing the key to success in subjugating the entire region lay in convincing the Achaeans to abandon their brand of confederal government in favor of each city independently governing itself. Trogus explains, «For the Achaeans, although having been distributed throughout cities like throughout members, they however have one body and one single empire, they repel the cities' dangers with mutual strength»¹⁶⁰. Trogus concludes that the Romans eventually overwhelmed the Achaeans – and all of Macedonia for that matter – due to presumption and a lack of organization among the region's inhabitants.

2.1.11 Conclusion

The very first author to employ the term «*unitas*» does so in the context of origin and relation. Varro calls the intimate and intrinsic relationship between any root word and its derivative a «oneness/unity». Unrelated names or words have no oneness/unity of identity, but related names and words, i.e. the nominative and genitive cases of the same word, do enjoy such oneness/unity. Pliny reiterates this in his anecdote regarding a pair of twin slaves, applying the concept of the «oneness/unity» of identity to a genetic relationship between humans, all the more unique if there be no consanguinity. Implicit in this notion is the concept of origin, as Varro compares such a relationship to that shared between a primary river and a diverging «riverbranch» (*rivus*), which derives its existence as such from the primary river, i.e. its origin or «source» (*fons*). Pliny draws the same conclusions as he describes the extent of the river Nile as being from the «oneness/unity» of said river to the points where it diverges, i.e. the literal point of convergence between a principle river and the diverging offshoots into which it branches.

Similarly Columella insinuates that oneness/unity derives from an origin while observing that only after the seed of a simple asparagus plant germinates, sprouts, and begins to grow do its roots embrace each other in a kind of «oneness/unity». Seneca implies the concept of origin to his nephew as he explains that only «out of» a greater reality (*ex hoc/ex quo*)

¹⁵⁹ «*Achaicae civitates ab unitate corporis deductae, inter Achaeos et Lacedaemonios certamine orto*» in MARCUS JUNIANUS JUSTINUS, *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi, Prologus Libri XXXIII* in O. SEEL, 319.

¹⁶⁰ «*Namque Achaei, licet per civitates veluti per membra divisi sint, unum tamen corpus et unum imperium habent singularumque urbium pericula mutuis viribus propulsant*» in MARCUS JUNIANUS JUSTINUS, *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi, Prologus Libri XXXIII* in O. SEEL, 241.

does even «oneness/unity» itself emerge. Likewise, all things which are born and exist possess «oneness/unity». Even the world itself was made «out of unformed oneness/unity» (*ex informi unitate*). Seneca muses that even the harmony and concord existing within the human soul does so only if the principle of virtue is present therein, i.e. that the principle of that «oneness/unity» of soul is present. Relating Pompeius Trogus' history of the world, Marcus Junianus Justinus explains that the Scythians were the «origin» (*origo*) of the human races when the world began as a «oneness/unity».

Columella again insinuates the notion of origin as he instructs that a «oneness/unity» is achieved only after, with much time and cultivation (echoed by Frontinus regarding the realization of «oneness/unity» in the concrete and masonry construction of waterlines), living vines (having been cut from an already existing tree) then have been so bound together that they grow together to become one stalk, i.e. they do not remain simply many individual branches bound together. Moreover and only then can this one stalk be cut and replanted, from which one tree will grow. Similarly Pliny advises that a living bud must be grafted so precisely onto a trunk or branch that a «oneness/unity» is obtained, adding that such will better if one apply a bandage or a «bond» (*vinculum*) to the area. Seneca identifies this «bond» (*vinculum*) with the emperor himself, so essential that without him the empire would otherwise vanish, as he is the principle «through which the republic coheres» (*per quod res publica cohaeret*). The emperor, as Pliny relates, authorized both the joining together of the equestrian order into a «oneness/unity» and the rights and privileges associated that permit one to wear a ring.

The absence of such «oneness/unity» in society would be disastrous for humanity according to Seneca, a thought seconded by Quintilianus as he demonstrates that society tends toward «oneness/unity». In fact, Marcus Junianus Justinus demonstrates how «from the oneness/unity of the body» (*ab unitate corporis*) of the Achaean civilization, made strong by their collective identity and one government, was overthrown when the Romans attempted the systematic secession of each city into an independently governed enclave. This «oneness/unity» of society is important, also, for the sake of its progeny's inheritance according to Quintilianus, as demonstrated by Columella in the process of selecting sheep based on the «oneness/unity» of their color to ensure uniformity and avoid aberrations in future offspring. Gellius insinuates what seems to be the obvious, viz. that «oneness/unity» is precisely that and not a plurality, i.e. the individual number one is one and not two. Celsus reveals that, although a mere thread can be doubled or even tripled up to make itself stronger, that seeming

plurality of threads now functioning as one stronger cord actually is formed from the already existing one thread, the source and origin of their «oneness/unity».

Celsus, Scribonius, and Columella all agree that healing medicaments and preservative agents are created and function only after their components have amalgamated into a «oneness/unity». Pliny explains that the beauty of anything, be it a gemstone, a marble floor, foliage, or a mountain range, is both in the «oneness/unity» of color, texture, symmetry, and appearance as well as the enhancement of such oneness/unity not by division or separation but «variation» (*variare*) within the «oneness/unity».

Seneca provides a well developed philosophical conception of oneness/unity by first making a distinction between two ways things are joined together. A «composite» (*comissura*) is «the touching of two bodies joined together» (*duorum coniunctorum inter se corporum tactus*), while a «continuity» is the «uninterrupted joining of parts among one another» (*partium inter se non intermissa coniunctio*). «Oneness/unity» belongs to this second category, i.e. «oneness/unity is continuity without the composite» (*unitas est sine comissura continuatio*). All bodies which possess «oneness/unity» do so not by a process whereby different bodies «have been united» (*unita corpora*), which would imply a composite and not continuity, but rather by a body's cohering by its own oneness/unity (*unitate sua cohaerentis*) without «external assistance» (*ope externa*). Subsequently, «oneness/unity» does not refer to number (*non ad numerum referre*), and so when speaking of «oneness/unity» one uses the neuter term «one thing only» (*unum*). Such metaphysical realities are not only evident in the material world, as for example in water and in the atmosphere, but the very principle by which they exist. The atmosphere belongs to the category of bodies possessing a continuous «oneness/unity». «Oneness/unity», like the atmosphere, may divide or separate (*separat*) that which does not belong to it, like the heavens and the earth, but it simultaneously joins these things together (*iungit*) by these things coming together through it (*per hunc inter se consensus est*). «Tension», which derives out of «out of oneness/unity» (*intentio ex unitate*) and is a necessary component of tension as it within «oneness/unity» is the «reason» (*motus*) by which everything animate and inanimate moves and produces (*producit*) and «is moved» (*agitur*).

CHAPTER TWO

The Christian Authors

2.2.1 *Minucius Felix* (c. 200CE to c. 240)

The Roman lawyer and convert to Christianity, Marcus Minucius Felix, is the author of *Octavius*, the only defense of Christianity (a.k.a. *apologeticum*) ever written in Latin in Rome prior to the *Pax Constantiniana*¹⁶¹. Besides the *Muratorian Fragment*, this is the first historical example of extant Christian literature composed in Rome, though more precisely dating its composition beyond the early third century CE remains impossible. While not profoundly theological in nature, the Ciceronian-styled dialogue presents a three-way debate among the author himself, his Christian lawyer friend, Octavius, and a pagan friend, Caecilius. The three discuss the preferability of Christianity to paganism. Minucius Felix uses the term «*unitas*» once while speaking with his companions.

Recounting the plethora of philosophies taught throughout the ancient world, Octavius stresses that all thinkers, from monotheists to varying degrees of polytheism, eventually find difficulty escaping the idea that there is ultimately one supreme being. «Zeno, and Chrysippus, and Cleanthes are also multi-form ones themselves [i.e. philosophers maintaining varying degrees of gods or emanations in the supreme being], but all are returned to the oneness/unity of providence»¹⁶².

¹⁶¹ Biographical information is from J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 155-163.

¹⁶² «Zenon et Chrysippus et Cleanthes sunt et ipsi multiformes, sed ad unitatem providentiae omnes revolvuntur» in M. MINUCIUS FELIX, «*Octavius*», 19 in F. SOLINAS, ed., *Marco Minucio Felice: Ottavio*, Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, Milano 1992, 82.

2.2.2 Tertullian (c. mid-second century CE to early third century)

Quintus Septimus Florentius Tertullianus was born in Carthage sometime in the middle of the second century CE¹⁶³. Possibly the son of a pagan pro-consular centurion, Tertullian converted to Christianity while a young man only after having studied law, rhetoric, and Latin and Greek literature, this last enabling him to compose quite capable treatises in both Latin and Greek¹⁶⁴. North-Africa's proud identity as a culture distinct from Rome was not lost on Tertullian and certainly influenced him, whom most scholars regard as the first Latin Father, whose writings contributed to what would become a particularly «African» brand of theology¹⁶⁵. Cyprian never mentions Tertullian by name, but scholars since Jerome's time have taken for granted that Cyprian knew of Tertullian and his writings¹⁶⁶. Though Tertullian's writings are extensive, and he is regarded universally as the father of theological Latin, the North African author employs the term «*unitas*» only thirty-two times, which is just a third of the term's instances as found in Cyprian and only twice as many times as found in the bishop of Caesarea Firmilian's letter to Cyprian (*Ep.* 75). Eleven of those thirty-two instances occur in Tertullian's «Christian» works, the remaining two thirds employed during his Montanist period.

Tertullian uses the term «*unitas*» three times in one of his first and most important works, *Apologeticum*, a defense of Christianity written around 197CE and addressed to the governors of the Roman empire. Tertullian describes the oneness/unity of the Trinity.

We say this thing having been brought forth out of God, and having been generated by having been brought forth, and therefore the son of God and God having been said out of the oneness/unity of substance: and now the spirit of God. For as a ray is stretched forth out of the sun, a portion out of the mighty; but the sun will be in the ray, because the ray is of the sun, the substance is not separated, but is extended, as light having been illuminated from light¹⁶⁷.

¹⁶³ Biographical information is from P. SINISCALCO, «Tertullian», *Encyclopedia of the Early Church* II, 818; J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 246-340; T. D. BARNES, *Tertullian: A historical and Literary Study*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1971. Dates are as assigned by Barnes.

¹⁶⁴ P. SINISCALCO, 818-820.

¹⁶⁵ P. SINISCALCO, 818.

¹⁶⁶ P. SINISCALCO, 819. Jerome even claims that Cyprian referred to Tertullian as his «*magister*», cfr. HIERONYMUS, *Ep.* LXXXIV,2 (*PL* 22, 744).

¹⁶⁷ «*Hunc ex Deo prolatum dicimus, et prolatione generatum, et idcirco filium dei et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiae: nam et Deus spiritus. Etiam cum radius ex sole porrigitur, portio ex summa; sed sol erit in radio, quia solis est radius, nec separatur*

Later, Tertullian explains that Christianity is one common religion of a community of believers. «We are a body from the knowledge and compact oneness/unity of religion and of discipline and hope. We join together into an assembly and we form a congregation»¹⁶⁸.

Addressing the Christian beliefs in death and resurrection Tertullian explains:

Which reason he [i.e. God] established the universe out of diversity, that all things are in agreement as rivaling substances under oneness/unity, and out of a vacuum and a solidity, out of things animate and inanimate, out of things knowable and unknowable, out of light and darkness, out of death and life itself, so in this way he preserves the everlasting itself by a distinct manner, that this first portion, which we inhabit from the beginning of things, flows through the temporal ages unto the end, really following, which we expect, is propagated into infinite eternity¹⁶⁹.

The next four occurrences of the term «*unitas*» are found in an equally important work of Cyprian's modelled on the Roman legal system's approach to argumentation. Tertullian wrote *De praescriptione haereticorum* around 203 as an attempt to definitively end all debate with heretics based on the notion of the *praescriptio*, a method of effectively dismissing a case before its hearing due to a lack or misuse of evidence. Explaining why schisms and heresies are arguments that should not even be addressed from the outset, Tertullian states «Thereupon if one knows the whole chapter unto the oneness/unity [of an argument] needing to be contained and the divisions needing to be enclosed, heresies no less really than schisms and dissensions rend asunder from oneness/unity»¹⁷⁰.

Next, Tertullian explains how heresies infect Christian communities and that even though there are many churches they are really all one church.

substantia, sed extenditur, ut lumen de lumine accensum» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Apologeticum*», XXI.11-12, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 124.

¹⁶⁸ «*Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinae unitate et spei foedere.*

Coimus in coetum et congregationem facimus» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Apologeticum*», XXXIX.1-2, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 150.

¹⁶⁹ «*Quae ratio universitatem ex diversitate composuit, ut omnia aemulis substantiis sub unitate constarent, ex vacuo et solido, ex animali et inanimali, ex comprehensibili et incomprehensibili, ex luce et tenebris, ex ipsa vita et morte, eadem aevum quoque ita distincta condicione conservit, ut prima haec pars, ab exordio rerum quam incolimus, temporali aetate ad finem defluat, sequens vero, quam expectamus, in infinitam aeternitatem propagetur»* in TERTULLIANUS, «*Apologeticum*», XLVIII.11, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 167.

¹⁷⁰ «*Denique si totum capitulum ad unitatem continendam et separations coercendas sapit, haereses vero non minus ab unitate divellunt quam scismata et dissensiones»* in TERTULLIANUS, «*De praescriptione haereticorum*», V.4, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 191.

And likewise they will have established churches near any one city, by which churches the vine of faith and the seed of another doctrine, whence the churches have been changed and are changed daily that they become churches. And through this also will they themselves be demonstrated apostolic as offshoots of the apostolic churches. It was needed that every kind be assessed from its origin. One [church] is that first from the apostles out of which all the many churches. Thus all [are] first and all apostolic, while all one. They demonstrate oneness/unity with the communion of peace and the name of fraternity and the friendship of hospitality. Which reason there rules no laws other than one tradition of the same sacrament itself¹⁷¹.

Tertullian contends that schisms themselves tend to rupture and create further divisions that are not readily apparent because of the ambiguity already existing from the first schism. Any seeming oneness/unity is false because their «oneness/unity itself is schism»¹⁷².

The term «*unitas*» occurs four times in Tertullian's longest work, *Adversus Marcionem*, written around 208 to refute the Marcionist heresy, which claims a duality in God and divorces Christ from the Father. In the first book of the five book series Tertullian refutes Marcion's notion of a duality in God, where the God of the Hebrew scriptures is evil and that of the Christians is good. Tertullian stresses the inherent logical contradiction of the existence two or more absolute supreme beings. Worshipping one either would incur the other's wrath, or would be superfluous as such a cultic act necessarily implies «demonstrating witness to the equality and oneness/unity of them»¹⁷³.

Concerning the debate between Peter and Paul regarding the extent to which the old law of the Hebrew covenant had been surpassed with the new gospel of Christ, Tertullian stresses that the two did not continue to maintain fundamentally divergent theological positions. «Nevertheless, regarding the oneness/unity of preaching, which we read above, they had

¹⁷¹ «*Et perinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinae ceterae exinde ecclesiae mutuatae sunt et cottidie mutantur ut ecclesiae fiant. Ac per hoc et ipsae apostolicae deputabuntur ut suboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantae ecclesiae una est illa ab apostolis prima ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primae et omnes apostolicae, dum una omnes. Probant unitatem communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalitatis. Quae iura non alia ratio regit quam eiusdem sacramenti una traditio*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De praescriptione haereticorum*», XX.5-9, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 202.

¹⁷² «*scisma est enim unitas ipsa*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De praescriptione haereticorum*», XXII.6, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 222.

¹⁷³ «*testimonio praestans parilitati et unitati eorum*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Marcionem*», I.5.5, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 446.

joined hands, and had brought together the distribution itself of office regarding the fellowship of the gospel. Just as elsewhere: “Whether I,” he says, “or they, so we preach”»¹⁷⁴.

Tertullian demonstrates the God of the Hebrews is identical with that of the Christians throughout his second book, and this is manifested best by arguments attempted by the Marcionist doctrine to prove otherwise. «For in these examples of opposing Christ to the creator and the study itself one looks all the more unto the oneness/unity»¹⁷⁵.

After treating Marcion’s Christological errors in the third book, Tertullian concludes with exposing the exegetical errors of Marcion’s interpretation of the Christian new testament in the fourth and fifth books. Concerning the distribution of the various charisms of the Spirit, Tertullian remarks

See the apostle agreeing both in the distribution needing to be made of the one spirit and in the particularity needing to be interpreted of the prophet. We can say: that which he has equated the oneness/unity of our body through many and diverse members to the joining together of the various charisms, he demonstrates the same Lord both of the human body and of the holy spirit, which spirit will not have wanted these rewards of charisms to be in the body, which things he placed neither in the human body <of members>, who instructed the apostle concerning love needing to be placed above all charisms which he taught as the principle precept, and Christ: «love the Lord from all heart and all strength and all soul and the one near to you as yourself»¹⁷⁶.

The remaining twenty-one instances of the term «*unitas*» occur in those works composed during Tertullian’s Montanist period. Tertullian employs

¹⁷⁴ «*Atquin de praedicationis unitate, quod supra legimus, dexterarum iunxerant, et ipsa officii distributione de evangelii societate conduxerant. Sicut et alibi: “sive ego,” inquit, “sive illi, sic praedicamus”*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Marcionem*», I.20.4, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 461.

¹⁷⁵ «*Nam et ipsum studium in eis exemplis opponendi Christum creatori ad unitatem magis spectat*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Marcionem*», II.29.2, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 508.

¹⁷⁶ «*Vide apostolum et in distributione facienda unius spiritus et in specialitate interpretanda prophetae conspirantem. Possum dicere: ipsum quod corporis nostri per multa et diversa membra unitatem charismatum variorum compagini adaequavit, eundem et corporis humani et spiritus sancti dominum ostendit, qui merita charismatum noluerit esse in corpore spiritus, quae nec <membrorum> in corpore humano collocavit, qui de dilectione quoque omnibus charismatibus praeponenda apostolum instruxerit principali praecepto quod probavit et Christus: “diliges dominum de totis praecoribus et totis viribus et tota anima et proximum tibi tamquam te”*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Marcionem*», V.8.9-10, in CCL: *I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954, 687.

the term four times in *Adversus Valentinianos*, a deconstruction of the errors and heresies in the Valentinian Gnostic sect. Tertullian recounts Valentinian's reason for entering into heresy and schism, that further schisms within the sect still reflect his heresy, and the circular argument they offer in explaining new teachings that are at variance with their original doctrines.

We are fully aware, I say, also the origin of them and we know, why we call [them] Valentinians, even if they are not seen to be. For they did depart from the founder, but the origin is destroyed not in the least, and even if perchance it is changed; the change itself is an attestation. Valentinus had hoped for the episcopacy, because he was able both in genius and eloquence, but, another out of the prerogative of a martyr having been put into power, the indignant one broke from the church of the authentic rule, as are accustomed souls being fired up on account of preference with presumption having been stirred up. And having turned unto the truth needing to be exterminated he delineated a path as his own serpent the seed of a certain old opinion having been stumbled upon....If they will have added any novelty, immediately they call presumption revelation and ingenuity a charism, not oneness/unity but diversity¹⁷⁷.

Tertullian later exposes more illogical redundancies coursing through Valentinian thought.

Take some other ingenuities, now the soul of a mild nature, of a more eminent teacher among them, who has estimated out of his pontifical authority in this way: «There is», he says, «before all things the Proarche, unerring and inconceivable and not namable, which I name Monotes. With this was another power, which itself I call Henotes. Monotes and Henotes, that is Being Alone and Oneness/Unity, while being one thing only, produced, not ones producing, the intellectual, invisible, unable to be born beginning of all things, which a word has called Monad. Of this is present a consubstantial power, which one calls Union. These powers therefore: Being Alone, Oneness/Unity, <Singularity>, Union propagate the other emanations of Aeons». What difference?! Union and Oneness/Unity and

¹⁷⁷ «Novimus, inquam, optime originem quoque ipsorum et scimus, cur Valentinianos appellemus, licet non esse videantur. Abscesserunt enim a conditore, sed minime origo deletur, et si forte mutatur; testatio est ipsa mutatio. Speraverat episcopatum Valentinus, qui et ingenio poterat et eliquio, sed alium ex martyrii praerogativa loci potitum indignatus de ecclesia authenticae regulae abruptit, ut solent animi pro prioratu exciti praesumptione ultionis accendi. Ad expugnandam converses veritatem et cuiusdam veteris opinionis semen nactus colubro suo viam delineavit....Si aliquid novi adstruxerint, revelationem statim appellant praesumptionem et charisma ingenium, nec unitatem sed diversitatem» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Valentinianos*», IV.1-2,4, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 755-756.

Singularity and Being Alone, wherever you will have assigned [the meaning], it is [still] one thing only¹⁷⁸.

Tertullian employs the term «*unitas*» once in his second largest work *De anima*, written around 207 to explain the doctrine on the soul according to Christian revelation as opposed to that put forth by strict Platonism and Gnosticism.

But out of the multitude of members one body is effected, that it is more aptly a concretion than itself a division. Look at the most wonderful liberality of Archimedes, I say the hydraulic organ, all the members, all the parts, all the combinations, all the passages of tones, all the compendia of sounds, all the traffic of harmonies, all the arrays of pipes, and the whole mass will be one. So too the wind, which this thing breathes from the torrent of water, is not therefore separated into parts, because it is administered through the parts, certainly solid in substance, really divided in work. This example is not far from Strato and Aenesidemus and Heraclitus; for they themselves also uphold the oneness/unity of soul, which [is] diffused into the whole body and everywhere itself, just like the blowing wind in the reed through caverns, again springs forth in various ways through the senses, not so divided as distributed. By which titles all these things are named and with which divisions out of themselves they are engaged and by which measurings in the body they are separated, physicians with philosophers will more ably consider; a few things [i.e. further remarks] will be convenient for us¹⁷⁹.

¹⁷⁸ «*Accipe alia ingenia, cicuri iam anima, insignioris apud eos magistri, qui ex pontificali sua auctoritate in hunc modum censuit: "est," inquit, "ante omnia Proarche, inexcogitabile et inenarrabile <et> innominabile, quod ego nomino Monoteta. Cum hac erat alia virtus, quam et ipsam appello Henoteta. Monotes et Henotes, id est Solitas et Unitas, cum unum essent, protulerunt, non proferentes, initium omnium intellectuale innascibile invisibile, quod sermo <Monada> vocavit. Huic adest consubstantiva virtus, quam appellat Unionem. Hae igitur virtutes: Solitas Unitas <Singularitas> Unio ceteras prolationes Aeonum propagarunt."* O differentia! Mutetur Unio et Unitas et Singularitas et Solitas, quaquā designaveris: unum est» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Valentinianos*», XXXVII, in *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 777-778.

¹⁷⁹ «*Atquin ex multitudine membrorum unum corpus efficitur, ut concretio sit potius ipsa divisio. Specta portentosissimam Archimedis munificentiam, organum hydraulicum dico, tot membra, tot partes, tot compagines, tot itinera vocum, tot compendia sonorum, tot commercia modorum, tot acies tibiarum, et una moles erunt omnia. Sic et spiritus, qui illic de tormento aquae anhelat, non ideo separabitur in partes, quia per partes administratur, substantia quidem solidus, opera vero divisus. Non longe hoc exemplum est a Stratone et Aenesidemo et Heraclito; nam et ipsi unitatem animae tuentur, quae in totum corpus diffusa et ubique ipsa, velut flatus in calamo per cavernas, ita per sensuality variis modis emicet, non tam concise quam dispensata. Haec omnia quibus titulis nuncupentur et quibus ex se divisionibus*

Tertullian employs the term «*unitas*» once in *De carne Christi*, written around 206 to refute certain heresies denying the divine incarnation in Christ.

«You tore me», he says, «out of the uterus». What is torn out lest what inheres, what having been adfixed, what was attached to it, from which it is torn that it be removed? If he did not adhere to the uterus, how was he torn out? If what was torn out of the uterus adhered, how might it have adhered, lest not while through that umbilical cord, as a branch to its own pod, attached to the origin of the womb? Because even when a foreign thing is glued to a foreign thing, it is so enfleshed and incarnated with that to which it is glued that when it is torn away, it takes with itself out of the body from which it is torn, a consequence which [is] a branch of the mutual joining together and of the oneness/unity having been broken off from¹⁸⁰.

Tertullian employs the term «*unitas*» once in *De exhortatione castitatis*, devoted to his recently widowed friend and composed around 208. The content departs from Tertullian's admiration and praise of Christian marriage contained in his *Ad uxorem* (c. 200) as now Tertullian, favoring virginity and continence, grapples with the idea of remarriage amounting merely to legitimate debauchery. Tertullian explains the significance of marriage as conceived by God between Adam and Eve and draws a parallel to Christ and the church.

The origin itself of the human race supports unto the law once needing to be established of needing to marry, answering the form needing to be examined for a future generation what God will have established in the beginning. For when he formed man and foresaw a partner necessary for him, having borrowed one from the ribs of him he fashioned for him one female only, when undoubtedly neither the maker nor the material would have been insufficient [to make more]. Many ribs in Adam, hands into infatigable things in God, but not many wives before God. And therefore the man of God, Adam, and the woman of God, Eve, one alone between themselves, sanctioned for humans the form for the duties of marriage from the authority of the origin of God and the primal will of God. Thus «they

detineantur et quibus in corpore metationibus sequestrentur, medici potius cum philosophis considerabunt; nobis pauca convenient.» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De anima*», XIV.4-5, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 800.

¹⁸⁰ «“Avulsisti,” inquit, “ex utero.” Quid avellitur, nisi quod inhaeret, quod infixum, quod innexum est ei, a quo ut auferatur avellitur? Si non adhaesit utero, quomodo avulses est? Si adhaesit qui avulses est ex utero, quomodo adhaesisset, nisi dum est per illum nervum umbilicalem, quasi folliculi sui traducem, adnexus origini vulvae? Etiam cum quid extraneum extraneo ad glutinatur, ita concarnatur et convisceratur cum eo cui adglutinatur ut, cum avelitur, rapiat secum ex corpore, a quo avellitur, sequelam quondam, abruptae unitatis traducem et mutui coitus» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De carne Christi*», XX.5, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 909-910.

will be», he says, «two in one flesh», neither three nor four. In no other way then will they be one flesh, two in one flesh, if once for all there be a joining together and concretion into oneness/unity. If really [it is] the contrary or [occurs] more often, it already ceases to be one, and they will now not be two in one flesh, but plainly on the contrary one into many. And so when the apostle interprets «they will be two into one flesh» into the church and Christ according to the spiritual nuptials of the church and Christ, – for one [is] Christ and one the church of him – we must acknowledge a duplication and a reinforcement to be the law of one matrimony for us both as according to the establishment of the [human] race and as according to the sacrament of Christ. We derive from one matrimony in each case, both carnally in Adam and spiritually in Christ. Of the two births there was one prescription made of monogamy. In each case he is degenerate who deviates from monogamy. A number of matrimony began from an accursed man: Lamech, the first having been married with two effected three into one flesh¹⁸¹.

Although already a strict Montanist, Tertullian wrote around 210 perhaps his most theologically profound and influential work, *Adversus Praxeas*, a treatise against the modalist and patripassian Trinitarian teachings of Praxeas, an immigrant to Rome from Asia Minor. While not entirely immune from subordinationist tendencies, the Trinitarian theology contained in this treatise was utilized heavily from Novatian to the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea convened by Constantine in 325 to Augustine himself. Not surprisingly Tertullian employs the term «*unitas*»

¹⁸¹ «*Ad legem semel nubendi dirigendam ipsa origo humani generis patrocinator, contestans quod deus in primordio constituerit in formam posteritati recensendum. Nam cum hominem figulasset eique parem necessariam prospexisset, unam de costis eius mutuatus unam illi feminam finxit, cum utique nec artifex nec material defecisset. Plures costae in Adam in infatigabiles manus in deo, sed non plures uxores apud deum. Et ideo homo dei Adam et mulier dei Eva unus inter se nuptiis functi formam hominibus dei de originis auctoritate et prima dei voluntate sanxerunt. Denique “erunt,” inquit, “duo in carnem unam,” non tres neque quatuor. Alioquin, quoniam una caro, nec duo in unam carnem <nisi> tunc erunt, si coniunctio et concretio in unitatem semel fiat. Si vero rursus aut saepius, iam una esse desiit, et erunt iam non duo in unam carnem, sed una plane contra in plures. At <et> cum apostolus in ecclesiam et Christum interpretatur “erunt duo in unam carnem” secundum spirituales nuptias ecclesiae et Christi, – unus enim Christus et una eius ecclesia – agnoscere debemus duplicatam et exaggeratam esse nobis unius matrimonii legem tam secundum generis fundamentum quam secundum Christi sacramentum. De uno matrimonio censemur utrobique, et carnaliter in Adam et spiritualiter in Christo. Duarum nativitatum unum est monogamiae praescriptum. In utraque degenerat is, qui de monogamia exorbitant. Numerus matrimonii a maledicto viro coepit: Primus Lamech duabus maritatus tre in unam carnem effecit» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De exhortatione castitatis*», V, in CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II, Brepols 1954, 1022-1023.*

twelve times in this composition, more than in any of his other works. Regarding the Praxean heresy's inability to accept the Trinity without reducing it to a modality of the Father, Tertullian begins

While one believes the one only God needing to be believed in no other ways than one say both the Father and the Son and the Spirit himself one and the same. As if in this way one alone be not all, while clearly all [are] out of one thing only through the oneness/unity of substance and no less is guarded the sacrament/mystery of the economy, which distributes the oneness/unity into the trinity, setting out three, Father and Son and Spirit, three however not in state but in degree, not in substance but in form, not in power but in kind, however of one substance, of one state, and of one power because one [is] God out of whom these degrees and forms and kinds are reckoned in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Spirit. The proceeding treatments will demonstrate how they suffer number without division. For simple ones indeed who I will not have called idiots and imprudent ones, which is always the greater part of ones believing, become terrified unto the economy, for the rule of faith itself transfers from the many gods of the ages to the true and one and only God, not ones understanding the one and only God to be needing to be believed in rather with his economy. They presume number and distribution of the trinity [to be] a division of the oneness/unity, when the oneness/unity, deriving out of its own self the trinity, is not destroyed but administered by that [trinity]. They throw out there to be preached two and three gods by us, they really presume themselves guardians of the one God, as if oneness/unity irrationally considered does not become heresy and the trinity rationally exposed constitute truth¹⁸².

¹⁸² «*dum unicum Deum non alias putat credendum quam si ipsum eundemque et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum dicat. Quasi non sic quoque unus sit omnia dum ex uno omnia per substantiae scilicet unitatem et nihilominus custodiatur oikonomiae sacramentum, quae unitatem in trinitatem disponit, tres dirigens Patrem et Filium et Spiritum, tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie, unius autem substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis quia unus Deus ex quo et gradus isti et formae et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti deputantur. <Qui> quomodo numerum sine divisione patiuntur, procedentes tractatus demonstrabunt. Simples enim quique, ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotae, quae maior semper credentium pars est, quoniam et ipsa regula fidei a pluribus diis saeculi ad unicum et verum Deum transfert, non intelligentes unicum quidem sed cum sua oikonomia esse credendum, expauescunt ad oikonomiam. Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis divisionem praesumunt unitatis, quando unitas, ex semetipsa derivans trinitatem, non destruat ab illa sed administretur. Itaque duos et tres iam iactitant a nobis praedicari, se vero unius Dei cultores praesumunt, quasi non et unitas irrationaliter collecta haeresin faciat et trinitas rationaliter expensa veritatem constituat» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Praxean*», II.3-III.1, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1161.*

Tertullian next explains how the oneness/unity of the Trinity is preserved and the divine economy protected.

The word therefore [is] in the Father always, as he says: «I and the Father», and always before God as it was written: «And the word was with God», and never having been separated from the Father or another one from the Father because: «I and the Father are one thing only [*unum*]» This will be the prolation of the truth, the guardian of the oneness/unity, by which we say the Son the prolation [i.e. procession] from the Father but not having been separated. For God brought forth the word of him, just as the Paraclete teaches, as the root the tree trunk and the source the river and the sun the ray. For also these kinds are prolations of the substances of them out of which they go forth. Nor will I have been able to doubt to say the Son both the tree trunk of the root and the river of the source and the ray of the sun, because every origin is a parent and everything which is brought forth out of the origin is progeny, much more the Word of God who so properly received the name of Son. For however neither the tree trunk from the root nor the river from the source nor the ray from the sun is separated, just as neither the Word from God. Therefore, I profess to say two according to the form of these examples: God and the Word of him, the Father and the Son of himself. For the root and the tree trunk are two things, but having been joined together; and the source and the river are two forms, but cohering ones. Everything which goes forth out of anything else, it is to be needed there be a second thing of him from whom it goes forth, it has not therefore, however, been separated. However, where a second one alone is, there are two, and where a third one alone is, there are three. For the third one alone is the Spirit from God and from the Son, as the fruit [is] the third out of the tree trunk from the root and the stream the third out of the river from the source and the point the third out of the ray from the sun. Nothing, however, is estranged from the womb/matrix from which it draws its own properties. So the trinity, flowing from the Father through concerted and connected degrees, obstructs nothing of the monarchy and protects the state of the economy¹⁸³.

¹⁸³ «*Sermo ergo et in Patre semper, sicut dicit: “Ego in Patre,” et apud Deum semper, sicut scriptum est: “Et sermo erat apud Deum,” et numquam separatus a Patre aut alius a Patre quia: “Ego et Patre unum sumus.” Haec erit προβολη veritatis, custos unitatis, qua prolatus dicimus Filium a Patre sed non separatum. Protulit enim Deus sermonem, quemadmodum etiam Paracletus docet, sicut radix fruticem et fons fluvium et sol radium. Nam et istae species προβολαι sunt earum substantiarum ex quibus prodeunt. Nec dubitaverim Filium dicere et radicis fruticem et fontis fluvium et solis radium, quia omnis origo parens est et omne quod ex origine profertur progenies est, multo magis sermo Dei qui etiam proprie nomen Filii accepit. Nec frutex tamen a radice nec fluvius a fonte nec radius a sole discernitur, sicut nec a Deo sermo. Igitur secundum horum exemplorum formam profiteor me duos dicere: Deum et sermonem eius, Patrem et Filium ipsius. Nam et radix et frutex duae res sunt, sed coniunctae; et*

Tertullian next addresses the Trinitarian intimations found in sacred scripture.

And I ask if unto the number of the trinity scandalizes, as if not having been connected in the simple oneness/unity, I ask how the one and only and singular speaks plurally: «Let us make man unto our image and likeness», when it will have been able to be said: Let me make man unto my image and likeness, as being one and only and singular. But also in the following things: «Behold Adam was made as one alone [*unus*] out of us» fools or lies as he speaks plurally, since he is one alone [*unus*] and alone and singular....Nay indeed, because the Son, the second person, the Word of him, was adhering already to him, and the third, the Spirit in the Word, therefore he declared plurally let us make and our and us. For because with these was he making man and with these was he making the likeness, with the Son, who indeed was that to be put on man, with the Spirit certainly who was to be sanctifying man, he was speaking out of the oneness/unity of the trinity as with ministers and arbiters. Then the following scripture distinguishes among persons: «<And> God <made> man, unto the image of God he made him». Why not his own [image], if he was not one alone [*unus*] who was making and unto whose [image] he was making? It was he, however, unto the image of whom he was making, unto [the image] of the Son indeed, who, the future and more certain and more true man, he had made his image to be said man, who then he held to be formed from the clay, with the true image and likeness¹⁸⁴.

*fons et flumen duae formae sunt, sed cohaerentes. Omne quod prodit ex aliquo, secundum sit eius necesse est de quo prodit, non ideo tamen est separatum. Secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt et tertius ubi est, tres sunt. Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice et tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine et tertius a sole apex ex radio. Nihil tamen a matrice alienatur a qua proprietates suas ducit. Ita trinitas per concertos et connexos gradus a Patre decurrens et monarchiae nihil obstrepit et oikonomiae statum protegit» in TERTULLIANUS, «Adversus Praxean», VIII.4-7, in CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II, Brepols 1954, 1167-1168. Some suggest that while Tertullian is not a subordinationist, he does exhibit some of those tendencies as in the preceding analogies used to explain the Trinitarian persons, cf. J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: The Ante-Nicene Literature After Irenaeus*, Spectrum Publishers, Utrecht – Antwerp 1953, 326-327.*

¹⁸⁴ «Si et adhuc numerus scandalizat trinitatis quasi non connexae in unitate simplici, interrogo quomodo unicus et singularis pluraliter loquitur: “Faciam hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram,” cum debuerit dixisse: Faciam hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem meam, utpote unicus et singularis. Sed et in sequentibus: “Ecce Adam factus est tamquam unus ex nobis,” fallit aut ludit ut, cum unus et solus et singularis esset, numerose loqueretur....Immo, quia iam adhaerebat illi Filius secunda persona, sermo ipsius et tertia, Spiritus in sermone, ideo pluraliter pronuntiavit faciamus et nostram et nobis. Cum quibus enim faciebat hominem et quibus faciebat similem, Filio quidem qui erat induiturus hominem, Spiritu vero qui erat sanctificaturus hominem, quasi cum ministries et arbitris ex unitate trinitatis loquebatur. Denique

Tertullian explains the equality of Trinitarian persons allows for interchangeable personifications because of the divine oneness/unity.

He says «the Father is greater than me». Therefore, the Father will be the face of the Son. For what, also, does scripture say? «The Spirit of his person [is] Christ the Lord». Therefore, if Christ is the Spirit of the fatherly person, by merit was he the Spirit the person of whom, that is of the Father, the face of him, declared his own out of the oneness/unity indeed. Plainly an astonishing thing, that the face of the Son can be accepted [to be] the Father, who is the head of him: for «the head of Christ [is] God»¹⁸⁵.

Tertullian furthers the idea of being able to refer to the persons of the trinity precisely because of their oneness/unity.

And, however, lest they be scandalized from this, we offer the reason by which neither two gods nor lords are said but by which the Father and Son [are] two, and this is not out of the separation of substance but by distribution, when we declare the Son undivided and unseparated from the Father, not by state but by degree, when the other, who also himself is called God, is named singular, makes not therefore two gods but one thing only [*unum*], by this [fact] itself that he holds to be called God, [i.e.] out of the oneness/unity of the Father¹⁸⁶.

Tertullian explains the importance of precise diction and grammar when discussing the divine oneness/unity and Trinitarian economy.

For concerning his own sheep, that no one snatch them from the hand of him, <he says>, «The Father that gave them to me is greater than all things»; and: «I and the Father are one thing only [*unum*]». Here, therefore,

sequens scriptura distinguit inter personas: “<Et fecit> Deus hominem, ad imaginem Dei fecit illum.” Cur non suam, si unus qui faciebat et non erat ad cuius faciebat? Erat autem ad cuius imaginem faciebat, ad Filii scilicet, qui, homo futurus et certior et verior, imaginem suam fecerat dici hominem qui tunc de limo formari habebat, imago veri et similitudo» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Praxean*», XII.1-4, in CCL: II *Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1172-1173.

¹⁸⁵ «“Pater,” inquit, “maior me est.” Ergo facies erit Filii Pater. Nam et scriptura quid dicit? “Spiritus personae eius Christus Dominus.” Ergo si Christus personae paternae spiritus est, merito Spiritus cuius persona erat, id est Patris, eius faciem, suam, ex unitate scilicet, pronuntiavit. Mira res plane, an facies Filii Pater accipi possit, qui est caput eius: “caput” enim “Christi Deus”» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Praxean*», XIV.10, in CCL: II *Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1178.

¹⁸⁶ «*Et tamen ne de isto scandalizentur, rationem reddimus qua Dii non duo dicantur nec Domini sed qua Pater et Filius duo, et hoc non est ex separatione substantiae sed dispositione, cum individuum et inseparatum Filium a Patre pronuntiamus, nec status sed gradu alium, qui etsi Deus dicatur, quando nominatur singularis, non ideo duos Deos faciat sed unum, hoc ipso quod et Deus ex unitate Patris vocari habeat*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Praxean*», XIX.8, in CCL: II *Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1185.

foolish, nay blind ones wish to fixate on the degree, who see not first I and the Father to be the meaning of two, then in the end [i.e. the predicate] we are, which was said plurally, to be not a person out of one alone [*unius*], then <he says> that we are one thing only [*unum*] not we are one alone [*unus*]. For if he would have said: we are one alone [*unus*], he would have been able to submit to the judgment of them, for one alone [*unus*] is seen [to be] the meaning of a singular number. Unto this with two in the masculine gender he says one thing only with a neuter word [*unum*] (which pertains not unto the singularity but unto the oneness/unity, unto the likeness, unto the joining together, unto the love of the Father who loves the Son and unto the obedience of the Son who obeys the Father's will): saying «I and the Father are one thing only [*unum*]» demonstrates two to be those who are equal and join together¹⁸⁷.

Tertullian concludes by emphasizing the oneness/unity of substance and not number.

And so the connection of the Father in the Son and of the Son in the Paraclete effects three cohering ones, the other out of another. Which three are one thing only [*unum*], not one alone [*unus*] as it was said: «I and the Father are one thing only [*unum*]» unto the oneness/unity of substance, not unto the singularity of number¹⁸⁸.

Tertullian uses the term «*unitas*» once in *De ieunio adversus psychicos*, composed around 210 after he had embraced most strictly Montanism. Arguing from sacred scripture he defends the extreme asceticism and fasts of the sect's adherents, many of whose practices were condemned as heresies, against what he considers the morally deficient laxism in the observances of Catholics, to whom he refers condescendingly as

¹⁸⁷ «*De ovibus etiam suis, quod nemo illas de manu eius eriperet, "Pater," enim, <inquit>, "quod mihi dedit, maius est omnibus;" et: "ego et Pater unum sumus." Hic ergo iam gradum volunt figere stulti, immo caeci, qui non videant primo ego et Pater duorem esse significationem, dehinc in novissimo sumus non ex unius esse persona quod pluraliter dictum est, tunc quod unum sumus, non unus sumus <dicit>. Si enim dixisset: unus sumus, potuisset adinuare sententiam illorum, unus enim singularis numeri significatio videtur. Adhuc cum duo masculini generis unum dicit neutrali verbo (quod non pertinet ad singularitatem sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad coniunctionem, ad dilectionem Patris qui Filium diligit et ad obsequium Filii qui voluntati Patris obsequitur): "Unum sumus," dicens, "ego et Pater," ostendit duos esse quos aequat et iungit» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Praxean*», XXII.10-11, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1190-1191.*

¹⁸⁸ «*Ita connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paraclete tres efficit cohaerentes, alterum ex altero. Qui tre unum sunt, non unus, quomodo dictum est: "Ego et Pater unum sumus," ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Praxean*», XXV.1, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1195.

«*psychicos*», or literally «psychic ones», sarcastically implying Gnostic strains among the Christians. «And accordingly if you all into one thing practice ταπεινοφρονησιν out of the edict of a man, how do you stigmatize also in us the oneness/unity of fasting and of xerophagy and of the stations»¹⁸⁹?

De pudicitia is one of Tertullian's very last compositions, written around 211, and is a departure from his other treatise on penitential discipline, *De paenitentia* (c. 200). His montanistic tendencies are manifest throughout this work on modesty as he argues the three capital sins of idolatry, fornication, and murder as being unforgivable after baptism by the church or the intercession of her martyrs. He employs the term «*unitas*» once while discussing fornication.

If in fact after the abolition [of sin] in long duration anything will have come back to life out of that, which was being held dead in sin, having come back in the flesh of him [is] to be judged unclean not to be expiated now by the bishop/priest («*a sacerdote*»). So is adultery an uncleansible vice, having returned from the pristine and staining the oneness/unity of the new color from which it had been excluded¹⁹⁰.

2.2.3 Arnobius of Sicca (mid-third century CE to early fourth century CE)

The rhetorician, Arnobius, taught at Sicca Veneria in Proconsular Numidia in North Africa around the turn of the fourth century CE¹⁹¹. His conversion to Christianity occurred around 295CE, but his bishop requested that he demonstrate sincerity in his new confession. Within a year or two Arnobius authored *Adversus Nationes*, a mostly philosophical defense of Christianity with very little reference to the Christian scriptures. Based on its internal evidence, Arnobius composed this work sometime during or very shortly following the persecutions of Diocletian (284CE-304) but prior to Galerius' Edict of Toleration (311CE).

¹⁸⁹ «Itaque si et ex hominis edicto et in unum omnes ταπεινοφρονησιν agitatis, quomodo in nobis ipsam quoque unitatem ieiunationum et xerophagiarum et stationum denotatis?» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De ieunio adversus psychicos*», XIII.4, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1272.

¹⁹⁰ «Si vero post abolitionem in vetustatem aliquid ex illa revixerit, rursum in carne eius quod emortuum delicto habebatur immundum iudicari nec expiari iam a sacerdote. Ita moechia de pristina recidiva et unitatem novi coloris, a quo fuerat exclusa, commaculans immundabile est vitium» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De pudicitia*», XX.7, in CCL: *II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1324-1325.

¹⁹¹ Biographical information is from W. H. C. FRENCH, «Arnobius», in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 122; J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 383-392.

Arnobius employs the term «*unitas*» three times in his aforementioned work. He refutes in Book One the accusation that the Christians are responsible for all of the evils in the world and defends the Christian belief in the crucified savior-God incarnate. Arnobius demonstrates in the second book the similarity of Christ's teachings to those of philosophers like Plato. The third and fourth books attack the inherent contradiction of pagan deities endowed with immoral or evil human characteristics, while the final three books argue against particularities of pagan worship such as temple sacrifices and cultic practices.

Arnobius takes issue with those pagans who laugh at the beliefs of the Christians.

To me the word is not with these ones, who having been dispersed through various digressions of sects, and these will have made those parts with difference of opinion: you, I call upon Mercury, you who chase after Plato and Pythagoras, and you others, who are of one mind and march through these same roads of opinions with oneness/unity. Because we venerate the father and lord of things and purify everybody and surrender and commit our hopes to him, how dare you laugh at us?¹⁹².

Arnobius later insists that the pagan gods can be angered by any number of things and never by only one thing. «For neither can it be through the nature of things, that what is one thing only be two and that there go an unbegotten oneness/unity with divided simplicity in different things»¹⁹³.

Arnobius, in addressing which religion is more sacreligious, argues sarcastically on behalf of the pagan deities' irascibility as justifiable. «Whatever that Jupiter is, if he will perceive himself to be or in any other sense will be inflicted of injury, is it not a worthy thing, on account as having been angered and excited he purge the land with our steps, he

¹⁹² «*Nec mihi cum his sermo est qui per varia sectarum deverticula dissipati has atque illas partes opinionum diversitate fecerunt: vos, vos appello qui Mercurium, qui Platonem Pythagoramque sectamini, vosque ceteros, qui estis unius mentis et per easdam vias placitorum inceditis unitate. Audetis ridere nos, quod patrem rerum ac dominum veneramur et colimus quodque illi dedamus et permittamus spes nostras?*» in ARNOBIUS, «*Adversus nationes*», II.13 in A. REIFFERSCHIED, ed., CSEL: IV, *Arnobii Adversus Nationes Libri VII*, C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1875, 57-58.

¹⁹³ «*neque enim fieri per rerum naturam potest, ut quod unum est fiat duo et in diversas res eat unitas ingenitas simplicitate divisa*» in ARNOBIUS, «*Adversus nationes*», IV.37 in A. REIFFERSCHIED, ed., CSEL: IV, *Arnobii Adversus Nationes Libri VII*, C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1875, 172.

extinguish the light of the sun and moon, by all means he confound all things in antiquity in a kind of oneness/unity»¹⁹⁴?

2.2.4 *Lactantius* (c. 240CE to 320)

Lucius Caelius Firmianus Lactantius hailed from North Africa, where he studied under Arnobius¹⁹⁵. The disciple eventually became greater and more renowned than his master, being requested by Diocletian to teach rhetoric at Nicomedia in Asia Minor. Lactantius, a recent convert to Christianity, lost his imperial teaching post there when the final wave of Diocletian's persecutions broke out in 303CE. The «Christian Cicero» was re-employed once more in the service of the Emperor, when Constantine charged Lactantius with tutoring his son Crispus in Treves in Gaul.

Lactantius employs the term «*unitas*» seven times. The first instance occurs in *De opificio dei*, written between 303 and 304CE, in which Lactantius demonstrates to his former pupil and now fellow Christian, Demetrianus, that God so elevated the human creature above all others as to endow human beings with intellects and reason. Lactantius proceeds to demonstrate divine providence through an anatomical and physiological exposition of the human body and psychology.

But that the abode of wisdom is seen, the heart, also, though be one, has inside, however, two chambers by which the divided fountains of living blood are contained by an intervening wall, with the result that just as in the world itself, either twofold from a simple thing or a simple thing from a thing twofold, the sum of all things both rules and contains the whole, so from two things the compact universe in the body holds forth an inseparable oneness/unity¹⁹⁶.

¹⁹⁴ «*Iuppiter ille quicumque est, si sentiret se esse aut si ullo sensu adficeretur iniuriae, nonne digna res esset, propter quam iratus et percitus terram nostris subduceret gressibus, solis lumina extingueret atque lunae, quinimmo res omnes in antiquae speciem confunderet unitatis?*» in ARNOBIUS, «*Adversus nationes*», V.23 in A.

REIFFERSCHIED, ed., *CSEL: IV, Arnobii Adversus Nationes Libri VII*, C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1875, 194-195.

¹⁹⁵ Biographical information is from J. STEVENSON, «*Lactantius*», in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 575-576; J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 392-410.

¹⁹⁶ «*Sed et cor, quod sapientiae domicilium videtur, licet sit unum, duos tamen intrinsecus sinus habet, quibus fons vivi sanguinis continentur saepe intercedente divisi, ut sicut in ipso mundo summa rerum simplici duplex vel de duplici simplex et gubernat et continet totum, ita in corpore de duobus universa compacta indissociabilem praetenderent unitatem*» in LACTANTIUS, «*De opificio dei*», X.11 in S. BRANDT, ed., *CSEL: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia, XXVII*, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1893, 34-35.

Lactantius indicates at the end of this work that he will expound in greater depth on the themes so far covered in his next and most famous work, *Divinae institutiones*, begun in 304CE and finally completed shortly before or in 313CE, as the Edict of Milan seems presupposed with his dedication to Constantine in the seventh and final book of this work. This treatise may be considered the first Latin catechism or *summa theologiae*. The first two books attempt to disprove polytheism, while the third book attempts to expose philosophy alone as errant and the need for revelation to arrive at true wisdom. Book Four demonstrates the God incarnate Jesus Christ to be the pinnacle of wisdom and truth, prophesied by both the Hebrew prophets and Sybilline oracles. Books Five and Six deal with justice and mercy, while the last book is an eschatological reflection on the last things. Lactantius employs the term «*unitas*» four times in this work.

«Now we will establish the oneness/unity of divine power with testimonies»¹⁹⁷. So begins Lactantius' survey of religious and secular authors' reflections on the concept. One of these ancient witnesses to whom Lactantius refers is Cicero's account of an Egyptian philosopher, Thoyth Trismegistus, who wrote in Greek.

This one wrote books and certainly many pertaining to the cognition of divine things, in which he asserts the majesty of the highest and singular god and calls the same with names which to us [are] lord and father. And not even the name of him will be required, he said to be «anonymous», by which there does not lack the property of a name, because oneness/unity itself is evident¹⁹⁸.

Having reviewed a number of ancient authorities on the divine nature and having demonstrated that even the ancient pagan Egyptians conceived of the ineffable Godhead as an inherent oneness/unity, Lactantius proceeds to an exposition of his own thought on the subject.

Now let us teach on oneness/unity. Since we say God the Father and God the Son, we do not say a different thing and sever one from the other, nor likewise to be called Father without the Son or the Son able to be generated

¹⁹⁷ «*Nunc unitatem divinae potestatis testimoniis conprobemus*» in LACTANTIUS, «*Divinae institutiones*», I.3.24 in S. BRANDT, ed., *CSEL: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XIX, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1890, 11.

¹⁹⁸ «*Hic scripsit libros et quidem multos ad cognitionem divinarum rerum pertinentes, in quibus maiestatem summi ac singularis dei asserit isdemque nominibus appellat quibus nos dominum et patrem. Ac ne quis nomen eius requireret, ἀνωνυμον esse dixit, eo quod nominis proprietate non egeat, ob ipsam scilicet unitatem*» in LACTANTIUS, «*Divinae institutiones*», I.6.4 in S. BRANDT, ed., *CSEL: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XIX, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1890, 19.

without the Father. Since therefore the Father makes the Son and the Son the Father, to each is one mind, one spirit, one substance: but that one is the ever-issuing forth font, this one then the river flowing out from him, that one like the sun, this one as if a ray extended out of the sun. He, therefore, who is the dear and faithful one to the highest Father, is not separated, just as neither a river from its source nor a ray from the sun, because as the water is of the source in the river so the light of the sun in the ray; equally neither can a voice be separated from the mouth nor strength or a hand be torn away from the body¹⁹⁹.

Considering his exposition on the divine nature a successful rebuttal of heretical opinions on the subject, Lactantius declares «They, who will make a divorce of oneness/unity and scatter the church, were certainly either with less solid faith or less learned or less cautious of us»²⁰⁰.

Lactantius employs the term «*unitas*» twice more in two works composed on the cusp of or immediately following Constantine's Edict of Milan in 313CE. Lactantius refutes the Epicurean philosophy, which claimed God to be aloof in the universe as most consistent with his divine nature, in his *De ira dei* written in 313 or 314CE.

There cannot be in this world, therefore, many rulers, nor many lords in one house, nor many pilots on one ship, nor many leaders in one herd or flock, nor many kings in one swarm, but neither can there certainly be many suns in heaven, so too neither many souls in one body: thus the natural universe harmonizes into oneness/unity²⁰¹.

¹⁹⁹ «*Nunc de unitate doceamus. Cum dicimus deum patrem et deum filium, non diversum dicimus nec utrumque secernimus, quia nec pater a filio nuncupari nec filius potest sine patre generari. Cum igitur et pater filium faciat et filius patrem, una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est: sed ille quasi exuberans fons est, hic tamquam defluens ex eo rivus, ille tamquam sol, hic quasi radius ex sole porrectus. Qui quoniam summo patri et fidelis et carus est, non separatur, sicut nec rivus a fonte nec radius a sole, quia et aqua fontis in rivo est et solis lumen in radio; aequae nec vox ab ore seiungi nec virtus aut manus a corpore divelli potest*» in LACTANTIUS, «*Divinae institutiones*», IV.29.3-6 in S. BRANDT, ed., CSEL: *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XIX, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1890, 392.

²⁰⁰ «*Fuerunt quidam nostrorum vel minus stabilita fide vel minus docti vel minus cauti, qui discidium facerent unitatis et ecclesiam dissiparent*» in LACTANTIUS, «*Divinae institutiones*», IV.30.4 in S. BRANDT, ed., CSEL: *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XIX, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1890, 395.

²⁰¹ «*non possunt igitur in hoc mundo multi esse rectores nec in una domo multi domini nec in navi una multi gubernatores nec in armento aut grege, duces multi nec in uno examine multi reges, sed ne in caelum multi soles esse poterunt, sicut nec animae plures in uno corpore: adeo in unitatem natura universa consentit*» in LACTANTIUS, «*De ira dei*», XI.4 in S. BRANDT, ed., CSEL: *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XXVII, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1893, 95.

Lactantius later revised *Divinae institutiones* with additions and corrections, creating what is called his *Epitome*, written shortly after 314CE.

But one who follows reason understands the Lord unable to be any less than one nor the Father other than one. For if God, who formed all things, is the same Lord and the same Father, that there be one is unavoidable, that the same head and the same source of things be he. Nor can another constitute the sum of things, unless all things be returned unto one, unless one hold the helm, unless one guide the reins and rule the collective members as one mind. If there be many kings of the bees in a swarm, they will perish and be dispersed, while with kings the great discord began with insurrection; if many leaders in the herd, they will long do battle, then one prevail; if many emperors in the army, they will not have been able to be esteemed equal by the infantry, because contrary things are commanded, nor oneness/unity obtained by these same ones themselves, because whoever it be will consider himself instead of the dead²⁰².

2.2.5 Conclusion

Minucius Felix demonstrates that Christian doctrine was already implicit in the ancient non-Christian philosophers as even those with polytheistic tendencies always returned «unto the oneness/unity of providence» (*ad unitatem providentiae*). Tertullian demonstrates the same with reference to the non-Christian philosophers' tenet of «oneness/unity of soul» (*unitatem animae*). Lactantius, demonstrating the «oneness/unity of divine power» (*unitatem divinae potestatis*) reechoes this judgment by suggesting that one philosopher in particular referred to the one divine being as having no name because its «oneness/unity is self-evident» (*ob ipsam scilicet unitatem*). Similarly, Tertullian emphasizes the illogical absurdity in arguing a plurality of equally supreme beings because of «oneness/unity» (*parilitati et unitati eorum*), and that «oneness/unity» by any other name is still «one

²⁰² «Sed qui rationem sequetur, intellet nec dominum esse posse nisi unum nec patrem nisi unum. Nam si deus, qui omnia condidit, et idem dominus et idem pater est, unus sit necesse est, ut idem sit caput idemque fons rerum. Nec potest aliter rerum summa consistere, nisi ad unum cuncta referantur, nisi unus teneat gubernaculum, nisi unus frena moderetur regatque universa membra tamquam mens una. Si multi sint in examine apum reges, peribunt aut dissipabuntur, dum regibus incessit magno discordia motu; si plures in armento duces, tam diu proeliabuntur, donec unus obtineat; si multi in exercitu inperatores, nec pareri poterit a milite, cum diversa iubeantur, nec ab iis ipsis unitas optineri, cum sibi quisque pro moribus consulat» in LACTANTIUS, «*Epitome divinarum institutionum*», 2.2-4 in S. BRANDT, ed., CSEL: *L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XIX, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1890, 676-677.

thing only» and not plurality (*unio et unitas et singularitas et solitas...unum est*). Lactantius demonstrates this principle by observing that as in this world (*in hoc mundo*) there cannot exist a multitude of rulers (*rectores*), or many lords (*domini*) in one house (*una domo*), or many pilots (*gubernatores*) on one ship (*in una navi*), or many leaders (*duces*) in a herd or flock (*in armento aut grege*), or many kings (*reges*) in one swarm (*in una examine*), or many suns (*soles*) in heaven (*in caelum*), or many souls (*plures animae*) in one body (*in uno corpore*) so «the natural universe harmonizes into «oneness/unity» (*in unitatem natura universa consentit*). Nor can such «oneness/unity» be obtained by a plurality of kings (*reges*) in the swarm (*in examine*), leaders (*duces*) in the herd (*in armento*), or emperors (*imperatores*) in the army (*in exercitu*) but only by «one alone» (*unus*). Tertullian maintains that God constituted all the diverse phenomena of the universe «under oneness/unity» (*sub unitate*), which includes everything proceeding from the beginning/webbing out of things (*ab exordio rerum*) into eternity (*in aeternitatem*). Arnobius suggests that were even the chief pagan god, Jupiter, to be angered, such would be justified in «confounding» the whole universe into a «kind of oneness/unity» (*speciem confunderet unitatis*).

Tertullian maintains the trinity is derived out of the «oneness/unity of substance» (*ex unitate substantiae*), which «substance is not separated but extended» (*nec separatur substantia sed extenditur*) as «the sun in the ray» (*sol in radio*), and «the ray is of the sun» (*solis est radius*), and «light from light» (*lumen de lumine*). God in the Trinitarian persons are «all out of one thing only through the oneness/unity of substance» (*ex uno omnia per substantiae scilicet unitatem*). The «oneness/unity deriving out of its own self the trinity» (*unitas ex semetipsa derivans trinitatem*) is not «destroyed» (*destruatur*) but «administered» (*administretur*) and «guarded» (*custodiatur*) by the «mystery/sacrament of the economy» (*oikonomiae sacramentum*), which «distributes the oneness/unity into the trinity» (*unitatem in trinitatem disponit*), which trinity in turn is «connected in simple oneness/unity» (*connexae in unitate simplici*), thereby «setting out three, Father and Son and Spirit, three however not in state but in degree, not in substance but in form, not in power but in kind, however of one substance, of one state, and of one power because one [is] God out of whom these degrees and forms and kinds are reckoned in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Spirit» (*tres dirigens Patrem et Filium et Spiritum, tres autem non statu sed gradu, nec substantia sed forma, nec potestate sed specie, unius autem substantiae et unius status et unius potestatis quia unus Deus ex quo et gradus isti et formae et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti deputantur*). Tertullian

demonstrates the same kind of distribution without division or separation with reference to Archimedes' ancient water organ, the many members of which issue «wind» (*spiritus*) throughout the invention and «is not separated into parts, because it is administered through the parts, indeed one solid substance, a real work not having been divided» (*separabitur in partes, quia per partes administratur, substantia quidem solidus, opera vero divisus*). So, too, the «oneness/unity of soul» (*unitatem animae*) moving «in the whole body everywhere diffused and itself» (*in totum corpus et ubique diffusa et ipsa*) does so «not as having been divided/separated but as having been distributed» (*non tam concise quam dispensata*). «Number» (*numerus*) and «distribution of the trinity» (*dispositionem trinitatis*) do not constitute «division» (*divisionem*).

The reason that the Trinitarian persons «suffer number without division» (*numerus sine divisionem patiuntur*), i.e. the «guardian of oneness/unity» (*custos unitatis*), is that the «Son is a prolation/procession from the Father but not having been separated» (*prolatum...Filius a Patre sed non separatum*). Every «origin» (*origo*) is a «parent» (*parens*), and everything «brought forth out of the origin is progeny» (*ex origine proferitur progenies est*). «Everything which goes forth out of anything» (*Omne quod prodit ex aliquo*) is «second from which it goes forth, not therefore however has it been separated» (*secundum...de quo prodit, non ideo tamen separatum*). Necessarily «where a second one is, are two, and where there is a third, are three» (*secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt et tertius ubi est, tres sunt*). Identifying the «Spirit is the third from the Father and from the Son» (*tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio*), Tertullian likens the Trinitarian relations to those shared among a root (*radix*), tree-trunk (*frutex*), and fruit (*fructus*), a source/font (*fons*), river (*fluvius*), and stream (*flumen*), and the sun (*sol*), a ray (*radius*), and apex (*apex*). These are all «cohering» (*cohaerentes*) and are «joined together» (*coniunctae*), but without one having been «separated» (*separatum*) from the other, and «nothing is estranged from the womb whence it draws its own properties» (*nihil...a matrice alienatur a qua proprietates suas ducit*). Subsequently, the «connection of the Father in the Son and of the Son in the Spirit effect three cohering ones, the other out of another» (*connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paracleto tres efficit cohaerentes, alterum ex altero*). The Godhead remains intact as the «trinity, flowing from the Father through concerted and connected degrees, both obstructs nothing of the monarchy and protects the state of the economy» (*trinitas per concertos et connexos gradus a Patre decurrens et monarchiae nihil obstrepat et oikonomiae statum protegit*).

Tertullian observes that otherwise God would not speak «plurally» (*pluraliter*) or «numerously» throughout sacred scripture if it were true that he «is one alone and alone and singular» (*cum unus et solus et singularis esset, numero loqueretur*). Arnobius insists that «one thing only» (*unum*) cannot be «two» (*duo*), and that «unbegotten oneness/unity» (*unitas ingenitas*) cannot «go into different things with divided simplicity» (*in diversas res eat unitas ingenitas simplicitate divisa*). When God speaks of creating man he refers to forming man according to «my» (*meam*) but rather «our image and likeness» (*imaginem et similitudinem nostram*). God does not say «let me make» man (*faciam*) but rather «let us make» man (*faciamus*), because God «was speaking out of the oneness/unity of the trinity as with ministers and arbiters» (*quasi cum ministries et arbitris ex unitate trinitatis loquebatur*). Moreover, when the person of Christ speaks plurally of himself and the Father, he refers to his being one with the Father not in the masculine *unus*, which would indicate «one alone», but in the neuter *unum*, which signifies «one thing only», as such «pertains not unto the singularity of number but unto oneness/unity, unto likeness, unto joining together, unto the Father's love who loves the Son and unto the obedience of the Son who obeys the Father's will» (*non pertinet ad singularitatem sed ad unitatem, ad similitudinem, ad coniunctionem, ad dilectionem Patris qui Filium diligit et ad obsequium Filii qui voluntati Patris obsequitur*). The grammatical structure employed in which Christ says «“I and the Father are one thing only” shows those to be two who are equal and joining together» («*Unum sumus,*» *dicens,* «*ego et Pater,*» *ostendit duos esse quos aequat et iungit*). The same is true for all the Trinitarian persons, i.e. «the three are one thing only, not one alone» (*tre unum sunt, non unus*) because such refers «unto the oneness/unity of substance, not unto the singularity of number» (*ad substantiae unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem*). Subsequently, and following theological developments seeking to explain and preserve the hypostatic union, what will later be termed perichoresis becomes possible, i.e. the uncompromising condision of characteristics among the Trinitarian persons. «The face of the Son will be the Father» (*facies erit Filii Pater*) and «the Spirit of the person of him [i.e. of the Father is] Christ the Lord» (*Spiritus personae eius Christus Dominus*). As the Father and Son are two «not out of the separation of substance but by distribution» (*non est ex separatione substantiae sed dispositione*) within the trinitartian economy, and the «Son undivided and undeparated from the Father thus does not two gods make but one thing only» (*individuum et inseparatum Filium a Patre non ideo duos Deos faciat sed unum*), Christ «holds to be called God out of the oneness/unity of the Father» (*Deus ex unitate Patris vocari habeat*).

Lactantius reiterates Tertullian's Trinitarian doctrine utilizing the same personifications and imagery of the «source» (*fons*) and «river» (*rivus*), the «sun» (*sol*) and «ray» (*radius*), adding that neither can a «voice» (*vox*) be separated from the «mouth» (*os*) nor «can a hand be torn away from the body» (*manus a corpore divelli potest*). Because the «Father makes the Son and the Son the Father» (*pater filium faciat et filius patrem*), so «we say the Father God and the Son God» (*dicimus deum patrem et deum filium*), and «we do not say a different thing nor do we sever the other, because neither the Father can be called apart from the Son nor can the Son be generated without the Father» (*non diversum dicimus nec utrumque secernimus, quia nec pater a filio nuncupari nec filius potest sine patre generari*). «To each [is] one substance» (*utrique...una substantia*), but «that one is the ever-issuing source/font, this one however the river flowing out of him, this one a ray having been extended forth out of the sun» (*ille quasi exuberans fons est, hic tamquam defluens ex eo rivus, ille tamquam sol, hic quasi radius ex sole porrectus*). The Son «is not separated, just as neither a river from the source nor a ray from the sun, because the source's water is in the river and the sun's light is in the ray» (*non separatur, sicut nec rivus a fonte nec radius a sole, quia et aqua fontis in rivo est et solis lumen in radio*). Lactantius elaborates «if God, who established all things, is the same Father and Lord, it is to be needed that he is one, as he is the same head and the same source of things» (*si deus, qui omnia condidit, et idem dominus et idem pater est, unus sit necesse est, ut idem sit caput idemque fons rerum*). Lactantius demonstrates the indivisibility of oneness/unity with reference to the heart (*cor*), the «source/font of living blood» (*fons vivi sanguinis*), which although having two chambers (*duos sinus*) nevertheless shows an «inseparable oneness/unity» (*indissociabilem unitatem*).

Tertullian applies this oneness/unity of the trinity christologically. Attempts «of needing to oppose Christ to the creator look all the more unto oneness/unity» (*opponendi Christum creatori ad unitatem magis spectat*). If Christ «is removed from the womb/uterus» (*avellitur...ex utero*), which necessarily means he at one time «inheres/adhered to the womb/uterus» (*inhaeret/adhaesit utero*) and is «connected to the origin of the womb to which he is glued» (*adnexus origini vulvulae...eo cui adglutinatur*), Christ nevertheless «takes with himself out of the body a branch of the mutual joining together and of the oneness/unity having been broken off from» (*rapiat secum ex corpore abruptae unitatis traducem et mutui coitus*). This is so «because even when a foreign thing is glued unto a foreign thing, it is so enfleshed and incarnated with that to which it is glued» (*Etiam cum quid*

extraneum extraneo ad glutinatur, ita concarnatur et convisceratur cum eo cui adglutinatur).

Tertullian applies these Trinitarian and Christological concepts to «marriage» (*matrimonium*), which is prescribed as «monogamy» (*monogamia*), because God ordained that they will be not two in one flesh (*duos in una carne*) but «two into one flesh» (*duos in unam carnem*), because so occurs «a joining together and concretion into oneness/unity» (*coniunctio et concretio in unitatem*). This is «according to the spiritual nuptials of Christ and of the Church, – for one [is] Christ and one is the church of him» (*secundum spirituales nuptias ecclesiae et Christi, – unus enim Christus et una eius ecclesia*). Therefore, «according to the mystery/sacrament of Christ» (*secundum Christi sacramentum*), there is a marriage «carnally in Adam» (*carnaliter in Adam*) and «spiritually in Christ» (*spiritualiter in Christo*), both «from one marriage» (*de uno matrimonio*).

Tertullian continues with an ecclesiological exposition. The apostles Peter and Paul enjoyed «oneness/unity or preaching» (*de praedicationis unitate*) because, after «they had joined right hands» (*dexteras iunxerant*), such derived «from the fellowship of the gospel [of Christ]» (*de evangelii societate*) that they were preaching. As Christians form a «body from the knowledge of religion and the compact oneness/unity of discipline and hope» (*corpus de conscientia religionis et disciplinae unitate et spei foedere*), so «do we join together into an assembly and we form a congregation» (*coimus in coetum et congregationem facimus*), «which oneness/unity of our body through many and different members» the apostle Paul «equated to the joining together of various charisms» (*quod corporis nostri per multa et diversa membra unitatem charismatum variorum compagini adaequavit*) always remain subject to the «principle precept» (*principali praecepto*) concerning «love» (*dilectione*) that «also Christ taught» (*probavit Christus*). Consequently, «the Lord of the human body and of the holy spirit, who wished not the rewards of the charisms to be in the body of the spirit, which neither did he place in the human body <of members>» (*corporis humani et spiritus sancti dominum...qui merita charismatum noluerit esse in corpore spiritus, quae nec <membrorum> in corpore humano collocavit*) taught above all else, including charisms, «love the lord from all heart and with all strength and with all soul and the one near to you as yourself» (*diliges dominum de totis praecoribus et totis viribus et tota anima et proximum tibi tamquam te*).

Subsequently, as there are «one is [the church] first from the apostles out of which all the many churches» (*tantae ecclesiae una est ab apostolis prima ex qua omnes*), one of these many churches is recognized as such

only after «is assessed unto its own origin» (*ad originem suam censeatur*). Moreover, «reason rules [there to be] one tradition of the mystery/sacrament itself» (*ratio regit...eiusdem sacramenti una traditio*). Then and only then can they be considered «all first and all apostolic, while all one» (*omnes primae et omnes apostolicae, dum una omnes*). The churches then can «demonstrate oneness/unity [to be] the communion of peace and the name of fellowship and the friendship of hospitality» (*probant unitatem communicatio pacis et appellatio fraternitatis et contesseratio hospitalitatis*). There is also a «oneness/unity» of religious disciplinary practices.

Schismatics' seeming oneness/unity is false «for [their] oneness/unity is itself schism» (*scisma est enim unitas ipsa*). Because Valentinian «broke away from the church of authentic rule» (*de ecclesia authenticae regulae abruptit*) he, like all such ones, has «not oneness/unity but diversity» (*nec unitatem sed diversitatem*). «Heresies, schisms, and dissensions» do not rend asunder oneness/unity but «rend asunder from oneness/unity» (*haereses, schismata, dissensions ab unitate divellunt*). Even if «they departed from the founder» (*abscesserunt enim a conditore*), as demonstrated even by the schismatics within a schism, «the origin is not destroyed in the least» (*sed minime origo deletur*). Lactantius likens the attempts of those who «would make division of oneness/unity and would scatter the church» to being «with less established faith or less learned or less cautious» (*vel minus stabilita fide vel minus docti vel minus cauti, qui discidium facerent unitatis et ecclesiam dissiparent*). Arnobius refers to the committed pagans «of one mind» (*unius mentis*) who remain steadfast in their opinions and beliefs «with oneness/unity» (*unitate*). Finally, Tertullian maintains that if «adultery» (*moechia*) be committed after baptism, then this «staining the oneness/unity of the new color» (*unitatem novi coloris conmaculans*) obtained in baptism is such a «vice» (*vitium*) «to be judged unclean not to be expiated now by the bishop/priest» (*immundum iudicari nec expiari iam a sacerdote*).

PART THREE

«Unitas» in the Cyprianic Context

3.1 Novatian (c. 200CE to c. 257)

Novatian's actual place and date of birth remain uncertain²⁰³. This first Latin theologian of the Church in Rome is well known for his attempt to usurp the episcopal see there when in 251 the Roman presbyterate rejected Novatian and instead elected Cornelius as bishop. The famous «Novatianist Schism» ensued, eliciting harsh reproachments from quarters such as Dionysius, the bishop of Alexandria in Egypt, and inspiring Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, to author *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*, or at least one of two versions of the treatise. Most scholars assign Novatian a martyr's death during the Valerian persecution of 257-258.

Novatian wrote his most famous work *De trinitate* sometime in the 240's. Considered a great theological treatise even by his contemporaries, the work suggests a degree of subordinationism in Novatian's Trinitarian theology. While conspicuously avoiding the term «trinitas», which appears nowhere in his *De trinitate*, Novatian does employ the term «unitas» twice in that treatise.

Referring to the Gospel of John 10,30 in his refutation of positions at variance with the Christian Trinitarian doctrine, Novatian attempts to explain how Christ's reference to himself and the Father as "one" is to be understood.

And because he said «one thing only» [*unum*] the heretics understand that he did not say «one alone» [*unus*]. For «one thing only» [*unum*], neutrally placed [i.e. in the neuter] pronounces the concord of fellowship, not the

²⁰³ J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 212-233.

oneness/unity of person. For it is said to be «one thing only», not «one alone» because it refers not to number but to the fellowship of the other²⁰⁴.

Novatian attempts to explain how such a moral oneness/unity (as opposed to Tertullian's substantial, or ontological oneness/unity) is the proper understanding of the Trinitarian relationships with a reference to the apostle Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians 3,6-8.

Furthermore the apostle Paul also renews this oneness/unity of concord with such a distinction of persons. For when he writes to the Corinthians: «I» he begins «planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase; and so neither he who plants nor he who waters is anyone, but he who gives the increase, God. "One thing only" are he who plants and he who waters». Who does not understand, however, the one Apollo, the other Paul, not to be the one and the same Apollo equally with Paul? Moreover, different offices of each one are produced: the one indeed, who plants, and the other, who waters. The apostle Paul, however, proposed not these two which are «one alone», but which are «one thing only», so that the one is certainly Apollo and the other really Paul, pertains with regard to the distinction of persons; <pertains with regard really to concord,> both are «one thing only». For, when of the two, one is the judgment, one is the truth, one is the faith, one and the same is the religion, one indeed is the fear of God, even though they be two, are «one thing only». They are the same thing as long as they will know the same thing. For on the one hand the reason of persons divides these who on the other hand the reason of religion brings together. And although they be not one and the same, as long as they feel the same thing they are the same thing; and though they are two, having the

²⁰⁴ «*Et quia dixit unum, intellegat haeretici quia non dixit unus. Unum enim neutraliter positum societatis concordiam, non unitatem personae sonat. Unum enim, non unus esse dicitur, quoniam nec ad numerum refertur, sed ad societatem alterius expromitur*» in NOVATIANUS, «*De trinitate*», XXVII,3 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL: IV Novatiani Opera*, Brepols 1972, 64. Novatian's tendency to Trinitarian subordinationism is evidenced here. A more thorough discussion of Novatian's Trinitarian theology is beyond the scope of this thesis. For this thesis' purpose suffice to mention two points: 1) Novatian is not redefining or altering the meaning of *unitas*, but rather how such is applied to the eternal Trinitarian relationships, i.e. as Tertullian's substantial, or ontological oneness/unity, which for Novatian risks the collapsing of three distinct persons into one person, which would be the extreme of monarchianism, or as a moral oneness/unity between two persons, regarded by the ancient ethic as the pinnacle of interpersonal intimate union and, for Novatian, the means of avoiding ditheism (cf. V. LOI, ed., *Novaziano: La Trinità*, Società Editrice Internazionale, Torino 1975, 283-284); 2) Novatian's preference for a moral oneness/unity seems to be at variance with Cyprian's thought, as will be evidenced in «Part Four» of this thesis.

fellowship in faith they are «one thing only», even though they manifest diversity in persons²⁰⁵.

3.2 *Cornelius* (c. 200CE to 253)

Novatian's nemesis, Cornelius, was elected bishop of Rome in 251 following the death of his predecessor bishop, Fabian, during the Decian persecution of 249-251CE. His short tenure as bishop of Rome, discontinued by his death in 253, produced seven letters to Cyprian of Carthage of which only two have been preserved. The second of these two extant letters appears in the *Corpus Cypriani* as *Epistula 50*, in which Cornelius informs Cyprian that Novatian has fomented damaging dissent within the Church in Rome and has sent partisan emissaries to encourage likewise in the Church in Carthage.

Cornelius employs the term «*unitas*» once in the other letter, *Epistula 49*. «And yet at first when our fathers loving, working peace, of the faith having been tested, that tumor having been mollified, of these were already

²⁰⁵ «Denique nouit hanc concordiae unitatem et apostolus Paulus, cum personarum tamen distinctione. Nam cum ad Corinthios scriberet: "ego," inquit, "plantavi, Apollo rigauit, sed Deus incrementum dedit; itaque neque qui plantat est quicquam, neque qui rigat, sed qui incrementum dat, duos. Qui autem plantat et qui rigat unum sunt." Quis autem non intellegat alterum esse Apollo, alterum Paulum, non eundem atque ipsum Apollo pariter et Paulum? Denique et diversa uniuscuiusque sunt officiali prolata: alter enim qui plantat, et alter qui rigat. Hos tamen duos non, quod unus sit, sed quod unum sit, proposuit apostolus Paulus, ut alter quidem sit Apollo, alter vero Paulus, quantum ad personarum distinctionem pertinet; <quantum vero ad concordiam pertinet,> unum ambo sint. Nam quando duorum una sententia est, veritas una est, fides una est, una atque eadem religio est, unus etiam dei timor est, unum sunt, etiam duo sint. Ipsum sunt, dum ipsum sapiunt. Etenim quos personae ratio invicem dividit, eosdem rursus invicem religionis ratio conducit. Et quamvis idem atque ipsi non sint, dum idem sentient, ipsum sunt; et cum duo sint, unum sunt, habentes in fide societatem, etiamsi gerant in personis diversitatem» in NOVATIANUS «*De trinitate*», XXVII,6 in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., *CCL: IV Novatiani Opera*, Brepols 1972, 64. Again it cannot be emphasized enough that Novatian is redefining «*unitas*». Indeed, his primary concern throughout his treatise is to demonstrate the oneness/unity of the Godhead in three distinct persons. Interesting to note, however, is that his concept of oneness/unity of concord alone among three persons when applied to the eternal and perfect Godhead may be, although an incomplete philosophical/theological explanation, arguably tenable and true in part. Applied to the Church, and in Novatian applied to the seminal apostolic age of the church, considering his Trinitarian theory it is not surprising that Novatian entered into schism against the bishop and church of Rome shortly after composing his treatise, whereas Cyprian of Carthage, writing against Novatian's divisive actions, did not, even though the former had theological reasons to do so, whereas Novatian rebelled against the Church after not being elected as bishop of Rome.

proclaiming oneness/unity, the faith however not proper, that it be given to us as easy to believe them having been changed with repenting»²⁰⁶.

3.3 Firmilian of Caesarea (c. 200CE to c. 270)

Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia and great champion of and benefactor to the Alexandrian theologian Origen, was a highly regarded authority during his episcopacy²⁰⁷. The only extant literature from his hand is his response to a letter to him from Cyprian (now lost) in which Firmilian provides the bishop of Carthage with his own ideas on oneness/unity and his opinion of Stephen's position on baptism. *Epistula* 75 in the *Corpus Cypriani* was written during the baptismal controversy between Cyprian and the bishop of Rome, Stephen, probably in 256CE. The original Greek text is lost, but Cyprian himself translated the correspondence into Latin, which employs the term «*unitas*» sixteen times.

Firmilian's letter is riddled with acerbic *ad hominem* attacks against the person of Stephen. Yet, Firmilian nowhere denies that Stephen holds a particular office unique to the bishop of Rome. Firmilian argues in similar vein to Cyprian's line of reasoning against the validity of heretical baptism and, subsequently, against Stephen's position on the subject. Firmilian begins «For union and peace and concord [are] not only with faithful men and ones knowing the truth, but, also, with the heavenly angels themselves warrants the greatest pleasure, for which the divine word says to be rejoicing in one sinner turning to repentance and returning unto the bond of oneness/unity»²⁰⁸.

After referring to Stephen as Judas Iscariot for the apparently harsh tone of his letter (the aforementioned now lost epistle) to Cyprian, Firmilian takes consolation that geography does not impede ecclesial communion. «For by the grace of God one is being able to bind and join by the bond of charity and oneness/unity even though those things which are seen to be

²⁰⁶ «*Et primo quidem fraters nostri probatae fidei amantes pacem unitatem optantes tumorem illum horum mollitum iam adnuntiabant, fides tamen non idonea, ut facile nobis credere daretur illos repente esse mutatos*» in CORNELIUS, «*Ep. 49*», 1.2 in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., *CCL: III B Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,1*, Brepols 1996, 231-232.

²⁰⁷ Biographical information is from J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 128-129.

²⁰⁸ «*Adunatio enim et pax et Concordia non solum hominibus fidelibus et cognoscentibus veritatem sed et angelis ipsis caelestibus voluptatem maximam praestat, quibus dicit sermo divinus esse gaudium in uno peccatore paenitentiam agente et ad unitatis vinculum revertente*» in FIRMILIANUS, «*Ep. 75*», 2.1 in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., *CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2*, Brepols 1996, 582.

divided by a vast space of lands»²⁰⁹. Firmilian reiterates his thanks to God «because all this is by divine oneness/unity»²¹⁰. Firmilian extrapolates further that such a spiritual union is preferable to a merely material union.

For even as the Lord, who lives in us, be one and the same, everywhere joins together and binds his own with the bond of oneness/unity. Whence the sound of them, who by the Lord were sent running quickly with the spirit of oneness/unity, has gone out into the whole wide world, as on the other hand nothing withstands anyone near and joined themselves to be with the body if they divide with soul and mind, when souls, which will have separated themselves from God's oneness/unity, cannot by all means be joined. «For behold,» he says, «they who remove themselves far away from you will perish». But such one will undergo the Lord's judgment on their own merit, retreating from the word of him who pleaded the Father on behalf of oneness/unity and says: «Father, grant that as You and I are one thing only, so too these be one thing only in us»²¹¹.

Firmilian lauds Cyprian's logical reasoning as the only correct theological hermeneutic and conclusion regarding baptism against what appears to be Stephen's argumentation from custom alone.

And indeed as pertains to that which Stephen has said, as if the apostles will have prohibited to be baptized those who come from heresy and will have handed down this thing needing to be preserved by their posterity [i.e. successors], you have replied most abundantly, no one to be so stupid who believe the apostles to have handed this down, for when it is agreed execrable and detestable heresies themselves to have existed afterwards, and when Marcion the disciple of Cerdo is discovered to have introduced a sacreligious tradition against God late after the apostles and far from these times...[such ones] with their wicked lies will have rebelled against God's church...These, however, who are at Rome do not in all things observe

²⁰⁹ «Potens est enim gratia dei copulare et coniungere caritatis atque unitatis vinculo etiam ea quae videntur longiore terrarum spatio esse divisa» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 3.2 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 584.

²¹⁰ «Quod totum hic fit divina unitate» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 3.3 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 584.

²¹¹ «Nam cum dominus unus atque idem sit qui habitat in nobis, coniugit ubique et copulat suos vinculo unitatis. Unde in universam terram exivit sonus eorum qui a domino missi sunt unitatis spiritu velociter currentes, sicut e contrario nihil prodest aliquos proximos et iunctos sibi esse corporibus, si animo et mente dissideant, quando adunare animae omnino non possint quae se a dei unitate diviserint. "Ecce enim," inquit, "qui longinquant se abs te peribunt." Sed tales iudicium domini pro merito suo subibunt recedentes a verbis eius qui patrem pro unitate deprecatur et dicit: "pater, da ut quomodo ego et tu unum sumus, sit et hi in nobis unum sint."» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 3.3-4 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 584.

these things which are handed down from the origin and vainly allege the authority of the apostles, for anyone is able to know that about the days of Easter needing to be celebrated and about many other sacraments of a divine thing, one may see there to be many differences in those things not equally observed there by all equally which are observed at Jerusalem, accordingly what in many other provinces are varied on account of the diversity of places and names, and yet, however, no one on account of this has been separated from the peace and oneness/unity of the Church. What Stephen now has dared to do breaking peace against you, which his predecessors have always maintained with you with love and mutual honor, and even unto this defaming the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, as if they themselves will have handed this down, who admonished in their epistles the heretics execrated and that we avoid them. Whence appears to be human this tradition, which affirms heretics and defends them to have baptism, which is not lest of the church alone. But also unto this part was answered well by you, where in his letter Stephen said heretics themselves also come together in baptism, and that they baptize not ones of others coming to them, but rather communicate, as if we, too, should do this²¹².

After recounting an episode where a false prophetess caused great upheaval throughout Cappadocia by baptizing and celebrating the

²¹² «*Et quidem quantum ad id pertineat quod Stephanus dixit, quasi apostolic eos qui ab haeresi veniunt baptizari prohibuerint et hoc custodiendum posteris tradiderint, plenissime vos respondistis neminem tam stultum esse qui hoc credat apostolos tradidisse, quando etiam ipsas haereses constet execrabiles ac detestendas postea extitisse cum et Marcion Cerdonis discipulus inveniatur sero post apostolos et post longa ab eis tempora sacrilegam adversus deum traditionem induxisse...adversus ecclesiam dei sceleratis mendaciis suis rebellaverint....Eos autem qui Romae sunt non ea in omnibus observare quae sint ab origine tradita et frustra apostolorum auctoritatem praetendere scire quis etiam inde potest, quod circa celebrandos dies Paschae et circa multa alia divinae rei sacramenta videat esse apud illos aliquas diversitates nec observari illic omnia aequaliter quae Hierosolimis observantur, secundum quod in ceteris quoque plurimis provinciis multa pro locorum et nominum diversitate variantur, nec tamen propter hoc ab ecclesiae catholicae pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est. Quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere rumpens adversus vos pacem, quam semper antecessores eius vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt, adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos, quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint, qui in epistolis suis haereticos execrati sunt et ut eos evitemus monuerunt. Unde apparet traditionem hanc humanam esse quae haereticos asserit et baptismum quod non nisi solius ecclesiae est eos habere defendit. Sed et ad illam partem bene a vobis responsum est, ubi Stephanus in epistula sua dixit haereticos quoque ipsos in baptismo convenire et quod alterutrum ad se venientes non baptizent, sed communicent tantum, quasi et nos hoc facere debeamus» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 5.2,6,7.1 in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 585-587.*

Eucharist, among other things, Firmilian reiterates the gist of Cyprian's rationale for denying the validity of baptism by heretics.

That if the baptism of heretics is able to have the regeneration of a second birth, they who are baptized by them have been reckoned not heretics but sons of God. For the second birth, which is baptism, generates sons of God. If, however, the bride of Christ, which is the Catholic Church, is one, she herself is that which generates sons for God. For neither many brides of Christ, as the apostle says: «I have espoused you to one man to consign a holy virgin to Christ», and: «Hear, o daughter, and see and incline your ear and forget your people, because the king has desired your beauty», and: «Come, bride from Lebanon, you will come and will pass over from the beginning of faith», and: «I have entered my garden, my sister, my bride». We see to be set forth everywhere one person, because the bride is one, also. But the synagogue of heretics, however, is not with us, because not a bride it is a fornicator and adulterer. Whence it cannot bear sons to God. Unless as what appears to Stephen if she bears and brings forth with heresies, the Church, however, receives ones having been brought forth, and will nourish as her own those whom she will not have born, because she cannot be the mother of strange children, and therefore Christ our Lord showing his bride to be one and declaring the sacrament of his oneness/unity says: «He who is not with me is against me, and he who gathers not with me scatters». For if Christ is with us, however the heretics are not with us, the heretics for sure are against Christ; and if we gather with Christ, the heretics however do not gather with us, without a doubt they scatter²¹³.

²¹³ «*Quod si baptismum haereticorum habere potest regenerationem secundae nativitatis, non haeretici sed filii dei computandi sunt qui apud illos baptizantur. Secunda enim nativitas quae est in baptismo filios dei generat. Si autem sponsa Christi una est, quae est ecclesia catholica, ipsa est quae sola generaliter deo filios. Neque enim multae sponsae Christi, cum dicat apostolus: “despondi vos uni viro virginem sanctam adsignare Christo,” et: “audi filia et vide et inclina aurem tuam et obliuiscere populi tui, quia desideravit rex speciem tuam,” et: veni sponsa de Libano, advenies et pertransibis a principio fidei,” et: “ingressus sum in hortum meum, soror mea, sponsa.” Videmus unam personam ubique proponi, quia et sponsa est una. Non est autem una nobiscum haereticorum synagoga, quia nec sponsa est adultera et fornicaria. Unde nec potest filios deo parere. Nisi si secundum quod Stephano videtur haeresis quidem parit et exponit, expositos autem ecclesia suscipit, et quos non ipsa peperit pro suis nutrit, cum filiorum alienorum mater esse non possit et ideo Christus dominus noster unam esse manifestans sponsam suam et unitatis eius sacramentum declarans ait: “qui non est mecum adversus me est, et qui non mecum colligit spargit.” Si enim nobiscum est Christus, haeretici autem non sunt nobiscum, pro certo adversus Christum sunt haeretici; et si nos colligimus cum Christo, non colligunt autem nobiscum haeretici, sine dubio spargunt» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 14 in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 594-595.*

Repeating Cyprian's identification of the church as an «enclosed garden» and a «sealed fountain»²¹⁴, Firmilian reiterates the sixth chapter of Cyprian's *De unitate*. «And as Noah's ark was really nothing other than the sacrament of Christ's church, which saved those alone who were inside the ark with everyone outside then perishing, we are manifestly instructed unto perceiving the oneness/unity of the Church»²¹⁵.

Certain that he has understood and successfully reiterated Cyprian's theological position regarding baptism, Firmilian marvels at Stephen's contrary position based on custom and accuses Rome's bishop of the equivalent of heresy and schism.

What really is his error and how great is his blindness, who says the remission of sins to be able to be given in the synagogues of heretics, remains not in the foundation of the one church, which once was established by Christ upon the rock, and here can be understood what Christ will have said to Peter alone: «whatever you will have held bound on earth, will be having been held bound in heaven, also, and whatever you will have loosed upon the earth will be having been loosed in heaven». And again in the Gospel Christ breathed on the apostles alone saying: «Receive the Holy Spirit. If you will have remitted sins of anyone, they will be remitted to him: if you will have held of anyone, they will be held». Power of sins needing to be remitted has been given to the apostles and the churches which those, having been sent by Christ, will have established and to the bishops who will succeed them by vicarious ordination. The enemies, however, of the one catholic church, in which we are, and the adversaries of us, who have succeeded the apostles, claiming for themselves an unlawful priesthood against us and setting up profane altars...And in this part I am justly indignant unto this so open and manifest stupidity of Stephen, that he who so glories on account of the place of his episcopacy and contends himself to hold the succession of Peter, upon whom the church's foundation was established, induces many other rocks and establishes a new edifice of many churches, while he defends that to be baptism by his own authority. For without a doubt they who are baptized fill out the number of the church; he who approves the baptism of them, however, and concerning the ones having been baptized confirms to be the church. Nor does he, who betrays and deserts oneness/unity, understand the truth of the Christian rock to be

²¹⁴ «*hortus conclusus*» and «*fons signatus*» in FIRMILIANUS, «*Ep. 75*», 15.1 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2*, Brepols 1996, 595.

²¹⁵ «*Cum vero et arca Noe nihil aliud fuerit quam sacramentum ecclesiae Christi, quae tunc omnibus foris pereuntibus eos solos servavit qui intra arcam fuerunt, manifeste instruimur ad ecclesiae unitatem perspicendam*» in FIRMILIANUS, «*Ep. 75*», 15.2 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2*, Brepols 1996, 595.

obfuscated by himself or in a certain manner abolished. The apostle acknowledges even the Jews, although having been blinded by ignorance and having been bound by most grave misdeeds, to have a zeal of God. Stephen, who professes himself to have through succession the chair of Peter, is excited by no zeal against heretics, conceding to them not a modicum but the greatest power of grace, that he says and asserts these unclean ones to wash clean of the old man through the sacrament of baptism, to pardon the old sins of death, to render them sons of God with heavenly regeneration, to restore eternal life with the sanctification of the divine bath....And now he deliberates vainly to consent and to be a participant with them in other things, that he also meet with them, and mix prayers equally with these same ones, and establish the sacrifice with a common altar²¹⁶.

Firmilian next provides what may constitute the only semblance of theological reasoning offered by Stephen for the position argued by Rome's bishop. «“But in much,” he [i.e. Stephen] says, “Christ's name advances

²¹⁶ «*Qualis vero error sit et quanta sit caecitas eius, qui remissionem peccatorem dicit apud synagogas haereticorum dari posse nec permanet in fundamento unius ecclesiae, quae semel a Christo supra petram solidata est, hinc intelligi potest quod soli Petro Christus dixerit: “quaecumque ligaveris super terram, erunt legata et in caelis, et quaecumque solveris super terram, erunt soluta et in caelis.” Et iterum in evangelio in solos apostolos insufflavit Christus dicens: “accipite spiritum sanctum. Si cuius remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi: si cuius tenueritis, tenebuntur.” Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum apostolis data est et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt et episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicaria successerunt. Hostes autem unius catholicae ecclesiae, in qua nos sumus, et adversarii nostri qui apostolis successimus sacerdotia sibi illicita contra nos vindicantes et altaria profana ponentes...Atque ego in hac parte iuste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat et ecclesiarum multarum nova aedificia constituat, dum esse illic baptismum sua auctoritate defendit. Nam qui baptizantur complent sine dubio ecclesiae numerum; qui autem baptismum eorum probat, de baptizatis et ecclesiam illic esse confirmat. Nec intelligit offuscari a se et quodammodo aboleri christianae petrae veritatem qui sic prodit et deserit unitatem. Iudaeos tamen quamvis ignorantia caecos et gravissimo facinore constrictos zelum dei apostolus habere profitetur. Stephanus qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se praedicat nullo adversus haereticos zelo excitatur, concedens illis non modicam sed maximam gratiae potestatem ut dicat eos et adseveret per baptismi sacramentum sordes veteris hominis abluere, antiqua mortis peccata donare, regeneratione caelesti filios dei facere, ad aeternam vitam divini lavacri sanctificatione reparare....Et frustra iam dubitat in ceteris quoque consentire eis et particeps esse, ut et simul cum eis conveniat et orationes pariter cum eisdem misceat et altare ac sacrificium commune constituat» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 16-17 in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 596-597.*

unto faith and the sanctification of baptism, that whoever and wherever one will have been baptized in Christ's name is conceded immediately Christ's grace»²¹⁷. Firmilian remains unconvinced by such argumentation, and proceeds to dismantle Stephen's argument from custom and explain the teaching and practice of the Cappadocian church.

However, what pertains to custom needing to be refuted, which they are seen to oppose to the truth, who is so idle that one prefer custom to truth or who with the light having been perceived flees not darkness? Unless, also, if with Christ coming to the Jews, that is with the truth, one remain in any ancient custom, because they will have remained in the old way with the truth's new things having been forsaken. That indeed you Africans can say against Stephen, the error of custom to be relinquished with the truth having been known. As for the rest we both join custom to truth and we place the custom of truth against the custom of the Romans, from the beginning ones holding this thing handed down by Christ and by the apostles. Nor do we recall this thing to be held by us at any time, because here it has always been observed that we knew nothing save the one church of God and we reckoned nothing except the holy baptism of the holy church. Plainly, for indeed some were doubting on account of their baptism, who, for they received the new prophets, were seen to know themselves with us the Father and the Son, we, so many ones coming to Iconium, diligently discussed and confirmed every baptism, which was constituted outside the church, to be altogether needing to be repudiated....For those whom these, who were formerly bishops in the catholic church and later assuming for themselves the power of clerical ordination, had baptized we judged as ones having not been baptized. And this thing is observed by us, that whoever coming unto us having been dipped by those ones, such as strangers and having attained nothing, they are baptized by us with the only and true baptism of the catholic church and they attain the regeneration of the living bath²¹⁸.

²¹⁷ «*Sed in multum, inquit, proficit nomen Christi ad fidem et baptismi sanctificationem, ut quicumque et ubicumque in nomine Christi baptizatus fuerit consequatur statim gratiam Christi*» in FIRMILIANUS, «*Ep. 75*», 18.1 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., CCL: III C *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III*, 2, Brepols 1996, 597.

²¹⁸ «*Quod autem pertineat ad consuetudinem refutandam quam videantur opponere veritati, quis tam vanus sit ut veritati consuetudinem praeferat aut qui perspecta luce tenebras non derelinquat? Nisi si et Iudaeos Christo adventante, id est veritate, adiuuat in aliquo antiquissima consuetude, quod relicta nova veritatis via in vetustate permanserint. Quod quidem adversus Stephanum vos dicere Afri potestis cognita veritate errorem vos consuetudinis reliquisse. Ceterum nos veritati et consuetudinem iungimus et consuetudini Romanorum consuetudinem sed veritatis opponimus, ab initio hoc tenentes quod a Christo et ab apostolis traditum est. Nec meminimus hoc apud nos aliquando coepisse, cum semper istic observatum sit ut non nisi unam dei ecclesiam nossemus et sanctum baptismum non nisi sanctae ecclesiae computaremus. Plane*

Firmilian maintains that Stephen and his irrational theological innovations have broken with the rest of the church and not vice-versa.

For how many arguments and dissensions have you contrived throughout the churches of the whole world? How great a sin for yourself really have you heaped up, when you have rent yourself asunder from all the flocks? For you yourself have extracted yourself, do not deceive yourself, if indeed that one is really the schismatic who will have made oneself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical oneness/unity. For while you deem all to be able to be abstained from by you, you alone have been abstained from by all. Neither will the precepts of the apostle have been able to inform you unto the rule of truth and peace, warning and saying: «I, having been bound in the Lord, therefore beseech you to walk worthily in the vocation by which you have been called, with gentleness and humility of sentiment, ones sustaining each other in love with patience, ones working sufficiently to preserve the oneness/unity of the spirit in the conjunction of peace, one body and one spirit, as you have been called in one hope of your vocation. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who [is] with us above all things, through all things, and in all things»²¹⁹.

Firmilian concludes his letter to Cyprian with a sarcastic and, if true, most pathetic and tragic estimation of Rome's bishop, Stephen.

quoniam quidam de eorum baptismo dubitabant qui, etsi novos prophetas recipiunt, eosdem tamen patrem et filium nosse nobiscum videntur, plurimi simul convenientes Iconio diligentissime tractavimus et confirmavimus repudiandum esse omne omnino baptisma quod sit extra ecclesiam constitutum....Nos etiam illos quos hi qui prius in ecclesia catholica episcopi fuerant et postmodum sibi potestatem clericae ordinationis adsumentes baptizaverant pro non baptizatis habendos iudicavimus. Et hoc apud nos observatur, ut quicumque ab illis tincti ad nos veniunt, tamquam alieni et nihil consecuti, unico et vero ecclesiae catholicae baptismo apud nos baptizentur et lavacri vitalis regenerationem consequantur» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 19,22.1 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 598.

²¹⁹ «*Lites enim et disensiones quantas parasti per ecclesias per totius mundi? Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti? Excidisti enim te ipsum, noli te fallere, si quidem ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiasticae unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstineri posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti. Nec te informare ad regulam veritatis et pacis vel apostolic praecepta potuerunt monentis et dicentis: obsecro ergo vos ego vinctus in domino digne ambulare vocatione qua vocati estis, cum omni humilitate sensus et lenitate, cum patientia sustinentes invicem in dilectione, satis agentes servare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis, unum corpus et unus spiritus, sicut vocati estis in una spe vocationis vestrae. Unus dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus deus et pater omnium, qui super omnes et per omnia et in omnibus nobis» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 24.2-3 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 601-602.*

How diligently has Stephen implemented these commands and salvific warnings of the apostle, preserving in the first place gentleness and humility of sentiment. For what more humble or gentle than to have broken with all the bishops through the whole world, breaking peace with each by various kinds of discord, now with the eastern ones, which we trust not to be unknown to you, now with you who are in the south, from whom he gently and patiently enough received representative bishops, that he admitted them not unto an ordinary word of common discourse, over and above so far as to, mindful of charity and love, direct the universal fraternity that no one receive them into his house, that not only peace and communion but also a roof and hospitality be denied to the ones coming. This is oneness/unity of the spirit in the conjunction of peace to be preserved, to sever himself from the oneness/unity of charity and to make alien through all things for the brothers and to rebel against the sacrament and bond of peace with the fury of discord. With such a one can there be one body and one spirit, with whom perhaps is not one soul itself, so slippery and movable and uncertain? But as far as pertains to that one, let us leave alone. Let us discuss more ably that which is concerning the most important question. They who contend that those baptized by the heretics thus should be received as ones having attained the grace of legitimate baptism, say one baptism to be with them and with us and to differ in no way. But what does the apostle Paul say? «One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God». If of the heretics it is one and the same with our baptism, without a doubt the faith is one, also. However, if the faith is one, undoubtedly the Lord is one, too. If the Lord is one, it is consequently to say that God is one. If, however, this oneness/unity, which cannot be at all divided or separated, is itself even with the heretics, what more is there to argue? For what do we call them heretics and not Christians? Moreover, since there is neither one God nor one Lord nor one church nor one faith with us and the heretics, but neither one spirit or one body, it has been demonstrated that baptism cannot be in common with us and the heretics, with whom there is nothing at all in common. And yet it does not shame Stephen to afford patronage to such ones against the church, and to rend asunder the fraternity for the sake of maintaining heretics, moreover to say Cyprian a pseudo-Christ and a pseudo-apostle and a deceitful worker. He, who conscious all these things to be in himself, has anticipated that he object through the lie of another those things which also he deservedly should hear²²⁰.

²²⁰ «*Haec apostolic mandata et monita salutaria quam diligenter Stephanus implevit, humilitatem sensus et lenitatem primo in loco servans. Quid enim humilitas aut lenius quam cum tot episcopis per totum mundum dissensisse, pacem cum singulis vario discordiae genere rumpentem, modo cum orientalibus, quod nec vos latere confidimus, modo vobiscum qui in meridie estis, a quibus legatos episcopos patienter satis et leniter suscepit, ut eos nec ad sermonem saltem colloquii communis admitteret, adhuc insuper dilectionis et caritatis memor praeciperet fraternitati universae ne quis eos in domum*

3.4 Pontius the Deacon (c. early to mid-third century CE)

Pontius, a deacon of the Church in Carthage, is the author of *Vita Cypriani*, the first known Christian biography²²¹. While historically unreliable to a certain degree, the hagiographical work lists various works of Cyprian. Pontius uses the term «*unitas*» once while cataloguing the many accomplishments of his hero and mentor. «Who teaches penitence to the lapsed, truth to heretics, oneness/unity to schismatics, peace and the law of gospel prayer to the sons of God»²²²?

3.5 The Seventh Council of Carthage in 256CE

The Seventh Council of Carthage was the last of a series of three synods of African bishops convened between 255 and 256CE²²³. The council

suam reciperet, ut venientibus non solum pax et communio sed et tectum et hospitium negaretur. Hoc est servasse unitatem spiritus in coniunctionem pacis, abscidere se a caritatis unitate et alienum per omnia fratribus facere et contra sacramentum et vinculum pacis furore discordiae rebellare. Apud talem potest esse unum corpus et unus spiritus, apud quem fortasse ipsa anima una non est, sic lubrica et mobilis et incerta? Sed quantum ad illum pertinet, relinquamus. Excutiamus potius id de quo cum maxime quaestio est. Qui contendunt ab haereticis baptizatos sic recipi oportere tamquam legitimi baptismi gratiam consecutos, unum nobis atque illis baptismum dicunt esse et in nullo discrepare. Sed quid ait apostolus Paulus? "Unus dominus, una fides, unum baptismum, unus deus." Si unum atque idem est cum nostro baptismum haereticorum, sine dubio et fides una est. Si autem una fides est, utique et dominus unus. Si dominus unus est, consequens est dicere quia deus unus est. Si autem haec unitas quae separari omnino et dividi non potest etiam apud haereticos ipsa est, quid ultra contendimus? Ut quid illos haereticos et non christianos vocamus? Porro cum nobis et haereticis nec deus unus sit nec dominus unus nec una ecclesia nec fides una, sed nec unus spiritus aut corpus unum, manifestum est nec baptismum nobis et haereticis commune esse posse, quibus nihil est omnino commune. Et tamen non pudet Stephanum talibus adversus ecclesiam patrocinium praestare et propter haereticos adserendos fraternitatem scindere, insuper et Cyprianum pseudochristum et pseudoapostolum et dolosum operarium dicere. Qui omnia in se esse conscius praevenit ut alteri ea per mendacium obiceret quae ipse ac merito audire deberet» in FIRMILIANUS, «Ep. 75», 25 in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2, Brepols 1996, 602-603.

²²¹ Biographical information is from J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 340.

²²² «*Quis doceret paenitentiam lapsos, veritatem haereticos, schismaticos unitatem, filios Dei pacem et evangelicae precis legem?*» in PONTIUS, «*Vita Caecilii Cypriani*», 7 in G. HARTEL, ed., CSEL: III.III.appendix S. Thasci Caecilii Cypriani Opera Omnia Pars III, C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam Accademiae, Vienna 1871, xcvi.

²²³ Historical information is from J. QUASTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 342-343.

reaffirmed the African tradition beginning with Tertullian's *De baptismo*, 15 (c. 200CE) and the first council of Carthage (c. 220CE), denying sacramental validity to those baptized by heretics and schismatics outside the Church. Eighty-seven bishops from across Numidia and North Africa with Cyprian presiding ratified their conciliar declaration, *Sententiae episcoporum* 87. Without mentioning the word «*unitas*» himself, Cyprian briefly addresses the other eighty-six bishops assembled at this council followed by each individual bishop's intervention. Only two bishops each use the term «*unitas*» once.

The bishop Nemesianus of Thubunae opines «Then they can be sons of God with the apostle saying: caring ones serving the oneness/unity of the spirit in the conjunction of peace, one body and one spirit, just as you have been called into the one hope of your vocation, one Lord, one faith, one baptism»²²⁴. The bishop Januarius of Muzzuli declares «I am amazed that, since all confess there to be one baptism, not all understand the oneness/unity of the same baptism»²²⁵.

3.6 Pseudo-Cyprianic Writings

More numerous than the authentic works authored by Cyprian are those documents falsely bearing his name, an indication of the immediate and long-lasting authority that the Carthaginian bishop enjoyed in early Christianity²²⁶. Only one of the works of the *Corpus Pseudo-Cypriani* employs the term «*unitas*» twice. The treatise in question, *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima* was probably written in the very early fourth century CE, and its Latin demonstrates Cyprian's influence. As the content discusses the rewards for not only good Christians and ascetics but also for martyrs, the work was probably written shortly before the *pax Constantiniana*, and so the two instances of the term «*unitas*» are included here.

²²⁴ «Tunc poterunt filii dei esse dicente apostolo: curantes servare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis, unum corpus et unus spiritus, sicut vocati estis in una spe vocationis vestrae, unus dominus, una fides, unum baptisma» in «*Sententiae Episcoporum LXXXVII*» V in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL: Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera III E*, Brepols 2004, 19.

²²⁵ «Miror quod, cum omnes confiteantur unum esse baptismum, non omnes intellegant eiusdem baptismi unitatem » in «*Sententiae Episcoporum LXXXVII*» XXXIV in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL: Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera III E*, Brepols 2004, 59.

²²⁶ Information is from J. QUAISTEN, *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, 367-372.

In the first instance the author states «Before all things the teacher of oneness/unity and the recognizer and doctor of divine conversation calls us worthy ones to himself»²²⁷.

In a second instance the author states:

The thing needing to be counseled to us, therefore dearest brothers, and the thing needing to be glistened with a real conference is that we inquire God with equal steps and that we insert the divine salvific precepts in our hearts and that we recover on behalf of the rewards and merits of him insisting with the faith joined together of oneness/unity²²⁸.

3.7 Conclusion

Novatian maintains that Christ's reference to himself and the Father not in the masculine (*unus*) but as «having been placed neutrally» (*neutraliter positum*) [i.e. in the neuter] as «one thing only» (*unum*) refers to the «concord of fellowship, not the oneness/unity of person» (*societatis concordiam, non unitatem personae*) and «not unto number, but unto the fellowship of the other» (*nec ad numerum refertur, sed ad societatem alterius*). Novatian demonstrates the abstract concept of «this oneness/unity of concord with such a distinction of persons» (*hanc concordiae unitatem...cum personarum tamen distinctione*) as applied in the material world with reference to the apostles Paul and Barnabus [i.e. «Apollo»]. Paul «plants» (*plantat*) and Apollo «waters» (*rigat*) and so in this context they do not count as «anyone» (*quicquam*) but God who «gives the increase» (*incrementum dat*). Consequently, «he who plants and he who waters are one thing only» (*qui autem plantat et qui rigat unum sunt*). Novatian asserts that even though «one to be Apollo» (*alterum esse Apollo*) «the other Paul» (*alterum Paulum*) they are nevertheless «one and the same Apollo equally with Paul» (*eundem atque ipsum Apollo pariter et Paulum*). Thus, with one planting and one watering «different offices of each one are produced» (*diversa uniuscuiusque sunt officia prolata*). And so that «these [are] two» (*hos duos*), i.e. Apollo and Paul, «that the one is certainly Apollo and the other really Paul, pertains with regard to the distinction of persons» (*ut alter quidem sit Apollo, alter vero Paulus, quantum ad*

²²⁷ «Ante omnia unitatis magister divinae conversationis agnitor atque doctor dignos nos sibi vocat» in «De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima» 54.12 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *PLS*: 53, Brepols 2004, 59.

²²⁸ «Consulendum est ergo nobis, fratres dilectissimi, et vera congressione nitendum est, ut vestigiis paribus deum inquiramus et divina praecepta salutaria cordi nostro ac pectori inseramus et praemiis eius insistere unitatis fide coniuncti pro meritis recipiamus» in «De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima» 54.12 in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *PLS*: 53, Brepols 2004, 59.

personarum distinctionem pertinet). However, that «both are “one thing only” <pertains with regard really to concord,>» (<*quantum vero ad concordiam pertinet,> unum ambo sint*). Finally, Novatian provides the principle whereby this «oneness/unity of concord» (*concordiae unitatem*) is grounded. «For, when of the two, one is the judgment, one is the truth, one is the faith, one and the same is the religion, one indeed is the fear of God, even though they be two, are “one thing only”. They are the same thing as long as they will know the same thing. For on the one hand the reason of persons divides these who on the other hand the reason of religion brings together. And although they be not one and the same, as long as they feel the same thing they are the same thing; and though they are two, having the fellowship in faith they are “one thing only”, even though they manifest diversity in persons» (*Nam quando duorum una sententia est, veritas una est, fides una est, una atque eadem religio est, unus etiam dei timor est, unum sunt, etiam duo sint. Ipsum sunt, dum ipsum sapiunt. Etenim quos personae ratio invicem dividit, eosdem rursus invicem religionis ratio conducit. Et quamvis idem atque ipsi non sint, dum idem sentient, ipsum sunt; et cum duo sint, unum sunt, habentes in fide societatem, etiamsi gerant in personis diversitatem*).

Cornelius, referring to those recently reconciled to the church, explains that a temporary problem arose within the church at Rome as some «were proclaiming oneness/unity» (*unitatem...adnuntiabant*) even though «the faith was not proper/sufficient».

The Seventh Council of Carthage affirmed the prevailing theological opinion that if there exists only «one baptism» (*unum baptismum*) then there necessarily must be «oneness/unity of baptism» (*baptismi unitatem*). Moreover, they can be considered «sons of God» (*filius dei*) only if they strive «to serve the oneness/unity of the Spirit in the conjunction of peace, one body and one Spirit...in one hope of your vocation, one Lord, one faith, one baptism» (*servare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis, unum corpus et unus spiritus...in una spe vocationis vestrae, unus dominus, una fides, unum baptisma*).

Pontius nostalgically recalls how Cyprian, among many other achievements, taught «oneness/unity to schismatics» (*schismaticos unitatem*), a thought paralleled by the author of the pseudo/Cyprianic treatise addressed herein. The author of this last work also seems to imply that the Christian faith's tenets be carefully discerned by all working together so that one faith may be evident with an end to oneness/unity, i.e. that «with true conference...we inquire God...and insert the divine salvific precepts in our heart and breast...with the conjoined faith of oneness/unity»

(*vera congressione...deum inquiramus et divina praecepta salutaria cordi nostro ac pectori inseramus...unitatis fide coniuncti*).

Firmilian observes that «union and peace and concord» (*Adunatio enim et pax et Concordia*) are found not only with «faithful men and ones knowing the truth» (*hominibus fidelibus et cognoscentibus veritatem*) but also with the «heavenly angels themselves» (*angelis ipsis caelestibus*) and so it is said there is rejoicing with «one sinner doing penance and returning unto the bond of oneness/unity» (*uno peccatore paenitentiam agente et ad unitatis vinculum revertente*). Geographical distance does not impede the ability «to bind and join together by the bond of charity and oneness/unity» (*copulare et coniungere caritatis atque unitatis vinculo*), thanks to the «divine oneness/unity» (*divina unitate*). The Lord himself «everywhere joins together and binds his own ones by the bond of oneness/unity» (*coniugit ubique et copulat suos vinculo unitatis*), who can then in turn be sent out «in the spirit of oneness/unity» (*unitatis spiritu*). Firmilian asserts that they «are not able to unite...who will have divided themselves from the oneness/unity of God» (*adunare...non possint quae se a dei unitate diviserint*) because «they who draw themselves away from you will perish» (*qui longinquant se abs te peribunt*). The «Lord's judgment» (*iudicium domini*) will be based «on their own merit» (*pro merito suo*), which Lord nevertheless beseeches the Lord «on behalf of oneness/unity» (*pro unitate*), and prays «Father, grant that as you and I are one thing only, let that these be one thing only, also, in us» (*pater, da ut quomodo ego et tu unum sumus, sit et hi in nobis unum sint*).

Firmilian suggests that Stephen's position of recognizing the validity of the baptism of heretics (*baptisma haereticorum*) and schismatics to be a «human tradition» (*traditionem humanam*), and that the argument from custom upon which the bishop of Rome bases his position is invalidated by Stephen himself as not all that has been «handed down from the origin» (*ab origine tradita*) is observed «at Rome» (*Romae*). This has never before been a problem as many things, like to observance of the «days of Easter» (*dies Paschae*) and «many other mysteries/sacraments of the divine thing» (*multa alia divinae rei sacramenta*), are celebrated at different times and in varying ways, and such do not cause «anyone divided from the peace and oneness/unity of the Catholic Church» (*ab ecclesiae catholicae pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est*). Yet, Firmilian suggests, that Stephen in «breaking peace against you» (*Stephanus...rumpens adversus vos pacem*) does something that none of the other bishops of Rome had done to Cyprian, as the «predecessors of him [i.e. of Stephen] always guarded with love and mutual honor with you» (*semper antecessores eius vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt*). Firmilian finds reprehensible that Stephen

«communicates» (*communicent*) with those baptized by heretics and schismatics. Firmilian implies that Stephen avails himself of the apostles Peter and Paul as if «they themselves will have handed [this teaching] down, who in their own epistles execrated heretics and so warned that we avoid them» (*ipsi tradiderint, qui in epistolis suis haereticos execrati sunt et ut eos evitemus monuerunt*).

Firmilian acknowledges the only rational argument, apart from that of custom, which Stephen supplies in defense of the latter's position on the validity of heretical baptism. «“But in much,” he [i.e. Stephen] says, “Christ's name advances unto faith and the sanctification of baptism, that whoever and wherever one will have been baptized in Christ's name is conceded immediately Christ's grace» (*Sed in multum, inquit, proficit nomen Christi ad fidem et baptismi sanctificationem, ut quicumque et ubicumque in nomine Christi baptizatus fuerit consequatur statim gratiam Christi*). Firmilian is perplexed with what appears a logical absurdity, realizing the full import of such a declaration, as the bishop of Rome is «conceding to them not a modicum but the greatest power of grace» in recognizing heretical and schismatic baptism to be valid (*concedens illis non modicam sed maximam gratiae potestatem*). Considering that all, including Stephen, who nowhere seems to deny the ecclesial structure as expressed by both Cyprian and Firmilian, such a concession seems to undermine the very logic of the Christian church. «They who contend that those baptized by the heretics thus should be received as ones having attained the grace of legitimate baptism, say one baptism to be with them and with us and to differ in no way. But what does the apostle Paul say? “One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God”. If of the heretics it is one and the same with our baptism, without a doubt the faith is one, also. However, if the faith is one, undoubtedly the Lord is one, too. If the Lord is one, it is consequently to say that God is one. If, however, this oneness/unity, which cannot be at all divided or separated, is itself even with the heretics, what more is there to argue? For what do we call them heretics and not Christians?» (*Qui contendunt ab haereticis baptizatos sic recipi oportere tamquam legitimi baptismi gratiam consecutos, unum nobis atque illis baptismum dicunt esse et in nullo discrepare. Sed quid ait apostolus Paulus? “Unus dominus, una fides, unum baptismum, unus deus.” Si unum atque idem est cum nostro baptismum haereticorum, sine dubio et fides una est. Si autem una fides est, utique et dominus unus. Si dominus unus est, consequens est dicere quia deus unus est. Si autem haec unitas quae separari omnino et dividi non potest etiam apud haereticos ipsa est, quid ultra contendimus? Ut quid illos haereticos et non christianos vocamus?*). And in fact Firmilian indicates that Stephen has now

introduced a host of other problems with which the bishop of Rome himself is uncertain as to how to handle. «And now he deliberates vainly to consent and to be a participant with them in other things, that he also meet with them, and mix prayers equally with these same ones, and establish the sacrifice with a common altar» (*Et frustra iam dubitat in ceteris quoque consentire eis et particeps esse, ut et simul cum eis conveniat et orationes pariter cum eisdem misceat et altare ac sacrificium commune constituat*).

Firmilian acknowledges and repeats Cyprian's line of argumentation against the validity of heretical and schismatic baptism throughout his letter. «Indeed as to what pertains to that which Stephen has said...you have replied most abundantly» (*quidem quantum ad id pertineat quod Stephanus dixit...plenissime vos respondistis*). Firmilian refers to the church while utilizing many of the phrases of his episcopal colleague in Carthage, calling the church an «enclosed garden» (*hortus conclusus*), a «sealed fountain» (*fons signatus*), «mother» (*mater*), «bride» (*sponsa*), and «Noah's ark [which] will have been nothing other than the mystery/sacrament of the Church of Christ, outside of which then with all the perishing ones, saved those alone who were inside the ark, [and so] we are instructed manifestly unto the oneness/unity of the church needing to be perceived» (*arca Noe nihil aliud fuerit quam sacramentum ecclesiae Christi, quae tunc omnibus foris pereuntibus eos solos servavit qui intra arcam fuerunt, manifeste instruimur ad ecclesiae unitatem perspiciendam*).

Insisting that «Christ our Lord demonstrating his own bride to be one and the mystery/sacrament of his oneness/unity to be one» (*Christus dominus noster unam esse manifestans sponsam suam et unitatis eius sacramentum*), Firmilian recalls Christ's declaration that one «who is not with me is against me, one who gathers not with me, scatters» (*qui non est mecum adversus me est, et qui non mecum colligit spargit*). Firmilian continues «For if Christ is with us, and however the heretics are not with us, indeed the heretics are against Christ; and if we gather with Christ, the heretics however gather not with us, without doubt they scatter» (*Si enim nobiscum est Christus, haeretici autem non sunt nobiscum, pro certo adversus Christum sunt haeretici; et si nos colligimus cum Christo, non colligunt autem nobiscum haeretici, sine dubio spargunt*). Firmilian reinforces his position invoking the apostle Paul «One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who [is] with us above all, and through all, and in all.» (*Unus dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus deus et pater omnium, qui super omnes et per omnia et in omnibus nobis*). Firmilian concludes that «baptism which is not unless of the one church alone» (*baptisma quod non nisi solius ecclesiae est*) and that «Christ's bride is one, which is the catholic church, is herself who alone generates

sons for God» (*autem sponsa Christi una est, quae est ecclesia catholica, ipsa est quae sola generat deo filios*). Invoking Christ's commendation in the upper room during pentecost, in which he addressed the apostolic body, Firmilian interprets «the power, therefore, of sins needing to be remitted was given to the apostles and to the churches, which were established by those sent by Christ and to the bishops who have succeeded them with vicarious ordination» (*potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum apostolis data est et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt et episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicaria successerunt*). Consequently, Firmilian and the church in Cappadocia «have judged the ones having [the baptism of heretics] not baptized. And this is observed by us, that whosoever having been dipped by them comes to us, as alien and having obtained nothing, are baptized with the one and only and true baptism of the catholic church» (*non baptizatis habendos iudicavimus. Et hoc apud nos observatur, ut quicumque ab illis tincti ad nos veniunt, tamquam alieni et nihil consecuti, unico et vero ecclesiae catholicae baptismo apud nos baptizentur et lavacri vitalis regenerationem consequantur*).

Consequently, Firmilian draws logical conclusions and makes alarming assertions. Stephen's theological position on the validity of heretical and schismatic baptism cause him to «betray and desert oneness/unity» (*prodit et deserit unitatem*). Referring to Stephen, Firmilian declares «you have divided yourself from all the flocks...you yourself have excised yourself», (*te a tot gregibus scidisti...Excidisti enim te ipsum*) sarcastically questioning (given Stephen's position and line of argumentation) whether or not «that one really is a schismatic, who will have made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastic oneness/unity» (*ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiasticae unitatis apostatam fecerit*). Firmilian concludes «for while you depute all to be abstained from by you, you yourself alone have been abstained from by all» (*dum enim putas omnes a te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti*). In Firmilian's estimation Stephen has failed miserably at following the apostle Paul's injunction of «preserving the oneness/unity of the spirit in the conjunction of peace» (*servare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis*). Indeed, Stephen's judgment and behavior has really «preserved the oneness/unity of the spirit in the conjunction of peace» (*servasse unitatem spiritus in coniunctionem pacis*), i.e. «to sever himself from the oneness/unity of charity» (*abscidere se a caritatis unitate*).

Firmilian actually affirms, albeit sarcastically and condescendingly given what appears to him and Cyprian to be logical contradictions incompatible with the faith and theology of the church, all that which Cyprian expostulates throughout the latter's writings regarding Peter and the bishop

of Rome. Firmilian nowhere denies the prerogatives afforded to the bishop of Rome by Cyprian or invoked by the bishop of Rome himself. Firmilian refers to Stephen «who professes himself to have the chair of Peter through succession» (*qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se praedicat*) and «who thus glories from the place of his own episcopate and contends himself to hold the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the church were established» (*qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiae collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat et ecclesiarum multarum nova aedificia constituat, dum esse illic baptismum sua auctoritate defendit.*) Consequently, given Stephen's apparent treatment of Cyprian and the latter's legates sent to Rome to discuss the matter of heretical and schismatic baptism with the bishop there, not to mention the latter's lack of a rational, theological explanation for his unwavering position on the matter, Firmilian is «justly indignant unto this so manifest and open stupidity of Stephen» (*iuste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam*). Firmilian observes «Nor does he [i.e. Stephen] understand the truth of the Christian rock to be obfuscated by himself and in a measure abolished» (*Nec intelligit offuscari a se et quodammodo aboleri christianae petrae veritatem*). This must be acknowledged as the closest Firmilian comes to implying that what Cyprian expostulates concerning the structure of the church may be jeopardized. However, while the semantic insinuation and reference to Peter seems clear, what is in danger of being obfuscated, if not abolished *in a measure* by Stephen is not the latter's position as bishop of Rome as «Peter» [i.e. the masculine *Petrus* and thoroughly explained by Cyprian and addressed in Part Four of this thesis), but the truth «of the Christian rock» (i.e. the feminine *christianae petrae*). An examination of Cyprian's own theory of oneness/unity seems most appropriate both for most properly contextualizing the preceding authors contemporary to Cyprian as well as determining what Carthage's bishop himself actually says.

PART FOUR

«*Unitas*» in Cyprian of Carthage

CHAPTER ONE

De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate

Any further observations of the historical context in which the first version of *De Unitate* appeared would be redundant in light of Part One of this thesis. Suffice to recall that no scholars contest identifying the impetus of the treatise's composition with one or the other of two schisms in the West in the year 251, viz. either that of Novatian the priest at Rome (against Cornelius) or of Novatus and Felicissimus the deacon at Carthage (against Cyprian), which nevertheless was instigated remotely by Novatian. Conflicting theories emerge over which version was composed first, i.e. the *PT* or the *TR* – with the majority of scholars maintaining the chronological precedence of *PT* –, and why that original version was altered – most scholars suggesting the baptismal controversy between Cyprian and Stephen as the primary motive.

This chapter avoids guessing *a priori* the reasons for Cyprian's revision and, subsequently, injecting his treatise with inaccurate meanings and

projecting unbalanced interpretations and conclusions onto his theory of oneness/unity. The point of departure instead will be Cyprian's *ipsissima verba* in the hopes of obtaining a clearer understanding of his use of the term «*unitas*».

De Unitate's nature as a treatise allows for a systematic philological analysis that is conducive to a thematic presentation of its content. The *PT* will be analyzed first followed by the *TR* and lastly by the *TC*, i.e. that portion of *De Unitate* common to both versions, without any consideration of their chronological sequence. Any evidence of change, confusion, contradiction, and/or continuity contained therein will be assessed and a synthesis of Cyprian's thought will be attempted in conclusion.

4.1.1 «*Unitas*» in the *Primatus Textus*:

That Man Is the Origin and Reason/Principle of Oneness/Unity

Cyprian employs the term only twice in the *PT*. After quoting Mt 16,18-19 and Jn 20,21 Cyprian briefly paraphrases these Gospel passages reiterating that the Lord builds His Church on that man (*illum*), i.e. Peter, and commands Peter to pasture His sheep.

And although He imparts equal power²²⁹ to all the Apostles, nevertheless He established one chair and by His authority determined the origin and reason/principle²³⁰ of oneness/unity. The others were certainly that which Peter was²³¹, but primacy is given to Peter and one Church and one chair is demonstrated; and all are shepherds, but one flock is shown which is pastured by all the Apostles with unanimous accord. Does one who does not hold this oneness/unity of Peter believe oneself to hold faith? Does one who deserts the chair of Peter, upon whom the Church was founded, trust oneself to be in the Church²³²?

²²⁹ What is this «*potestas*»? Pasturing the sheep? Being the foundation? Binding and loosing?

²³⁰ Of the two full pages L&S provides for meanings of «*ratio*», the most likely in this context seem to be «principle, reason, reasoning, a system based on reason; motive». Bévenot's translation «hallmark» finds no support in L&S and seems to diminish the significance of the term, cf. M. BÉVENOT, *Cyprian: «De Lapsis»...*, 63; ID., *The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church*, 46.

²³¹ Bévenot injects the phrase «all that Peter was» into his English translation, cf. M. BÉVENOT, *Cyprian: «De Lapsis»...*, 63; ID., *The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church*, 46. There is absolutely nothing in the Latin text of either the CCL edition, the Migne edition (cf. *PL* 4, 500A), or the variations among manuscripts referenced therein that would warrant such a forced insertion, which injection seems to nuance significantly the meaning of the sentence.

²³² *De Unitate* 4: «*Et quamvis apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem, unam tamen cathedra constituit et unitatis originem adque rationem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc*

4.1.1.i «*Cathedra*» and «*Primatus*»

Distinguish Peter from the Other Apostles

Cyprian acknowledges that «although (*quamvis*) He imparts equal power to all the Apostles, [the Lord] nevertheless (*tamen*) established one chair and by His authority determined the origin and reason of oneness/unity». Cyprian immediately and specifically clarifies what such a divinely ordained principle and origin of oneness/unity is. He reiterates that undoubtedly the other Apostles were what Peter was, however primacy is given to Peter and in this way one Church is demonstrated, one chair is shown.

As if striving for complete clarity in expression to avoid misunderstanding, Cyprian repeats that all are shepherds. However, one flock is shown, which is pastured by all the Apostles with unanimous accord²³³. Cyprian has identified already Peter as the origin of and reason/principle of oneness/unity, for which Peter simultaneously or subsequently is given primacy. Lest unanimous accord (*consensione unianimi*) itself be understood as the principle of oneness/unity²³⁴, Cyprian rhetorically asserts that deserters of the oneness/unity of Peter and the chair of Peter neither have faith nor are in the Church²³⁵.

The one chair seems significantly and intimately connected with the origin and reason/principle of oneness/unity, i.e. Peter. The inanimate chair alone would seem to be an awkward principle of oneness/unity for the *living* Church, which Cyprian describes as the «flock adhering to its

erant utique et ceteri quod fuit Petrus, sed primatus Petro datur et una ecclesia et cathedra una monstratur; et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur qui ab apostolis omnibus unianimi consensione pascatur. Hanc Petri unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidei credit? Qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata ecclesia est, deserit, in ecclesia se esse confidit?», CCL III, 251.

²³³ Bévenot translates «*consensione unianimi*» as «common accord», which seems to imply more of a mutual agreement (open to disagreement because it is mutual) than an accord that seems qualified by a unanimity without qualification, i.e. without the possibility for disagreement.

²³⁴ Benson suggests that the principle/reason of oneness/unity for Cyprian is a «unity...held together by its own sense of unity, by the “cement of mutual concord”». Contrary to this view that oneness/unity is its own principle/reason seems to be Seneca, who assigns «virtue» as the principle of «oneness/unity» effecting harmonious concord in the soul.

²³⁵ Perhaps this partially explains whence Harnack derives his notion that Cyprian seems to maintain that communion with the bishop of Rome is a necessary prerequisite for communion with the Church.

shepherd, the people having been united to the bishop (*sacerdoti*)»²³⁶. Cyprian understands that chair necessarily implies a bishop that sits on that chair and vice versa.

4.1.1.ii *Summary*

In the *PT* Cyprian identifies Peter as the «*ratio*» for and «*origo*» of «*unitas*» because Christ built His «*una ecclesia*» on «*Petrus*», a unique position not shared by the other Apostles. Cyprian assigns «*primatus*» to Peter, also something uniquely given to Peter and not to the other Apostles. One «*ecclesia*» and one «*cathedra*» consequently are demonstrated. One who does not hold the «*Petri unitas*» or the «*cathedra Petri*» neither has «*fides*» nor is in the «*ecclesia*».

4.1.2 «*Unitas*» in the *Textus Receptus*:

One Man is the Origin of Oneness/Unity

Cyprian includes the term «*unitas*» six times in this longer version. Retaining the passage from Mt 16,18-19 used to introduce Chapter 4 in the *PT*, Cyprian again insists that the Lord built His Church on Peter. Cyprian indicates this, however, not by referring to Peter as that man (*illum*) as he does in the *PT*, but as one man only upon whom the Church is built (*unum*). The *PT* phrases «*primatus Petro datur*» and «*cathedram Petri*» are conspicuously absent, also. Peter is still referred to as the «*origo*» but not as the «*ratio*» of oneness/unity. While the term «*Petrus*» is used four times in the *PT*, two of which are in direct relation to «*primatus*» and «*cathedra*», the title appears only once in the *TR* and this almost exactly as it appears in the *PT*²³⁷. Cyprian replaces the *mandatum* to shepherd the sheep given to Peter by Christ in Jn 21:17 as found in the *PT* with the commissioning of the disciples²³⁸ in the upper room to bind and remit sins one chapter before in Jn 20:21.

[The Lord] builds His Church on one [man] only, although He imparts equal power to all the Apostles after His resurrection and says: «As the Father has sent me so I send you, Receive the holy Spirit: whose sins you will have

²³⁶ *Ep.* 66,8 (CCL III C, 443).

²³⁷ «*Hoc erant utique et ceteri quod fuit Petrus*» in the *PT* compared with the addition of only one word in the *TR*: «*Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus*». The meaning is not altered as the «*apostoli*» are understood to be the «*ceteri*» in the *PT*.

²³⁸ While the «Apostles» may be understood as the «disciples» in the upper room – even though John himself never refers to them as such or even as the «Twelve» – noteworthy is Cyprian's choice of this passage with its emphasis on the «disciples», i.e. presumably the Apostles, as opposed to the *mandatum* assigned by Christ explicitly to Peter alone.

remitted, they are remitted to him; whose you will have held, they are held», nevertheless, He determined by His authority the origin of oneness/unity itself beginning from one in order that He demonstrate oneness/unity. The other Apostles were certainly that which Peter was, an equal fellowship having been bestowed with both power and honor, however the beginning/webbing out proceeds/originates from oneness/unity in order that Christ's one Church only may be shown. Which one Church the Holy Spirit out of the Lord's person indicates in the Cantic of Canticles, and says: «One is my dove, my perfect one, one is her mother, the chosen one of her *genetrix*». Does one, who does not hold this oneness/unity of the Church, believe oneself to hold faith? Does one who resists and withstands the Church trust oneself to be in the Church when the blessed apostle Paul teaches this very thing and shows the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity saying: «One body and one Spirit, one hope your vocation, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God»? Which oneness/unity we bishops especially must hold firmly and vindicate/claim, in order that we credibly prove the episcopate itself one and undivided. Let no one deceive the fraternity with mendacity, let no one corrupt the truth of faith with faithless violation of duty²³⁹.

Cyprian practically reiterates the same position that he maintains in the *PT*. Although (*quamvis*) the Lord grants His equal power²⁴⁰ to all the Apostles after the resurrection²⁴¹, the Lord by His authority nevertheless

²³⁹ *De Unitate* 4-5: «*Super unum aedificat ecclesiam et, quamvis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: «Sicut misit me Pater et ego mitto vos, Accipite Spiritum sanctum: si cuius remiseritis peccata remittentur illi; si cuius tenueritis tenebuntur», tamen, ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate profiscitur ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. Quam unam ecclesiam etiam in Cantico Canticorum Spiritus sanctus ex persona Domini designat, et dicit: «Una est columba mea, perfecta mea, una est matri suae, electa genetrici suae». Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit, in ecclesia se esse confidit, quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat et sacramentum unitatis ostendat dicens: «Unum corpus et unus Spiritus, una spes vocationis vestrae, unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus»? Quam unitatem tenere firmiter et vindicare debemus maxime episcopi, qui in ecclesia praesidimus, ut episcopatum quoque ipsum unum adque indivisum probemus. Nemo fraternitatem mendacio fallat, nemo fidei veritatem perfida praevaricatione corrumpat», CCL III, 251-252.*

²⁴⁰ Cyprian seems to qualify this power (*potestas*) not as Peter's commission of shepherding (*pascere*) as in the *PT*, but as a binding and remitting (*remittere* and *tenere*) of sins by the power of the Holy Spirit. This does not mean, however, that Cyprian denies that this power includes shepherding.

²⁴¹ Though quoting a different Johanne passage Cyprian seems mindful here of the pericope of John's Gospel quoted in the *PT*, adding in the *TR* that the Lord granted His equal power to all the Apostles «after the resurrection» as if to clarify something in or

(*tamen*) determined the origin of oneness/unity as beginning from one man only. Cyprian explains that the Lord has so arranged this not with the result that but in order that He manifest this very same oneness/unity.

4.1.2.i «*Exordium*» Distinguishes Peter from the Other Apostles

After repeating the *PT* *verbatim* that the other Apostles certainly were what Peter was, Cyprian employs a different qualification describing precisely how this is the case. Cyprian mentions nothing of Peter's primacy or chair, and he deletes the *PT*'s line that «all are shepherds, but one flock only is shown, which is tended by all the apostles with unanimous accord». Cyprian adds that the apostles were both equal to Peter and constituted «an equal fellowship having been bestowed both with honor (*honoris*) and power (*potestatis*)». Cyprian then introduces a phrase not used in the *PT*. «However, the beginning/webbing out (*exordium*)²⁴² proceeds/originates (*profiscitur*) from oneness/unity, in order that Christ's one Church only may be shown»²⁴³.

How is this last line to be understood? Cyprian has already stated in both versions that there is an origin (*origo*) of oneness/unity. He identifies that origin of oneness/unity with Peter – referred to as that one/man in the *PT* and as one man only in the *TR* – upon whom Christ built His Church. This is precisely how the oneness/unity of Christ's one Church is made manifest. The honor and power shared by the equal fellowship of the Apostles including Peter, however, has a beginning/webbing out (*exordium*). This beginning/webbing out of such honor and power, which itself proceeds/originates from oneness/unity, likewise makes manifest the oneness/unity of the Church. This oneness/unity of the Church has an origin, also. This origin is Peter, the only one upon whom Christ built His Church.

The Holy Spirit indicates this one Church in the Canticle of Canticles. The one Church is «my dove, my perfect one, the only one for her mother, the chosen one for her *genetrix*». Employing the *PT*'s same rhetorical construction Cyprian upholds that one who does not maintain the oneness/unity of the Church neither maintains faith. This does not and cannot exclude what Cyprian calls the «oneness/unity of Peter» in the *PT*,

insinuate something not in the *PT*. This would be understandable if in fact Cyprian is now altering the earlier composed *PT*.

²⁴² This term can mean the «the warp of a web», also, cf. L&S under the entry «*exordium*».

²⁴³ The translation of this line «*ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur*» is conspicuously absent from the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* translation, cf. A.C. COXE – J. DONALDSON, – A. ROBERTS, ed., «Cyprian», 422.

as Cyprian describes Peter in both versions as the origin (*origo*) of such oneness/unity of the Church and the beginning/webbing out (*exordium*) of apostolic honor and power in the *TR*.

One who resists and withstands the Church is not in the Church. Cyprian supports this last assertion and interprets Paul as teaching the same with a quotation from the latter's letter to the Ephesians 4,4. Cyprian also interprets Paul as establishing here the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity.

Finally, referring to this same oneness/unity Cyprian exhorts most especially the bishops that «we must hold firmly to and vindicate/claim oneness/unity in order that we credibly prove the episcopate itself one and undivided».

4.1.2.ii *Summary*

In the *TR* Cyprian identifies Peter as the «*origo*» of «*unitas*» because Christ built His Church on Peter (*super unum*), a unique position not shared by the other Apostles. Because Peter is the «*origo unitatis*» Cyprian describes Peter as the «*exordium*» of «*honor*» and «*potestas*», which honor and power has been bestowed upon the equal fellowship of the other Apostles. One «*ecclesia*» consequently is demonstrated. One who does not hold this (*hanc*) «*unitas*» of the Church neither has «*fides*» nor is in the «*ecclesia*». The Apostle Paul himself preaches this establishing what Cyprian formulates as the «*sacramentum unitatis*». In order to credibly prove (*probare*) that the «*episcopatum*» itself is «*unum*» and «*indivisum*» Cyprian insists that the bishops themselves must hold firmly to (*tenere firmiter*) and vindicate/claim (*vindicare*) this «*unitas*». A parallel comparison of the pertinent texts of both the *PT* and *TR* versions will be made in the conclusion to this chapter.

4.1.3 «*Unitas*» in the *TC*: Oneness/Unity Is Preserved in Its Origin

Cyprian introduces *De Unitate* with the assertion in the third chapter that the *auctor mendaciorum* «has invented heresies and schisms²⁴⁴, by which he might subvert faith, corrupt truth, rend oneness/unity»²⁴⁵. Cyprian then employs Mt 16,18-19 at the beginning of the fourth chapter to introduce both the *PT* and *TR* versions, followed by an explanation of the two-fold concept of oneness/unity contained in the term «*unitas*».

²⁴⁴ Cyprian equates heresy with schism.

²⁴⁵ «*Haeresis inuenit et schismata quibus subuerteret fidem, ueritatem corrumpet, scinderet unitatem*», CCL III, 250.

4.1.3.i *The Oneness of the Church*

Following the *PT*'s fourth chapter and that portion of the fifth chapter unique to the *TR*, Cyprian asserts that the «episcopate is one, a part of which is held by individuals in entirety»²⁴⁶. Cyprian immediately adds that the Church is likewise one. Cyprian compares the Church to a variety of natural phenomena to explain how she remains one even though extended throughout the earth.

The Church is one, which is extended into a rather widespread multitude by an increase of fruitfulness. Though the sun's rays are many, the light is one; many the branches of a tree, but one hardy trunk having been grounded by a tenacious root; when many streams flow from one source, although the number seems scattered abroad by the abundance of copious overflowing, nevertheless oneness/unity is preserved in the origin²⁴⁷.

4.1.3.ii *The Unity of the Church*

«Separate a ray from the body of the sun, oneness/unity suffers no division of light; break a branch off a tree, having been broken it will not have been able to sprout forth; cut off a stream from the source, having been cut off it will dry up»²⁴⁸. Cyprian employs the same metaphors to explain the indivisibility, i.e. the unity, of the Church.

So too the Church...extends her rays throughout the whole world, though one light is spread everywhere the oneness/unity of the body is not separated; she extends...her branches over the whole earth; one...is the head and one the

²⁴⁶ *De Unitate* 5: «*Episcopatus unus est cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*», CCL III, 252. Cyprian does not employ the term «*unitas*» here in describing the nature of the episcopate, which is «one». Compare with other translations. «The authority of bishops forms a unity, of which each holds his part in its totality» in M. BÉVENOT, *Cyprian: «De Lapsis»...*, 65; «The episcopate is one, the parts of which are held together by the individual bishops» in R.J. DEFERRARI, ed. and tr., *St. Cyprian: Treatises*, 98. Cyprian seems to use the episcopate to analogously explain the oneness of the Church.

²⁴⁷ *De Unitate* 5: «*Ecclesia una est quae in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur: quomodo solis multi radii sed lumen unum, et rami arboris multi sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum, et cum de fonte uno riui plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa uideatur exundantis copiae largitate, unitas tamen seruat in origine*», CCL III, 253. Compare the translation of this last phrase with «yet their oneness abides by reason of their starting-point», in M. BÉVENOT, *Cyprian: «De Lapsis»...*, 65-66.

²⁴⁸ *De Unitate* 5: «*Auelle radium solis a corpore, diuisionem lucis unitas non capit; ab arbore frange ramum, fractus germinare non poterit; a fonte prae cide riuum, praecisus arescit*», CCL III, 253.

origin, and one mother...by whose bearing we are born, with whose milk we are nourished, by whose spirit we are animated²⁴⁹.

Cyprian revisits these ideas at the conclusion of *De Unitate*. Oneness/unity does not originate or subsist in the episcopate or the people. Rather these are grafted or cemented onto oneness/unity by their oneness, unanimous accord, concord. «God is one, and Christ is one, and the faith is one, and His Church is one, and the people having been joined/linked/bonded into a solid oneness/unity of the body by the glue of concord»²⁵⁰. Whence originates and where subsists such oneness/unity? What fate awaits that which is separated from such oneness/unity? «Oneness/unity is not able to be rent asunder nor one body separated by a tearing apart of the structure...Whatever will have parted asunder from the womb will not have been able to live and breathe apart: it loses the substance of health»²⁵¹.

4.1.3.iii *The Oneness/Unity of the Church Is the Oneness/Unity of the Trinity*

Cyprian boldly asserts in the sixth chapter that «one who does not have the Church, the Mother, cannot have God, the Father»²⁵². Cyprian insists upon this because the Church's oneness/unity derives from the One Triune God. «The Lord says: "I and the Father are one," and again it was written concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit: "And the three are one."...this oneness/unity [is] coming from the divine strength, cohering in the heavenly mysteries/sacraments»²⁵³. The ramifications of rejecting such oneness/unity are eternal. «One who does not hold this oneness/unity

²⁴⁹ *De Unitate* 5: «Sic et ecclesia,...per orbem totum radios suos porrigit, unum tamen lumen est quod ubique diffunditur nec unitas corporis separatur; ramos suos in uniuersam terram...extendit; unum...caput est et origo una, et una mater...illius fetu nascimur, illius lacte nutrimur, spiritu eius animamur», CCL III, 253.

²⁵⁰ *De Unitate* 23: «Vnus Deus est et Christus unus, et una ecclesia eius et fides una, et plebs in solidam corporis unitatem concordiae glutino copulata», CCL III, 266. Cf. note 175.

²⁵¹ *De Unitate* 23: «Scindi unitas non potest nec corpus unum discidio compaginis separari, diuulsis laceratione uisceribus in frusta discerpi; quicquid a matrice discesserit, seorsum uiuere et spirare non poterit: substantiam salutis amittit», CCL III, 266.

²⁵² *De Unitate* 6: «Habere iam non potest Deum patrem qui ecclesiam non habet matrem», CCL III, 253.

²⁵³ *De Unitate* 6: «Dicit Dominus: "Ego et Pater unum sumus," et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto scriptum est: "Et tres unum sunt."...hanc unitatem de divina firmitate venientem, sacramentis caelestibus cohaerentem», CCL III, 254.

neither holds God's law, nor holds the faith of the Father and of the Son, nor holds life and salvation»²⁵⁴.

4.1.3.iv *The Mystery and Sacrament of Oneness/Unity Revealed in Christ's Seamless Garment: the Bond of Concord, Without Which One Is «Extra Ecclesiam»*

Cyprian introduces the seventh chapter by describing the Church as revealed in Christ's seamless garment. Cyprian employs this metaphor first to explain the divine origin of the Church. The Lord Jesus Christ «from heaven and from the Father carried oneness/unity, which was not able to be rent asunder at all by the one receiving and possessing [the tunic]...but obtained once for all time an inseparably whole and solid enduring strength»²⁵⁵. Cyprian next identifies the Church as mystery/sacrament and bond.

This mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity, this bond of an inseparably cohering concord²⁵⁶ is shown when in the Gospel the Lord Jesus Christ's tunic is not divided nor at all rent asunder, but a whole vestment is received and an uncorrupted and undivided tunic is possessed by the ones casting lots for Christ's vestment, that one may rather put on Christ²⁵⁷

²⁵⁴ *De Unitate* 6: «Hanc unitatem qui non tenet non tenet Dei legem, non tenet Patris et Filii fidem, vitam non tenet et salutem», CCL III, 254.

²⁵⁵ *De Unitate* 7: «Vnitatem ille portabat...de caelo et a patre...quae ab accipiente ac possidente scindi omnino non poterat, sed totam semel et solidam firmitatem inseparabiliter obtinebat, CCL III, 254.

²⁵⁶ Important to point out here is that not the «bond» but the «concord» is cohering inseparably: «...vinculum concordiae inseparabiliter cohaerentis». Were the «bond» understood to be «inseparably cohering» the oneness/unity, also, might be understood as Benson's «unity...held together by its own sense of unity, by the “cement of mutual concord”». Rather the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity, i.e. the Church, is itself the bond, or principle, of an «inseparably cohering concord». This concord is joined to the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity, the Church, by the «glue/cement» of concord. The nature of this cement and concord is discussed at length in Chapter Five. Compare the «concord cohering» here with how Cyprian understands the identical oneness/unity of Christ and His Church to «cohere by indivisible connections» in *Ep.* 52,1. Also, compare the similarity between the phrase here and as it appears in *Ep.* 52,2: «fraternitatis...cohaerentis...concordiam».

²⁵⁷ *De Unitate* 7: «Hoc unitatis sacramentum, hoc vinculum concordiae inseparabiliter cohaerentis ostenditur quando in euangelio tunica Domini Iesu Christi non diuiditur omnino nec scinditur sed, sortientibus de ueste christi, quis christum potius indueret, integra uestis accipitur et incorrupta adque indiuia tunica possidetur», CCL III, 254.

Christ, «with the sign and mystery/sacrament of the vestment, declared the oneness/unity of the Church»²⁵⁸. Cyprian avoids implying, however, that Christ's tunic is in any way prior to or superior to Christ's people. Cyprian proceeds from the premise that «because the people of Christ cannot be rent asunder, His tunic, woven and cohering throughout, was not divided by those in possession of it»²⁵⁹. Christ's seamless robe, «undivided, joined together, connected, shows the cohering concord of our people, we who put on Christ»²⁶⁰. Consequently, «one who rends asunder and divides Christ's Church is not able to possess Christ's garment»²⁶¹.

4.1.3.v Oneness/Unity: Divisible or Indivisible?

Cyprian asserts the indivisibility of oneness/unity with a rhetorical enquiry in the eighth chapter. «Who, therefore, is so wretched and faithless, who so insane with the madness of discord, that one believe able to be rent asunder or dare to rend asunder the oneness/unity of God, the Lord's vestment, Christ's Church»²⁶²? Cyprian finds support for his argument in Jn 10,16. «They shall be one flock and one shepherd»²⁶³. Cyprian again rhetorically inquires whether «anyone supposes either many shepherds or many flocks able to be in one place»²⁶⁴. There is only one Church in one place whose oneness/unity is incapable of being divided.

Cyprian rhetorically questions how it is possible for one to agree with another who does not agree with the body of the Church herself and the

²⁵⁸ *De Unitate* 7: «...sacramento uestis et signo declarauit ecclesiae unitatem», CCL III, 255.

²⁵⁹ *De Unitate* 7: «...quia Christi populus non potest scindi, tunica eius per totum textilis et cohaerens diuisa a possidentibus non est», CCL III, 254-255. Could this mean that Christ's people are ontologically prior to that garment by which Christ declares the sacrament of the Church's oneness/unity? If so is this because Cyprian implicitly identifies the incarnate Christ with man who is incorporated into the body of Christ through baptism, which is possible because the same Christ has assumed human nature?

²⁶⁰ *De Unitate* 7: «...indiuia, copulata, conexa ostendit populi nostri, qui christum induimus, concordiam cohaerentem», CCL III, 255.

²⁶¹ *De Unitate* 7: «...possidere non potest indumentum christi qui scindit et diuidit ecclesiam Christi», CCL III, 254.

²⁶² *De Unitate* 8: «Quis ergo sic sceleratus et perfidus, quis sic discordiae furore uesanus, ut aut credat scindi posse aut audeat scindere unitatem Dei, uestem Domini, ecclesiam Christi?», CCL III, 255.

²⁶³ *De Unitate* 8: «Monet ipse in euangelio suo et docet, dicens: "Et erunt unus grex et unus pastor"», CCL III, 255.

²⁶⁴ *De Unitate* 8: «...esse posse uno in loco aliquis existimat aut multos pastores aut greges plures?», CCL III, 255.

universal fraternity, who has separated oneself from Christ's Gospel²⁶⁵. He questions «what oneness/unity one really preserves, what love (*dilectionem*) one cares for or ponders who, insane with the madness of discord, has rent the Church assunder, destroyed the faith, disturbed the peace, squandered love (*caritatem*), profaned the mystery/sacrament»²⁶⁶. Cyprian insists that unanimity with such is not possible, as «they have abandoned us, not we from them, and since they have given birth to heresies and schisms...they have forsaken the head and origin of truth»²⁶⁷. If such professes oneself to be a Christian, such a one lies like the devil claiming to be Christ²⁶⁸. «Discordant faithlessness does not hold oneness/unity»²⁶⁹.

One can freely choose to possess or not to possess the oneness/unity of the Church. «God allows and suffers this [i.e. heresies and schisms], respecting the willful judgment of one's own freedom»²⁷⁰. Cyprian reiterates the potential consequences of the variable that is man's free will with a reference to Genesis. «If one who was outside Noah's ark was able to go outside, so does one who will have been *extra ecclesiam* go outside»²⁷¹.

In his First Letter to the Corinthians 1,10 «the Apostle Paul [finds himself] insinuating this very oneness/unity to us»²⁷². He beseeches his listeners to embrace this oneness/unity and exhorts the brethren to speak the same thing, to be joined together in the same meaning, understanding, and judgment, and not to allow schisms among themselves²⁷³. The Church's oneness/unity cannot be compromised or injured by man. Though one «break the peace and concord of Christ, which one does against Christ,...this oneness/unity...can[not] be rent asunder in the Church

²⁶⁵ Cf. *De Unitate*, 12 (CCL III, 258).

²⁶⁶ *De Unitate*, 15: «*Quam uero unitatem seruat, quam dilectionem custodit aut cogitat qui, discordiae furore uesanus, ecclesiam scindit, fidem destruit, pacem turbat, caritatem dissipat, sacramentum profanat?*», CCL III, 261.

²⁶⁷ *De Unitate*, 12: «*Non enim nos ab illis, sed illi a nobis recesserunt et, cum haeresis et schismata postmodum nata sint dum conuenticula sibi diversa constituunt, veritatis caput adque originem reliquerunt*», CCL III, 258.

²⁶⁸ Cf. *De Unitate*, 14 (CCL III, 260).

²⁶⁹ *De Unitate* 10: «*...perfidia discordans non tenet unitatem*», CCL III, 256.

²⁷⁰ *De Unitate* 10: «*Fieri uero haec Dominus permittit et patitur manente propriae libertatis arbitrio*», CCL III, 256.

²⁷¹ *De Unitate* 6: «*Si potuit euadere quisque extra arcam Noe fuit, et qui extra ecclesiam foris fuerit euadet*», CCL III, 253.

²⁷² *De Unitate* 8: «*Apostolus item Paulus hanc eandem nobis insinuans unitatem*», CCL III, 255.

²⁷³ *De Unitate* 8 (Cf. CCL III, 255).

nor be separated by a divorce of colliding wills»²⁷⁴. Yet Paul urges «bearing with one another in love [and] endeavoring to preserve the oneness/unity of the Spirit in the conjunction of peace»²⁷⁵. What does Cyprian mean? Is the Church's oneness/unity, which is identical with God's oneness/unity, in some way essentially dependent on human endeavor? If so, then isn't the integrity of that indivisible divine oneness/unity potentially compromised in some way? How does Cyprian reconcile this latent seeming contradiction? This question will be addressed in detail in the conclusion to Chapter Five²⁷⁶.

4.1.3.vi *Mystery and Sacrament in One House*

«In Exodus...is not the mystery/sacrament of Passover, the lamb, which is killed in the figure of Christ, eaten in one house»²⁷⁷? Likewise the «flesh of Christ, the holy mystery/sacrament of the Lord is not able to be cast outside, nor is there any house other than the one Church for believing ones. Simple and concordant ones persevere in the house of God, [in] this household of unanimity, unanimous ones dwell in Christ's Church»²⁷⁸.

«Whoever will have been separated from the Church is to be fled from:...[such] has been damned by himself»²⁷⁹. Included are all «who have established themselves as prelates without any law of ordination...[and] assume the name of bishop for themselves with no one giving the episcopate...[who even though]...killed in confession of the

²⁷⁴ *De Unitate* 6: «...pacem Christi et concordiam rumpit, adversus Christum facit...hanc unitatem...scindi in ecclesia posse et voluntatum colidentium divortio separari», CCL III, 253-254.

²⁷⁵ *De Unitate* 8: «sustinentes inuicem in dilectione, satis agentes seruire unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis», CCL III, 255.

²⁷⁶ The conclusion to Chapter Five will investigate the seeming contradiction between the divisibility and indivisibility of the Church's oneness/unity and how and to what extent both oneness/unity and concord are affected by man's free will.

²⁷⁷ *De Unitate* 8: «...sacramentum Paschae...in Exodi...agnus, qui in figura Christi occiditur, in domo una edatur?», CCL III, 255.

²⁷⁸ *De Unitate* 8: «Caro Christi et sanctum Domini eici foras non potest, nec alia ulla credentibus praeter unam ecclesiam domus est...Hanc domum, hoc unianimitatis hospitium...in domo Dei, in ecclesia Christi unianimes habitant, concordantes et simplices perseverant», CCL III, 255.

²⁷⁹ *De Unitate*, 16.17: «...fugiendus quisque fuerit ab ecclesia separatus:...est a semetipso damnatus», CCL III, 261-262.

name...[persist in] rending asunder the concord of oneness/unity»²⁸⁰. Such «have rent themselves asunder from the Church»²⁸¹.

Cyprian's attitude toward those outside the Church and warning to those within the Church with respect to the former logically proceeds from his vision of the Church as the one source alone of sacramental grace. Those outside the Church cannot offer the «grace of saving and life-giving water, the source of life having been deserted»²⁸². Such may regard themselves capable of administering baptism even though there «can be no other save one baptism»²⁸³. Nevertheless, «having been procreated from faithlessness, they lose the grace of faith. Those who have broken the Lord's peace with the madness of discord cannot come unto the reward of peace»²⁸⁴.

4.1.3.vii *Love and Oneness/Unity of the Church* *Endure Forever in the Kingdom of Heaven*

Christ gave us peace and prescribed for us to be unanimous and concordant and «commanded the pacts of love (*dilectionis et caritatis*) uncorrupted and inviolate»²⁸⁵. The sacrifice of the one-mindedness of the many praying and not the great number, or the mere quantity, qualifies as most important for the Lord²⁸⁶. «The Lord in the Gospel...taught love (*dilectio*) along with oneness/unity by his magisterium; he included the law and all the prophets with two precepts»²⁸⁷.

Why are both love and oneness/unity included together in the Lord's teaching? Cyprian earlier explains that the oneness/unity of the Church is identical with and comes from the oneness/unity of God. The same would seem to apply to love, also. «One who does not have love (*caritatem*) does

²⁸⁰ *De Unitate*, 10.14.21: «...qui se praepositos sine ulla ordinationis lege constituunt,... nemine episcopatum dante episcopi sibi nomen adsumunt...si occisi in confessione nominis...unitatis concordiam scindens», CCL III, 256-257.259.265

²⁸¹ *De Unitate*, 12: «ipsi ab ecclesia scissi sunt», CCL III, 257.

²⁸² *De Unitate*, 11: «vitae fonte deserto, vitalis et salutaris aquae gratiam», CCL III, 257.

²⁸³ *De Unitate*, 11: «...aliud baptisma praeter unum esse non possit», CCL III, 257.

²⁸⁴ *De Unitate*, 11: «de perfidia procreati fidei gratiam perdunt. Ad pacis praemium venire non possunt qui pacem Domini discordiae furore ruperunt», CCL III, 257.

²⁸⁵ *De Unitate*, 14: «...dilectionis et caritatis foedera incorrupta adque inviolata mandavit», CCL III, 259. Also *De Unitate*, 12: «Dominus enim, cum discipulis suis unanimitatem suaderet et pacem...unanimitatem prius possuit, concordiam pacis ante praemisit», CCL III, 257-258.

²⁸⁶ Cf. *De Unitate*, 12, (CCL III, 258).

²⁸⁷ *De Unitate*, 15: «Dominus in euangelio...Unitatem simul et dilectionem magisterio suo docuit; prophetas omnes et legem praeceptis duobus inclusit», CCL III, 261.

not have God»²⁸⁸. Finding support from the apostle John Cyprian observes that «God is love (*dilectio*)...and he who remains in God remains in love, and God remains in him. [Consequently] those who do not want to be of one mind in God's church are not able to remain in God»²⁸⁹.

Where does one find such love (*dilectio/caritas*)? «“Love (*caritas*), which never fails,” as the Apostle Paul tells us, will be in the kingdom always, will last unto eternity with the oneness/unity of a fraternity cohering to herself»²⁹⁰. As mentioned earlier Cyprian explains at the end of *De Unitate* that God's people, i.e. the Church, are joined into a solid oneness/unity of the body by the glue of concord. In other words both love and oneness/unity are found together in heaven as well as in the Church. Consequently, «one who has deserted her who is to reign [i.e. the Church] will not have been able to come unto the kingdom [i.e. heaven]»²⁹¹. «Discord cannot reach the kingdom of heaven; one who has violated the love (*dilectio*) of Christ with faithless dissension will not have been able to attain the reward of Christ»²⁹². Only love can accomplish such an endeavor and attain ultimately the «reward of glory»²⁹³.

4.1.3.viii Summary

Cyprian begins the *TC* with the assertion that Satan introduces heresies and schisms to rend the Church's «*unitas*». Try as he might employing even discord and the «*divortium*» of «*voluntates colidentes*», the adversary will never prevail as the Church's «*unitas*» derives from the strength of the Triune God and coheres in the heavenly «*sacramenta*» contained therein.

²⁸⁸ *De Unitate*, 14: «*Qui caritatem non habet, Deum non habet*», CCL III, 260.

²⁸⁹ *De Unitate*, 14: «*Deus...dilectio est, et qui manet in Deo, in dilectione manet, et Deus in illo manet. Cum Deo manere non possunt qui esse in ecclesia Dei unianimes moluerunt*», CCL III, 260.

²⁹⁰ *De Unitate*, 14: «*“Numquam” inquit “excidet caritas:” haec enim semper in regno erit, haec in aeternum, fraternitatis sibi cohaerentis unitate, durabit*», CCL III, 259-260. *N.B.*: What is «cohering (*cohaerentis*)» to love («*sibi* [i.e. *caritati*]») is not «oneness/unity (*unitate*)» but rather «fraternity (*fraternitatis*)». Compare with the significantly different meaning rendered in the translation «charity...will continue for all eternity in the close union of the brethren together» in M. BÉVENOT, *Cyprian: «De Lapsis»...*, 81. Oneness/unity and love seem necessarily inseparable in Cyprian's thought, which should not be terribly surprising as God is in himself the origin of both.

²⁹¹ *De Unitate*, 14: «*...ad regnum pervenire non poterit qui eam quae regnatura est derelinquit*», CCL III, 259.

²⁹² *De Unitate*, 14: «*Ad regnum caelorum non potest pervenire discordia; ad praemium Christi...pertinere non poterit qui dilectionem Christi perfida dissensione uiolauit*», CCL III, 260.

²⁹³ *De Unitate*, 21: «*...ad gloriae praemium*», CCL III, 265.

The Church's «*unitas*», like sunlight, by its very nature cannot suffer any division because, like several streams flowing from one «*fons*» and several branches grounded by a tenacious «*radix*», the «*unitas corporis*» is preserved in the one «*caput*», i.e. «*in origine*». One who maintains not this «*unitas ecclesiae*», i.e. our one «*mater*», neither has God for a Father. Christ declared the Church's «*unitas*» with His tunic, not merely a symbol but a sign and «*sacramentum*» of the «*unitatis sacramentum*», which is the Church herself. Heretics and schismatics, rending assunder not «*unitas*» itself but the «*concordia*» of «*unitas*», are consequently «*extra ecclesiam*» and so incapable of possessing the «*tunica Christi*», the «*sacramentum Paschae*», the «*carno Christi*», the «*unum baptisma*», the «*fidei gratia*», the «*pax Christi*», and the «*praemium pacis*», i.e. heaven itself. Those who abandon the «*unitatis concordia*» and «*dilectionis et caritatis foedera*» by introducing heresies and schisms necessarily abandon the «*veritatis caput adque origo*». Those who by the «*propriae libertatis arbitrium*» do not preserve the «*unanimitas et concordia pacis*» and do not remain joined to the «*corporis unitas*» by the «*concordiae gluten*». They have forsaken «*Dei unitas ac ecclesiae dilectio et caritas*» and consequently die. Why? Because what is rent asunder from the «*matrix*» loses its «*substantia salutis*». «*Unitas*» is preserved (*servatur*) «*in origine*».

4.1.4 Conclusion

There does not appear to be any confusion or contradiction in Cyprian's thought as contained in either the *PT*, the *TR*, or the *TC* of the *De Unitate*. Do the textual variations in the *PT* and *TR* reflect substantial changes in Cyprian's thought, leading to confusion and/or contradiction between the two versions themselves and/or between either of the two versions and the rest of the *TC*? A parallel comparison of the *PT* and *TR* seems appropriate.

Primatus Textus

Peter is the «*ratio et origo unitatis*» because Christ built His Church on «*illum*», i.e. Peter (CCL III, 251).

Although the other Apostles were what Peter was, nevertheless «*primatus*» is given to Peter (CCL III, 251).

Textus Receptus

Peter is the «*origo unitatis*» because Christ built His Church on «*unum*», i.e. Peter (CCL III, 251).

As Peter is the «*origo unitatis*» he is, also, the «*exordium*» (CCL III, 252) of an honor and power that have been bestowed upon the equal fellowship of the other Apostles (CCL III, 251).

One «*cathedra*» and one «*ecclesia*» consequently are demonstrated (CCL III, 251). One who does not hold the «*Petri unitatem*» or the «*cathedram Petri*» neither has «*fidem*» nor is in the «*ecclesia*» (CCL III, 252).

One «*ecclesia*» consequently is demonstrated (CCL III, 252). One who does not hold «*hanc unitatem ecclesiae*» neither has «*fidem*» nor is in the «*ecclesia*» (CCL III, 252).

The «*episcopi*» themselves must hold firmly and vindicate/claim this «*sacramentum unitatis*» in order to prove the «*episcopatum*» itself «*unum*» and «*indivisum*» (CCL III, 252).

Although the *TR* does not include the *PT*'s description of Peter as the reason/principle (*ratio*) of oneness/unity (*unitas*), both are consistent in their assertion that Peter is the origin (*origo*) of oneness/unity. The absence of the term «*ratio*» in the *TR* and its inclusion in the *PT* neither alters the meaning of oneness/unity nor changes the context of either version. Peter is the unqualified origin of oneness/unity because Christ built His Church (*ecclesia*) on Peter, whether designated as that (*ille*) or one (*unus*).

The *TR* mentions nothing of Peter's primacy (*primatus*), but it does refer to Peter as the beginning/webbing out (*exordium*) of the honor (*honor*) and power (*potestas*) enjoyed by the equal fellowship of the Apostles. Peter is described as the beginning/webbing out of such honor and power, with which the other Apostles have been bestowed (*praediti*). Though neither version includes that phrase which is contained respectively in the other, the mutual absence of one in no way contradicts the other. Rather the *TR*'s description of Peter as the beginning/webbing out of honor and power seems to clarify what the *PT* may mean by the term primacy, and *vice versa*.

The *PT*'s chair (*cathedra*) of Peter and primacy of Peter and the *TR*'s description of Peter as the beginning/webbing out of honor and power demonstrate the Church to be one (*una*). Both versions maintain that Peter as the origin of oneness/unity demonstrates the Church to be one. One has no faith (*fides*) and is not in the Church according to the *PT* if one does not maintain the oneness/unity of Peter. This in turn is only because Peter is the origin of oneness/unity, which is the major premise of both the *PT* and *TR*. Therefore, one who does not hold what the *TR* explicitly calls the oneness/unity of the Church necessarily does not hold what the *PT* calls explicitly the oneness/unity of Peter, which the *TR* necessarily holds implicitly. The oneness/unity of the Church is the oneness/unity of Peter because Peter is the origin of oneness/unity.

The *PT* mentions nothing of *TR*'s insistence that the bishops hold firmly (*tenere firmiter*) and vindicate/claim (*vindicare*) the mystery/sacrament (*sacramentum*) of oneness/unity. Their compliance is for the sake neither of preserving the oneness/unity of the Church nor of assisting Peter, the origin of oneness/unity and the beginning webbing out of the honor and power with which the bishops have been bestowed. Rather the bishops must hold firmly to and vindicate/claim the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity for their own sake, i.e. in order to credibly prove (*probare*) the episcopate (*episcopatum*) itself to be one (*unum*) and indivisible/undivided (*indivisum*).

Although Cyprian does not identify explicitly the Church with the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity, one may infer as much from that portion of *De Unitate* including the first chapter through the end of the *TR*. The Church is described as being built on Peter, the origin of oneness/unity, in both versions of the treatise. Further clarification of this portion of the *TR* absent in the *PT* occurs only in the *TC*, which in fact does identify the Church explicitly with the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity. The exclusion of certain phrases present in one version yet absent in the other and the subsequent textual variations introduce neither confusion nor contradiction in Cyprian's thought. Rather each version seems to complement the other, and both are consistent with the ideas expressed in the *TC*.

There are no changes, confusion, or contradiction in the *TC* as compared with the *PT* and *TR*. Cyprian's notion of Peter as the origin of oneness/unity is dramatically reinforced with a variety of metaphors. These in turn introduce other personifications of Peter as the one source (*fons*), the tenacious root (*radix*), and the one head (*caput*) in which is preserved the oneness/unity of the body (*corpus*) of the Church. This one Church, our mother (*mater*) and mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity, from her womb (*matrix*) nourishes the people (*plebs*) joined (*copulata*) to her by the glue/cement (*gluten*) of concord (*concordia*) with one baptism (*unum baptisma*), the flesh of Christ (*carno Christi*), and the grace of faith (*fidei gratia*), and consoles her people with the Lord's peace (*pax Domini*). Separated from the Church's womb, which is Peter, one has no faith, is certainly outside the Church (*extra ecclesiam*), loses the substance of health (*substantia salutis*) and subsequently dies. The beginning/webbing out of such an honor and power of the Church, like that of the equal fellowship of the Apostles and the Church's oneness/unity and love (*dilectio/caritas*), is preserved only in the origin (*in origine*), i.e. Peter, who demonstrates both the Church and his chair to be one. Consequently, if the bishops, who have been bestowed with the honor and power that originates from Peter, wish to

credibly prove their own episcopate, of which each bishop holds a part in its entirety, they must hold firmly to and vindicate/claim the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity, i.e. their mother the Church, which includes her origin, Peter. Nothing less is to be expected from the bishops, since such oneness/unity derives from the Triune God, Who is love, and with Whom cohere the heavenly mysteries/sacraments.

There is no confusion or contradiction in any portion of Cyprian's *De Unitate*. Textual changes in the *PT* and the *TR* actually seem to clarify, complement, and enhance Cyprian's thought. Analyzed individually or collectively, the *PT*, the *TR*, and the *TC* exhibit continuity in Cyprian's thought throughout *De Unitate*.

CHAPTER TWO

Cyprian's Letters

Seventeen, or about one third, of the fifty-nine letters from Cyprian's hand contain the term «*unitas*». The term occurs sixty-five times in the *Epistulae Cypriani*, accounting for more than half of the total 101 instances of the term in the *Corpus Cypriani*.

The baptismal controversy between Cyprian and the bishop of Rome, Stephen, is regarded by most scholars as the most likely period in which Cyprian supposedly revised *De Unitate*. The beginning of that controversy provides a convenient dividing line. If Cyprian did change his theory of oneness/unity, then his use of the term «*unitas*» will reflect such a change, including any subsequent confusion or contradiction in his thought. If Cyprian has altered his theory, then the meaning he assigns to the term should appear significantly nuanced, if not different, after Stephen's election and later *sententia* on the issue of whether or not heretics and schismatics can baptize efficaciously in contrast to the period before the baptismal controversy.

The philological analysis in this chapter will be presented differently from that in the previous chapter. Because Cyprian's letters are discursive in their nature, a thematic presentation of Cyprian's thought as expressed in his entire epistolary *corpus* is best synthesized in conclusion. This chapter will be divided into three parts. The first section will analyze «*unitas*» as used thirty times in ten letters dating from the earlier period of Cyprian's episcopate (*Ep.* 3) through the last letter (*Ep.* 66) before Carthage's bishop addresses the issue of heretical and schismatic baptism. The second section

will review the remaining thirty-five instances of «*unitas*» in seven letters (*Ep.* 68-74). Any change, confusion, contradiction, or continuity in Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity will be assessed in conclusion.

4.2.1 The Epistolary Evidence Prior to the Baptismal Controversy

Only one of the ten letters studied in this section is not easily datable. *Ep.* 3 probably was composed sometime after the end of the Decian persecution but obviously before Cyprian was beheaded on 14 September 258²⁹⁴. Decius' persecution ended with his death in late Winter of 251. Cyprian penned *Ep.* 45, 46, 48, 51, 52, and 54 in that order between late Spring and early Autumn of 251 from Carthage, obviously coinciding with the first version of *De Unitate*²⁹⁵. *Ep.* 55 was written either in late 251 or early 252, and *Ep.* 59 was written in Autumn of 252, or at least before the end of the «sailing season» that year²⁹⁶. *Ep.* 66 is the last letter written before the period of the baptismal controversy and was written most likely in 254²⁹⁷.

4.2.1.i *Epistula* 3

Cyprian responds to the request by a Numidian bishop, Rogatian, for advice on disciplining an apparently insolent and problematic deacon within Rogatian's jurisdiction²⁹⁸. Cyprian assures Rogatian that the Numidian bishop would have been justified completely were he to have taken disciplinary action against the surly deacon²⁹⁹. Cyprian lauds Rogatian for having sought counsel on the matter first from another bishop³⁰⁰. Citing support from Sacred Scripture Cyprian explains that the one bishop (*episcopus*) of any area is the rightful authority to whom is owed obedience especially by the deacons, whose ministry in turn the Apostles instituted to assist in service of the Gospel³⁰¹. Cyprian asserts that one's pride giving way to dishonor and disobedience toward the prelate (*praepositus*) is the beginning of one's path toward heresy and schism³⁰². «Thus is one cut off from the Church, thus a profane altar is erected outside, thus the peace of Christ and the ordination/design/plan and the

²⁹⁴ G.W. CLARKE, 691.

²⁹⁵ G.W. CLARKE, 698-699.

²⁹⁶ G.W. CLARKE, 699-700.

²⁹⁷ G.W. CLARKE, 701-702.

²⁹⁸ Cf. *Ep.* 3,1 (CCL III B, 9).

²⁹⁹ Cf. *Ep.* 3,1 (CCL III B, 9).

³⁰⁰ Cf. *Ep.* 3,1 (CCL III B, 9-10).

³⁰¹ Cf. *Ep.* 3,3 (CCL III B, 14).

³⁰² Cf. *Ep.* 3,3 (CCL III B, 15).

oneness/unity of God is rebelled against»³⁰³. Cyprian advises that Rogatian concerning the unruly deacon «must exercise against him the power of your honor, that you either depose or keep him away (*abstineas*)»³⁰⁴. Giving the impression that the source of the deacon's contumacious disposition toward his bishop is the latter's youth, Cyprian advises Rogatian to discipline similarly anyone who associates himself with this deacon in such disrespect and disobedience against God's bishop/priest (*sacerdos*)³⁰⁵.

Summary

To disobey the «*episcopus/sacerdos/praepositus*», who is the Church's only rightful authority in the area of his jurisdiction, is to cut oneself off from the «*ecclesia*», to wage war against the «*pax Christi*» and the «*ordinatio dei*» and «*unitas dei*», and to establish a profane «*altare*» outside the «*ecclesia*». Such a one is to be deposed or kept at a distance (*abstentus*)³⁰⁶.

4.2.1.ii *Epistula 45*

Cyprian reassures the recently elected bishop of Rome, Cornelius, that any seeming delay on the former's part at recognizing the latter as the rightful bishop of Rome is due to the need for clarifying discrepancies insinuated and perpetuated by members of the party opposing Cornelius at Rome³⁰⁷. Cyprian relates his hope that his Carthaginian colleagues, Caldonius and Fortunatus, can assist Cornelius in Rome to bring together «the members of the body rent asunder unto the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church and join them to the bond of Christian love (*caritatis*)»³⁰⁸. The schismatic party of Novatian in Rome «not only has rejected the womb and embrace of the root and mother, but has established for itself a bishop and, against the mystery/sacrament once handed down of divine

³⁰³ «*Sic de ecclesia receditur, sic altare profanum foris conlocatur, sic contra pacem Christi et ordinationem atque unitatem dei rebellatur*», CCL III B, 15.

³⁰⁴ *Ep. 3,3*: «...*fungeris circa eum potestatem honoris tui, ut eum vel deponas vel abstineas*», CCL III B, 15.

³⁰⁵ Cf. *Ep. 3,3* (CCL III B, 15-16).

³⁰⁶ Far from introducing change, confusion and/or contradiction, the ideas here expressed resonate with *De Unitate* and in certain cases repeat *verbatim* the seventeenth chapter of that treatise, cf. CCL III, 262.

³⁰⁷ Cf. *Ep. 45,1* (CCL III B, 216).

³⁰⁸ *Ep. 45,1*: «...*ut ad catholicae ecclesiae unitatem scissi corporis membra conponerent et Christianae caritatis uinculum copularent*», CCL III B, 215-216.

appointment and of Catholic oneness/unity, has made an adulterous and opposed head outside the Church»³⁰⁹.

Cyprian relates to Cornelius that they are obliged to expend their energies in rescuing those of the flock that have been confused and scattered by the Novatianist schism and gather them into the Church. Cyprian insists that Cornelius and he «labor in order that we care for and can obtain the oneness/unity handed down by the Lord through the Apostles and to us successors and...gather the wandering and bleating sheep, whom the headstrong faction and heretical temptation of certain ones has severed from the mother»³¹⁰. Cyprian laments that those who are obstinate and remain outside and do not wish to return to us will have to provide reason to the Lord for the separation they have made and of the Church [they have] forsaken³¹¹. Cyprian concludes by commiserating that one of his deacons, Felicissimus, has attempted the same in Carthage against Cyprian as Novatian had in Rome³¹².

Summary

The Novatianist party at Rome is schismatic *ipso facto* having rejected the womb (*sinum*) and embrace of the «*radix*» and «*mater*», establishing for itself an «*episcopus*», identified here as the «*caput*», «*extra ecclesiam*» against the «*sacramentum unitatis*». The «*episcopi*» as the «*successores apostolorum*» are charged with guarding and maintaining the «*unitas*» given to them by the Lord. These shepherds must labor to gather the scattered sheep back into the «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*» and join them to the «*vinculum*» of «*Christiana caritas*». The freedom of all is respected implicitly as those who stubbornly remain outside (*foris*) will have to reckon with God since they refuse to return to the «*ecclesia*».

4.2.1.iii *Epistula 46*

Cyprian admonishes the confessors, Maximus and Nicostratus, a priest and a deacon respectively of the Church in Rome, for continuing to support

³⁰⁹ *Ep. 45,1*: «...non tantum radicis et matris sinum atque complexum recusavit, sed...episcopum sibi constituit et contra sacramentum semel traditum diuinae dispositionis et catholicae unitatis adulterum et contrarium caput extra ecclesiam fecit», CCL III B, 216.

³¹⁰ *Ep. 45,3*: «...laborare debemus ut unitatem a domino et per apostolos nobis successoribus traditam quantum possumus obtinere curemus...balabundas et errantes oues, quas quorundam peruicax factio et haeretica temptatio a matre secernit», CCL III B, 221.

³¹¹ Cf. *Ep. 45,3* (CCL III B, 221).

³¹² Cf. *Ep. 45,3* (CCL III B, 221-222).

the schismatic Novatian against the rightful bishop Cornelius³¹³. Cyprian is grieved that these two have allowed «consent to be made to another bishop, i.e. what is neither divine law nor is allowed to be done, another church to be instituted against the ordering <of God>, against the evangelical law, against the oneness/unity of the Catholic institution»³¹⁴. They «cannot claim the Gospel of Christ so long as they themselves [are] ones having been separated from the flock of Christ and from His peace and concord»³¹⁵.

Cyprian exhorts the two schismatics «to be mindful of their confession and the divine tradition, that they return to the mother whence they set forth³¹⁶, whence they came to the glory of confession together with the exultation of its mother»³¹⁷. Cyprian reminds them that «since³¹⁸ our [i.e. Cyprian's and Cornelius' and the Church's] unanimity and concord must not at all be rent assunder, because we cannot go outside the Church having

³¹³ Cf. *Ep. 46* (CCL III B, 224-225).

³¹⁴ *Ep. 46,1*: «...contra <dei> dispositionem, contra euangelicam legem, contra institutionis catholicae unitatem alium episcopum fieri consensisse, id est, quod nec fas est nec licet fieri, ecclesiam alteram institui», CCL III B, 224-225.

³¹⁵ *Ep. 46,2*: «Nec putetis sic uos euangelium Christi adserere, dum uosmet ipsos a Christi grege et ab eius pace et concordia separatis», CCL III B, 225.

³¹⁶ Cyprian uses the verb «prodo, -ere, -didi, -ditum» which implies not merely an embarking or a «setting forth» but with the duplicitous connotation that one has treacherously betrayed another by surrendering/setting forth/presenting incriminating evidence unto another's demise. The double and potentially insulting, yet very subtle nuance in meaning could not fail to provoke those rigorist confessors who believed they themselves had been betrayed by the *lapsi* and the *traditores* during the Decian persecution. Cf. L&S under the entry «prodo».

³¹⁷ «...confessionis et diuinae traditionis memores ad matrem reuertamini unde prodistis, unde ad confessionis gloriam cum eiusdem matris exultatione uenistis», CCL III B, 225.

³¹⁸ «Cum» with the subjunctive here yields neither a purpose clause, translated as «in order that», nor a result clause, translated as «with the result that». Rather the term's usage here as a causal clause renders the meaning «because» or «since». The presumption is that, as the Church's oneness/unity is incapable of being rent assunder, one has no real option but to remain in the glue of concord joined to her if one should desire to remain not only in the Church but ultimately in God Himself. The translation «in order that» or «with the result that» would render a different meaning. The implication could arise that leaving the fraternal concord/charity joined to the one Church's oneness/unity is perhaps necessary for the sake of empathizing with, if not entering communion with, those outside the Church. Cyprian seems to conceive of no such possibility save that which is part of man's exercise of his free will to choose to remain in or to separate himself from the Church and from God. For those who choose the latter the end result is always the same: «salus extra ecclesiam non est» in *Ep. 73,21* (CCL III C, 555).

been abandoned and come to you, rather we beseech...that you return to Mother Church and your fraternity»³¹⁹.

Summary

Anyone who supports another who has set himself up in opposition to the rightful bishop *ipso facto* has rent himself assunder from the «*unitas*» of the «*mater ecclesia*» to which he cannot be coerced to return. Such a one, who does not possess the «*evangelium Christi*», cannot be forced but freely must rejoin the «*grex Christi*», the «*pax Christi*», and the «*concordia Christi*» from which one has separated oneself.

4.2.1.iv *Epistula 48*

Cyprian apologizes profusely to Cornelius that recent letters addressed to Rome's presbyterate sent by the presbyterate of the Church at the Hadrumentine colony during or shortly after Cyprian's pastoral visit there seem to imply that presbyterate's uncertainty regarding Cornelius being the rightful bishop of Rome³²⁰. Cyprian explains that the unintentional, if not embarrassing, miscommunication is due to Hadrumentina's ignorance of the acknowledgment of Cornelius by Cyprian and the other bishops of north-Africa, which occurred following the visit of Carthage's bishop to that colony³²¹. Cyprian assures Cornelius that there is now no discrepancy among the «consensus of churches existing there»³²². «We know ourselves to have exhorted them that they acknowledge and hold the root (*radicem*) and womb (*matricem*) of the Catholic Church³²³, restoring to the individuals sailing [to Rome] the reason/principle («*rationem*»)³²⁴, lest they sail with scandal»³²⁵.

³¹⁹ «*Nam cum unanimitas et concordia nostra scindi omnino non debeat, quia nos ecclesia derelicta foras exire et ad uos uenire non possumus, ut uos magis ad ecclesiam matrem et ad uestram fraternitatem reuertamini...rogamus*», CCL III B, 225. The CUA series translates «*unanimitas*» as «unity», while the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* series translates «*uestram fraternitatem*» as «our fraternity», cf. R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Letters (1-81)*, 119; A.C. COXE – J. DONALDSON – A.C. ROBERTS, ed., 322.

³²⁰ Cf. *Ep. 48,1-2* (CCL III B, 228-229).

³²¹ Cf. *Ep. 48,2-3* (CCL III B, 228-229).

³²² *Ep. 48,2*: «...*ecclesiarum istic consistentium consensio*», CCL III B, 229.

³²³ Which is the root and matrix/womb of the Catholic Church? Is it Peter, the Church in Rome, or both simultaneously and inseparably? This last seems most likely as a logical consequence of the Church's oneness/unity being preserved in its origin, Peter.

³²⁴ What is precisely the «reason/principle» (*ratio*) that has been restored by Cyprian exhorting those sailing to Rome to acknowledge and hold the Catholic Church's «root» and «matrix»? Notion of specifically Peter as the «reason/principle» (*ratio*) of «oneness/unity» in *De Unitate* (PT); of specifically Christ and/or Peter as the same;

Cyprian explains that information like news of the valid election of Cornelius as bishop of Rome issued from Carthage among the churches of north-Africa would prove difficult³²⁶. The dissemination of information of such importance throughout the vast expanse of the province of north-Africa could be compromised by confusion in that same province regarding the schism at Carthage and the rightful bishop of that city³²⁷. Cyprian had suggested, subsequently, that each bishop write to the Church at Rome requesting confirmation of the rightful bishop there³²⁸. Cyprian assures Cornelius that any subsequent seeming insult is not intentional³²⁹. Carthage's bishop implies that such measures were taken because of the gravity of the matter at stake. The bishops of north-Africa have proceeded accordingly not with the result that but «in order that all our colleagues strongly approve and hold both you and your communion, i.e. [hold] the love (*caritas*) equally with the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church»³³⁰.

Cyprian strictly and synonymously identifies the bishop of Rome, Cornelius, and communion with him with the love and oneness/unity of the Catholic Church³³¹. This in turn seems to contextualize properly and identify strictly Cyprian's references to the «root», «womb/matrix», and «reason/principle» of the Catholic Church with that with which these terms are synonymous and identical in *De Unitate*, viz. Peter.

Summary

Cyprian asserts more succinctly, uncategorically, and, subsequently, boldly in this letter than in any other writing that remaining in the «*caritas*» and «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*» necessarily means that one hold the «*episcopus*» of Rome and «*communicatio*» with him, the «*matrix*», «*radix*», and «*ratio*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*».

regarding the «bond» (*vinculum*) in the sense of «reason/principle» of concord, which «bond» is the oneness/unity of the Church, whose origin is Peter.

³²⁵ «*Nos enim singulis nauigantibus, ne cum scandalo ullo nauigarent, rationem reddentes, scimus nos hortatos eos esse ut ecclesiae catholicae radicem et matricem agnoscerent ac tenerent*», CCL III B, 229.

³²⁶ Cf. *Ep.* 48,3 (CCL III B, 229).

³²⁷ Cf. *Ep.* 48,3 (CCL III B, 229).

³²⁸ Cf. *Ep.* 48,3 (CCL III B, 229).

³²⁹ Cf. *Ep.* 48,2 (CCL III B, 228).

³³⁰ *Ep.* 48,3: «...ut te uniuersi collegae nostri et communicationem tuam id est catholicae ecclesiae unitatem pariter et caritatem probarent firmiter ac tenerent», CCL III B, 229-230.

³³¹ That this is both Harnack's and Frend's overall impression of Cyprian's ecclesiology.

4.2.1.v *Epistula 51*

Cyprian expresses to Cornelius his immense joy and great thanks to God that former supporters of Novatian in Rome, the confessors Maximus the priest and Urbanus along with Sidonius and Macarius, have returned to the Catholic Church³³². Even more does Cyprian rejoice and give thanks «to God the Father and His Christ the Lord our saving God because such a Church is protected divinely that its holiness and oneness/unity neither continually nor altogether violated by the obstinacy of heretical depravity and faithlessness»³³³. Cyprian strictly and synonymously identifies the «Catholic Church...[as the] home of truth and oneness/unity»³³⁴. Fortunately these glorious confessors, who were briefly heretics and schismatics, have returned, «lest they, who had not been won over by strength and virtue, be tempted against the faith of love (*caritatis*) and oneness/unity»³³⁵. «No one does not consider himself an associate and a sharer of their glory [i.e. the glory of] the ones returning to oneness/unity»³³⁶.

Summary

Treacherous schism and heresy cannot completely or permanently violate the «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*». Those schismatics who return to the home of «*veritas*» and «*unitas*», and so to «*unitas*» itself, avoid tempting the «*fides*» of «*caritas*» and «*unitas*».

4.2.1.vi *Epistula 52*

Cyprian assures Cornelius that this latter has acted most appropriately in sending via the Roman acolyte, Nicephorus, news of the return of the formerly schismatic confessors mentioned in *Epistula 51*³³⁷. Cornelius has demonstrated diligence and love in informing Cyprian of the conspired plans of Novatian at Rome and Novatus at Carthage for attacking Christ's

³³² Cf. *Ep. 51,1* (CCL III B, 240).

³³³ *Ep. 51,1*: «...deo patri omnipotenti et Christo eius domino et deo nostro salutari, quod sic ecclesia diuinitus protegatur ut unitas eius et sanctitas non iugiter nec in totum perfidiae et haereticæ prauitatis obstinatione uioletur», CCL III B, 240.

³³⁴ *Ep. 51,1*: «...ecclesiam catholicam...id est...unitatis ac ueritatis domicilium», CCL III B, 240.

³³⁵ *Ep. 51,1*: «...nec temptarentur caritatis atque unitatis fide qui uicti robore et uirtute non fuerant», CCL III B, 241.

³³⁶ *Ep. 51,1*: «...ad unitatem reuertentibus nemo non socium se et participem eorum gloriae computat», CCL III B, 241.

³³⁷ Cf. *Ep. 52,1* (CCL III B, 243).

Church³³⁸. One proclaiming himself to be a confessor that denies Christ's Church is not really a confessor³³⁹. The Apostle Paul's letter to the Ephesians (5,31-32) states that «for this will a man leave his father and mother and [cleaving to his wife] they will be two in one flesh. That mystery/sacrament (*sacramentum*) is great, yet I speak regarding Christ and

³³⁸ Cf. *Ep. 52,1* (CCL III B, 243).

³³⁹ Cf. *Ep. 52,1* (CCL III B, 244). Novatian was a priest of Rome, a confessor of the Decian persecution, and a member of the rigorist party that believed the *lapsi* to be excommunicated permanently from the Church. Cornelius was a deacon of Rome. The Roman deacons were regarded as laxists by the Roman priests as the former did not maintain excommunication to be a permanent state for those who, unlike the confessors and martyrs, had not persevered in the face of torture and death. Novatian was installed as anti-bishop in opposition to Cornelius by the rigorist priests who contested the election of the laxist deacon as bishop of Rome.

Novatus, a priest of Carthage, ordained Felicissimus a deacon there as a candidate eligible to be ordained a bishop in opposition to the rightful bishop, Cyprian. Though Cyprian speaks of Felicissimus as a «deacon» the former does not consider the latter to be validly ordained. Felicissimus is not validly ordained as such would have occurred «with me [i.e. Cyprian] neither permitting nor knowing» («*nec permittente me nec sciente*», cf. CCL III B, 246). According to Cyprian's sacramental theology Felicissimus' moral state *ipso facto* rendered him already «not to remain in God's Church...not only just to be sent out from the priesthood, but with communion to be prohibited» («...*hoc se non de presbyterio excitari tantum, sed et communicatione prohiberi...*», cf. CCL III B, 248.) In fact, Cyprian assures Cornelius that, were it not for Decius demanding a «*supplicatio*» and the subsequent persecution, a council was indeed about to excommunicate Felicissimus for the grave sins of «parricide» (*parricidium*) and «abortion» (*abortio*), cf. CCL III B, 248.

After installing Felicissimus as a «deacon» Novatus sailed for Rome to support Novatian against Cornelius. Novatus and Felicissimus represented the Carthaginian «laxists» regarding the treatment of the *lapsi*. A portion of the Carthaginian presbyterate was embittered, perhaps understandably, that their bishop, Cyprian, had gone into hiding during Decius' «*supplicatio*». Cyprian was not opposed to reconciling the *lapsi*, but insisted that such reconciliation occur only through him as bishop, who demanded that everyone wait patiently until the persecution had ceased. Those priests and deacons of Carthage who remained behind persisted in reconciling the *libellatici* and *sacrificati* (i.e. those *lapsi* who had either bribed an official to forge a certificate (*libellus*) attesting to their having sacrificed or those who actually had sacrificed) with the *libelli* (certificates/vouchers) of martyrs (cf. *Ep. 15,4* in CCL III B, 89) and without any penance on the part of the *lapsi*. Ironically these Carthaginian laxists, perhaps unable to reconcile what they regarded as Cyprian's seemingly hypocritical behavior, supported and sought support from Novatian and the rigorist priests in Rome, who were opposed to reconciling the *lapsi* at all against the opinion of Cornelius and the more laxist deacons there, from among whom Cornelius had been elected bishop.

regarding the Church»³⁴⁰. Cyprian interprets Paul here as attesting to «both Christ's and the Church's oneness/unity equally cohering³⁴¹ by indivisible³⁴² connections»³⁴³. Cyprian inquires, «how can one, who is not with Christ's spouse and in His Church, be with Christ? Or how does he, who has despoiled and defrauded Christ's Church³⁴⁴, assume for himself the care of either ruling or governing the Church»³⁴⁵?

After setting up Felicissimus as his satellite (*satellitem*) in Carthage Novatus sails «also to Rome³⁴⁶ unto overthrowing/subverting the Church...tearing a portion of the people apart from the clergy, rending asunder the concord of the fraternity cohering well among itself and of the ones loving one another»³⁴⁷. Cyprian compares the collateral damage of Novatus' actions at Carthage with his effects at Rome. «Plainly he

³⁴⁰ Ep. 52,1: «...propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et erunt duo in carne una. Sacramentum istud magnum est, ego autem dico in Christum et in ecclesiam», CCL III B, 244-245.

³⁴¹ Notice that what is «cohering by indivisible connections» is the oneness/unity held «equally in the same degree» by Christ and His Church and not «concord» of any sort. In other words, the «concord cohering» between the Church, i.e. the bond, and the fraternity united to her is not confused with the «oneness/unity cohering by indivisible connections» here between Christ and the Church.

³⁴² This identical and indivisible oneness/unity seems to be the key to understanding how and why both Christ and Peter can be said to be the «ratio» and «origo» of the Church's «unitas».

³⁴³ Ep. 52,1: «...et Christi pariter atque ecclesiae unitatem indiuiduis nexibus cohaerentem», CCL III B, 245.

³⁴⁴ Felicissimus, besides being accused of murdering both his father and child, is accused in this same letter of stealing from the Church's coffers in Carthage, cf. CCL III B, 247.

³⁴⁵ Ep. 52,1: «...quomodo potest esse cum Christo qui cum sponsa Christi atque in eius ecclesia non est? Aut quomodo adsumit sibi regendae aut gubernandae ecclesiae curam qui spoliavit et fraudavit ecclesiam Christi?», CCL III B, 245.

³⁴⁶ The proper understanding of the Latin text here is not that Novatus is «also» destroying the Church in Rome, which certainly is the case. Rather Novatus is sailing «also» to Rome. Otherwise the sentence makes no sense. Cyprian's point is that Novatus, who has already attacked the Church in Carthage by setting up Felicissimus in opposition to Cyprian, is now attempting the same in Rome. Compare the CUA translation «sailing also to overthrow the Church» (R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Letters (1-81)*, 129) with the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* series translation «sailing also to Rome to overthrow the Church» (A.C. COXE – J. DONALDSON – A.C. ROBERTS, ed., 325).

³⁴⁷ Ep. 52,2: «...cum sua tempestate Romae quoque ad euertendam ecclesiam nauigans...a clero portionem plebis auellens, fraternitatis bene sibi cohaerentis et se inuicem diligentis concordiam scindens», CCL III B, 246-247. Compare the similarity of the «concord of a fraternity cohering among itself» here with the notion of a «concordia inseparabiliter cohaerentis» in *De Unitate*.

committed greater and graver things there [i.e. at Rome] because on account of her magnitude Rome must precede Carthage. He, who here [i.e. Carthage] has made a deacon against the Church, there [i.e. Rome] made a bishop»³⁴⁸.

Summary

Cyprian rhetorically asserts that he who is not in the «*ecclesia*» is neither with Christ and, subsequently, cannot be an «*episcopus*». Citing the Apostle Paul for support Cyprian maintains that the «*unitas ecclesiae*», which is a great «*sacramentum*», coheres equally with the «*unitas Christi*» by «*indiudivis nexibus*» (indivisible connections). The «*unitas ecclesiae*» shares an inseparable and indivisible spousal relationship with the «*unitas Christi*». Rome's «*magnitudo*» is such that she is afforded a certain capacity to «*praecedere*».

4.2.1.vii *Epistula 54*

Cyprian lauds the Romans, Maximus, a priest, and Urbanus, Sidonius, and Macarius for having returned to the Church from which they had departed by following the schism of Novatian³⁴⁹. «Now you really have held via Lordly peace the congruent tenor of your faith and the law of concord and undivided/indivisible love (*caritatis*)»³⁵⁰. They similarly «have made for others an example of peace and love (*dilectionis*)»³⁵¹. Consequently, «the truth of the Church and the oneness/unity of the Gospel and of the mystery/sacrament (*sacramenti*), which oneness/unity is held by us, is connected together with your consensus and bond»³⁵².

Cyprian explains citing the Apostle Paul's second letter to Timothy (2 Tim 2,20) that God the Father has charged only Christ the Lord with separating the tares, i.e. the *lapsi* that seem to be in the Church, from the

³⁴⁸ *Ep. 52,2*: «Plane quoniam pro magnitudine sua debebat Carthaginem Roma praecedere, illic maiora et grauiora commisit. Qui istic aduersus ecclesiam diaconum fecerat, illic episcopum fecit», CCL III B, 247. What exactly is this «magnitude» that «plainly» causes Rome to «precede» Carthage? What does this «preceding» imply and what are its ramifications?

³⁴⁹ Cf. *Ep. 54,1* (CCL III B, 251-252).

³⁵⁰ *Ep. 54,1*: «Nunc uero et uos congruentem fidei uestrae tenorem atque indiudivuae caritatis et concordiae legem dominica pace tenuistis», CCL III B, 252. Notice Cyprian's identification of «charity» with «concord».

³⁵¹ *Ep. 54,1*: «...et exemplum ceteris dilectionis et pacis uestro itinere fecistis», CCL III B, 252.

³⁵² *Ep. 54,1*: «...ut ecclesiae ueritas et euangelii ac sacramenti unitas quae a nobis tenebatur uestro etiam consensu ac uinculo necteretur», CCL III B, 252.

wheat³⁵³. The Christian's duty is to strive to be not a vessel of wood or clay but one of silver or gold, i.e. a stalk of wheat and not a tare³⁵⁴. God the Father has charged Christ the Lord alone with separating the tares from the wheat³⁵⁵.

Cyprian suggests the recipients of this letter peruse the other two treatises he recently has sent, viz. *De lapsis* and *De unitate*³⁵⁶. Cyprian's «mediocrity has expressed as much as it was able the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church»³⁵⁷. Cyprian trusts that *De Unitate* will be more pleasing to them as they «have returned to the Church with the oneness/unity of peace and charity»³⁵⁸.

Summary

Those who abandon schism and return to the «*ecclesia*» unite themselves to the «*veritas ecclesiae*» and the «*unitas*» of the «*evangelium*» and «*sacramentum*». They join the «*unitas*» of the «*catholica ecclesia*» with and in the «*unitas*» of «*caritas*» and «*pax*».

4.2.1.viii *Epistula 55*

Cyprian relates to a bishop in north-Africa, Antonianus, that he has received the latter's letters «by which you have indicated [yourself] not to communicate with Novatian but [to be] keeping the concord of the episcopal/priestly (*sacerdotalis*) college and cohering to the Catholic Church following our advice and holding one consensus with our fellow bishop Cornelius»³⁵⁹. Cyprian reminds Antonianus that this latter had requested Cyprian in a previous letter to forward a copy of that letter to

³⁵³ Cf. *Ep. 54,3* (CCL III B, 253-254).

³⁵⁴ Cf. *Ep. 54,3* (CCL III B, 254).

³⁵⁵ Cf. *Ep. 54,3* (CCL III B, 254).

³⁵⁶ Cf. *Ep. 54,4* (CCL III B, 255).

³⁵⁷ *Ep. 54,4*: «*Sed et catholicae ecclesiae unitatem quantum potuit expressit nostra mediocritas*», CCL III B, 255.

³⁵⁸ *Ep. 54,4*: «*...quando ad ecclesiam caritatis ac pacis unitate remeatis*», CCL III B, 255.

³⁵⁹ *Ep. 55,1*: «*...concordiam collegii sacerdotalis firmiter obtinentes et catholicae ecclesiae cohaerentes, quibus significasti cum Nouatiano te non communicare, sed sequi consilium nostrum et cum Cornelio coepiscopo nostro unum tenere consensum*», CCL III B, 256. Notice Cyprian's description of Antonianus' keeping the «concord of the episcopal/priestly college», «cohering to the Catholic Church», and «holding one consensus with...Cornelius». Cyprian's emphasis here appears to be on that aspect of the bishop's exercise of his free judgment whether or not to unite himself to the «bond of concord», which bond is the Church's oneness/unity.

Cornelius «in order that Corneilus knows you to communicate with himself, this is [i.e.] with the Catholic Church»³⁶⁰.

Cyprian must reassure Antonianus that any rumors of the bishop Trofimus, formerly a schismatic Novatian supporter, having been readmitted to communion by Cornelius as a bishop are untrue³⁶¹. Trofimus has been reconciled only as a layman³⁶².

Cyprian continues to explain to Antonianus throughout the remainder of this letter the entire episode concerning the treatment of the *lapsi*. In the event that Antonianus is not persuaded by the consensus of the other north-African bishops regarding the treatment of the *lapsi*, Cyprian assures him that they had written, also, «to Rome to our colleague Cornelius, who, with a council of very many bishops having been held, agreed with our judgment»³⁶³.

Cyprian cautions Antonianus against the «lies uttered from the devil's mouth against bishops/priests (*sacerdotes*) of God unto rupturing the concord³⁶⁴ of Catholic oneness/unity»³⁶⁵. Cyprian assures Antonianus that Cornelius' election as bishop is legitimate.

Cornelius was made bishop by many of our colleagues who went to the city Rome...from the judgment of God and of his Christ...when no one before himself had been made, when the place of Fabian, i.e. the place of Peter (*locus Petri*) and the station of the episcopal/sacerdotal chair (*cathedrae sacerdotalis*), was vacant³⁶⁶.

³⁶⁰ «...ut [Cornelius] sciret te secum hoc est cum catholica ecclesia communicare», CCL III B, 256. Cyprian seems to be implying the necessity of communion with Cornelius, i.e. the bishop of Rome, as a prerequisite for communion with the Catholic Church.

³⁶¹ Cf. Ep. 55,2 (CCL III B, 257).

³⁶² Cf. Ep. 55,11 (CCL III B, 269).

³⁶³ Ep. 55,6: «...Romam...scripsimus ad Cornelium collegam nostrum, qui et ipse cum plurimis coepiscopis habito concilio in eandem nobiscum sententiam pari gravitate et salubri moderatione consensit», CCL III B, 263. Cyprian seems to invoke his having sought the judgment of Cornelius alone, after this latter had of course met with a council of bishops [that Cornelius' is an informed decision is very important].

³⁶⁴ Cyprian himself interprets here what he understands by «rending asunder oneness/unity». This should help to clarify any seeming contradiction regarding the «divisibility vs. indivisibility» of oneness/unity.

³⁶⁵ Ep. 55,7: «...mendacia aduersus sacerdotes dei de diaboli ore prolata ad rumpendam catholicae unitatis concordiam ubique iactentur», CCL III B, 263. Notice that the «oneness/unity» of the Church is «Catholic».

³⁶⁶ Ep. 55,8: «Et factus est episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris qui tunc in urbe Roma aderant...Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de dei et Christi eius iudicio...cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est cum Petri locus et gradus cathedrae sacerdotalis uacaret», (CCL III B, 265).

Anyone who attempts to set himself up as bishop in opposition to the rightful bishop, which in this case is Cornelius, is outside (*foris*) the Church³⁶⁷. One «who does not hold the Church's oneness/unity does not have ecclesiastical ordination»³⁶⁸. There can be only one bishop in any one place as «there can be no second [bishop] after the first [bishop is in place]»³⁶⁹.

Cyprian gently explains the Church's duty to provide for the spiritual welfare and salvation of the repentant *lapsi*, including former bishops, by reconciling them since he «having been established outside the Church (*extra ecclesiam*) and divided from love (*caritate*) and oneness/unity cannot be crowned in death»³⁷⁰. Though some of the bishops in the province of north-Africa disagreed with other bishops over reconciling the *lapsi*, they did not, therefore, «depart from the college of their fellow bishops or rupture the Catholic Church's oneness/unity by the obstinacy of their severity or censure»³⁷¹. Rather they «persevered in maintaining the bond of concord and the undivided mystery/sacrament of the Catholic Church»³⁷². «Each bishop will determine his action and will aim to render reason for his intention to the Lord»³⁷³.

Novatian dares to establish a merely human church and set up false bishops (*pseudoepiscopos*) opposed to the rightful bishops³⁷⁴. Novatian mistakenly supposes the structure of the ecclesiastical body (*ecclesiastici corporis*) capable of being broken³⁷⁵. Yet there is «only one Church divided by Christ into many members throughout the whole world...only one episcopate diffused with an harmonious multitude of many bishops this after the tradition of God after the Catholic Church's oneness/unity having

³⁶⁷ Cf. *Ep. 55,8* (CCL III B, 265).

³⁶⁸ *Ep. 55,8*: «...*nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem qui ecclesiae non tenet unitatem*», CCL III B, 265.

³⁶⁹ *Ep. 55,8*: «*Et cum post primum secundus esse non possit*», CCL III B, 266.

³⁷⁰ *Ep. 55,17*: «...*extra ecclesiam constitutus et ab unitate atque a caritate diuisus coronari in morte non poterit*», CCL III B, 276.

³⁷¹ *Ep. 55,21*: «*Non tamen a coepiscoporum suorum collegio recesserunt aut catholicae ecclesiae unitatem uel duritiae uel censurae suae obstinatione ruperunt*», CCL III B, 280.

³⁷² *Ep. 55,21*: «*Manente concordiae uinculo et perseuerante catholicae ecclesiae indiuiduo sacramento*», CCL III B, 280. Cyprian identifies the «bond of concord» with the Church's oneness/unity. The Church herself is the «sacrament of oneness/unity».

³⁷³ *Ep. 55,21*: «...*actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque episcopus rationem propositi sui domino redditurus*», CCL III B, 280.

³⁷⁴ Cf. *Ep. 55,24* (CCL III B, 286).

³⁷⁵ Cf. *Ep. 55,24* (CCL III B, 286).

been connected and joined everywhere»³⁷⁶. Consequently, he «who has held neither fraternal love (*caritatem*) nor ecclesiastical oneness/unity surrenders what he was previously»³⁷⁷. «If a bishop first made by the body of his fellow bishops separates from the oneness/unity of the Church he is not able to hold the episcopate»³⁷⁸. Cyprian maintains that he is no longer a bishop «who observes neither the conjunction of peace nor the oneness/unity of the Spirit and separates himself from the bond of the Church and the college of bishops/priests (*sacerdotum*)»³⁷⁹. In other words, «he who wishes to hold neither the episcopate, nor oneness/unity, nor peace has neither the honor nor the power of bishop»³⁸⁰. Moreover, «he who is not in Christ's Church is not Christian»³⁸¹.

The Apostle Paul admonishes that Christians not withdraw «from the oneness/unity which God established [but that they bear] with one another in love (*dilectione*), endeavoring to preserve the oneness/unity of the Spirit in the conjunction of peace»³⁸². Nonetheless, «apostates and deserters or adversaries and enemies dispersing Christ's Church, even if one will have been killed outside, according to the apostle really cannot be admitted into the peace of the Church, because they have held the oneness/unity neither of the Spirit nor of the Church»³⁸³.

³⁷⁶ Ep. 55,24: «*Et cum sit a Christo una ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra diuisa, item episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum concordie numerositate diffusus, ille post dei traditionem, post conexam et ubique coniunctam catholicae ecclesiae unitatem*», CCL III B, 286.

³⁷⁷ Ep. 55,24: «*...qui nec fraternam caritatem nec ecclesiasticam unitatem tenuit etiam quod prius fuerat amisit*», CCL III B, 285.

³⁷⁸ Ep. 55,24: «*Episcopatum autem tenere non posset, etiam si episcopus prius factus a coepiscoporum suorum corpore et ab ecclesiae unitate descisceret*», CCL III B, 286-287.

³⁷⁹ Ep. 55,24: «*Qui ergo nec unitatem spiritus nec coniunctionem pacis obseruat et se ab ecclesiae uinculo atque a sacerdotum collegio separat*», CCL III B, 287.

³⁸⁰ Ep. 55,24: «*...episcopi nec potestatem potest habere nec honorem qui episcopatus nec unitatem uoluit tenere nec pacem*», CCL III B, 287.

³⁸¹ Ep. 55,24: «*Christianus non est qui in Christi ecclesia non est*», CCL III B, 285.

³⁸² Ep. 55,24: «*...ne ab unitate quam deus constituit recedamus...inuicem in dilectione, satis gentes seruare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis*», CCL III B, 287.

³⁸³ Ep. 55,29: «*Apostatae uero et desertores uel aduersarii et hostes et Christi ecclesiam dissipantes, nec si occisi pro nomine foris fuerint, admitti secundum apostolum possunt ad ecclesiae pacem, quando nec spiritus nec ecclesiae tenuerunt unitatem*», CCL III B, 294.

Summary

Not «*communicare*» with Novatian, the schismatic in opposition to Cornelius, and holding «*consensus*» with Cornelius, the rightful «*episcopus*» of Rome, means that one maintains the «*concordia collegii sacerdotalis*» and adheres to the «*catholica ecclesia*». Communicating with Rome's «*episcopus*», Cornelius, who occupies the «*locus Petri*» and the «*cathedra*» there, is to «*communicare*» with the «*ecclesia catholica*». Every «*sacerdos dei*» must be on guard against the devil, who desires to break the «*catholicae unitatis concordia*». As there can exist only one «*episcopus*» in any one «*locus*», he who does not hold the «*ecclesiae unitas*» by setting himself up in opposition to the lawful «*episcopus*» is «*foris ecclesia*». One who is not in the «*Christi ecclesia*» is not a Christian. One who is «*extra ecclesiam*» is divided from «*caritas*» and «*unitas*» and, subsequently, cannot even in his death be crowned. «*Episcopi*» who do not agree with each other are not thereby permitted to break the «*catholicae ecclesiae unitas*». As the structure of the «*ecclesiastice corpus*» is incapable of being broken, such individuals would succeed only in cutting themselves off from the «*coepiscoporum corpus*» and the «*ecclesiae unitas*». «*Episcopi*» are obliged to maintain the «*concordiae vinculum*» and the «*catholicae ecclesiae sacramentum indivisum*», especially if they wish to hold the «*episcopatum*». The Apostle Paul exhorts the Christians to not withdraw from but preserve the divinely established «*unitas*» in «*dilectio*». The Christian that does not maintain the «*fraterna caritas*», the «*ecclesiastica unitas*», the «*unitas Spiritus*», the «*coniunctio pacis*», the «*ecclesiae vinculum*», the «*sacerdotum collegium*» surrenders what he had been formerly. Likewise he who separates himself from these things and desires to hold neither «*pax*», nor the «*episcopatum*», nor «*unitas*» has neither the «*honor*» nor the «*potestas*» of the «*episcopus*». Such a one is an apostate and enemy and as such is incapable of being admitted to the «*ecclesiae pax*» since he has held the «*unitas*» neither of the «*Spiritus*» nor of the «*ecclesia*».

4.2.1.ix Epistula 59

Cyprian warns Cornelius that Novatus' satellite deacon, Felicissimus, whom the former set up in opposition to Cyprian, has now set up a false bishop (*pseudoepiscopus*) named Fortunatus³⁸⁴. Cyprian assures Cornelius that this latter has not been informed until now because the situation in Carthage did not seem to warrant the notification of Rome's bishop³⁸⁵.

³⁸⁴ Cf. *Ep.* 59,10-11 (CCL III C, 354).

³⁸⁵ Cf. *Ep.* 59,9 (CCL III C, 350).

Many bishops in north-Africa excommunicated Fortunatus along with four other priests (*presbyteris*)³⁸⁶. Nevertheless, there have been many false bishops set up in opposition to bishops in communion with Cyprian throughout north-Africa, for which reason Carthage's rightful bishop now deems necessary Cornelius' awareness of these events³⁸⁷.

Cyprian contends that heresies and schisms have arisen from nowhere else than that neither «is God's bishop/priest (*sacerdoti*) obeyed nor is there regarded only one judge in Christ's stead and one bishop/priest (*sacerdos*) in the Church at any one time»³⁸⁸. Were the one rightful bishop obeyed «no one would make himself judge not just of the bishop but of God, no one would rend asunder Christ's Church by a division of oneness/unity»³⁸⁹.

Cyprian asserts that it was not enough for those schismatics who wish to withhold mercy and peace from the *lapsi* not to reconcile them³⁹⁰. Indeed, these individuals «bearing letters from schismatics and profane ones outside the Church, with a false bishop...dare to sail to both the chair of Peter and the principle Church from where episcopal/priestly oneness/unity proceeds/originates»³⁹¹. Such do not consider them «to be the Romans whose faith was praised by the Apostle [Paul]...to whom faithlessness has no access»³⁹². Cyprian asserts with support from the same Apostle that there «can be no association of faith and faithlessness. One who is not with Christ, who is an adversary of Christ, who is an enemy of His peace and oneness/unity cannot cohere with us»³⁹³.

³⁸⁶ Cf. *Ep.* 59,9 (CCL III C, 350).

³⁸⁷ Cf. *Ep.* 59,9 (CCL III C, 351-352).

³⁸⁸ *Ep.* 59,5: «*Neque enim aliunde haereses obortae sunt aut nata sunt schismata quam dum sacerdoti dei non obtemperatur nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos et ad tempus iudex uice Christi cogitatur*», CCL III C, 344.

³⁸⁹ «...iudicem se non iam episcopis sed deo faceret, nemo discidio unitatis Christi ecclesiam scinderet», CCL III C, 345.

³⁹⁰ Cf. *Ep.* 59,14 (CCL III C, 361).

³⁹¹ «...extra ecclesiam et...pseudoepiscopo...nauigare audent et ad Petri cathedram atque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est a schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre», CCL III C, 361-362. J. Meyendorff limits the interpretation of this passage to the «missionary expansion in Latin countries through the preaching of Peter and Paul in Rome and not to administrative power», cf. J. MEYENDORFF, *Rome, Constantinople, Moscow*, 14 fnt. 23; *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, 15 fnt. 17.

³⁹² «...nec cogitare eos esse Romanos quorum fides apostolo praedicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum», CCL III C, 362.

³⁹³ «Nulla societas fidei et perfidiae potest esse. Qui cum Christo non est, qui aduersarius Christi est, qui unitati et paci eius inimicus est, nobiscum non potest cohaerere», CCL III C, 373.

Summary

Heresies and schisms arise from disobedience to the only rightful «*episcopus*» in the «*vicis Christi*» at any one time in the one «*ecclesia*» and, subsequently, lead one to rend asunder the «*Christi ecclesia*» by dividing the «*unitas*». Those who are «*extra ecclesiam*» audaciously sail to Rome, the «*cathedra Petri*», the «*ecclesia principalis*» whence «*sacerdotalis unitas exoritur*» (proceeds/originates). «*Perfidia*» (faithlessness) has no access to those Romans that constitute the Church in Rome. As an association of both «*fides*» and «*perfidia*» is impossible, the «*inimicus Christi*» and one who is not with Him cannot «*cohaerere*» with the «*ecclesia*».

4.2.1.x *Epistula 66*

A bishop and confessor of the Decian persecution, Florentius Puppianus, has sacriliciously believed lies and calumnies of others against Cyprian and now questions whether or not he should hold communion with Carthage's bishop³⁹⁴. If Puppianus' allegations are true, Cyprian rhetorically inquires, why «then [do] all the churches throughout the world [remain] joined with us by the bond of oneness/unity»³⁹⁵? Cyprian suggests sarcastically that everyone else is wrong and that the «holy Puppianus alone will live in paradise and in the kingdom of heaven»³⁹⁶.

Peter, «upon whom the Church had been built...[himself taught that the] Church is the people united to the bishop/priest (*sacerdoti*)»³⁹⁷. Puppianus «should know the bishop to be in the Church and the Church to be in the bishop...[so that] one who is not with the bishop [is] neither...in the Church»³⁹⁸. This Church united to its bishop is «one, undivided, not rent asunder, and Catholic, everywhere connected and joined by the glue of bishops/priests cohering with one another»³⁹⁹.

³⁹⁴ Cf. *Ep. 66,1-2* (CCL III C, 434-436).

³⁹⁵ *Ep. 66,7*: «...*ecclesiae denique uniuersae per totum mundum nobiscum unitatis uinculo copulatae?*», CCL III C, 442.

³⁹⁶ *Ep. 66,7*: «*Puppianus solus...sanctus...in paradiso atque in regno caelorum solus habitabit*», CCL III C, 442.

³⁹⁷ *Ep. 66,8*: «*Petrus, super quem aedificata fuerat ecclesia...illi sunt ecclesia, plebs sacerdoti adunata*», CCL III C, 443.

³⁹⁸ *Ep. 66,8*: «...*scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo...si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse*», CCL III C, 443.

³⁹⁹ *Ep. 66,8*: «...*ecclesia quae catholica una est scissa non sit neque diuisa...utique conexa et cohaerentium sibi inuicem sacerdotum glutino copulata*», CCL III C, 443.

Summary

«*Petrus*» taught that the «*ecclesia*» is the «*plebs*» united to the «*sacerdos*», i.e. the «*episcopus*», who while himself is in the «*ecclesia*» contains in himself the «*ecclesia*». Consequently, whoever is not with the «*episcopus*» is not in the «*ecclesia*». All of the «*ecclesiae*» around the world joined to their bishops are everywhere connected by the «*gluten*» of the «*sacerdotes cohaerentes*» with one another. This «*ecclesia*» is, consequently, «*catholica*», and the many «*ecclesiae*» contained in their respective «*episcopi*» remain joined with one another by the «*unitatis vinculum*».

4.2.2 Epistolary Evidence During the Baptismal Controversy

Cyprian employs the term «*unitas*» in seven of the letters he composed during the period following Cornelius' death in early June of 253 but before Stephen's death in August of 258⁴⁰⁰. Cyprian composed *Ep.* 68 sometime between Spring of 254 and Summer of 257, probably around 255, while *Ep.* 69 possibly could have been written a bit earlier sometime between mid-253 and early 255⁴⁰¹. *Ep.* 70 was written after these previous two letters in either 254 or 255 with both *Ep.* 71 and 72 written thereafter probably in Spring of 256⁴⁰². Cyprian penned *Ep.* 73, then, in early Summer of 256 and *Ep.* 74 toward the end of that season⁴⁰³.

4.2.2.i *Epistula* 68

Cyprian encourages the bishop of Rome, Stephen, to intervene with letters in the Church in Arles near Lyons where the bishop, Marcianus, has entered schism by entering communion with Novatian and departing «from both our body and the bishop/priest (*sacerdoti*) consensus and from the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church»⁴⁰⁴. In order to protect the sheep from those shepherds who would attempt to lacerate Christ's flock the «body of bishops/priests is abundant, joined by the glue of mutual concord and by the bond of oneness/unity»⁴⁰⁵. Cyprian closes this letter to Stephen, in which the former beseeches the latter to intervene in a matter well beyond

⁴⁰⁰ G.W. CLARKE, 702.708.

⁴⁰¹ G.W. CLARKE, 702.708.

⁴⁰² G.W. CLARKE, 703.708-709.

⁴⁰³ G.W. CLARKE, 703-704.709.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ep.* 68,1: «...a catholicae ecclesiae unitate atque a corporis nostri et sacerdotii consensione discesserit», CCL III C, 463.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ep.* 68,3: «...copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiae mutuae glutino atque unitatis uinculo copulatum», CCL III C, 465.

the geographical boundaries of Rome, with the following appeal. «The glorious honor of our predecessors, the blessed martyrs Cornelius and Lucius, is needing to be preserved. Since whose memory we honor, dearest brother, you, who have been made successor and vicar to them, all the more must honor and preserve by your gravity and authority»⁴⁰⁶.

Summary

An «*episcopus*» has departed from the «*catholicae ecclesiae unitas*» by entering communion with another that had been deemed to be outside the «*ecclesia*» by the «*corpus sacerdotum*». This body of «*episcopi*», which is joined together by the «*gluten*» of «*concordia mutua*» and the «*unitatis vinculum*», is obligated to protect Christ's flock from any who would attempt to harm his sheep, including providing a suitable replacement as «*pastor*» of the «*grex Christi*». Rome's «*episcopus*» is the «*successor*» and «*vicarius*» of previous «*episcopi*» of Rome. As such he enjoys a certain «*gravitas*» and «*auctoritas*» that obligates him to intervene in a Church matter beyond the geographical confines of Rome, honoring (*honorificare*) and preserving (*servare*) the glorious memory and «*honor*» of his predecessors.

4.2.2.ii Epistula 69

Cyprian responds to a question posed by a certain Magnus regarding the efficacy of baptism administered by schismatics in support of Novatian⁴⁰⁷. Cyprian confirms that «those who come from Novatian, among other heretics, after his profane washing are to be baptized and sanctified in the Catholic Church with the legitimate and true and unique baptism of the Church...We say all heretics and schismatics to have absolutely nothing of power or right»⁴⁰⁸. Such schismatics are «all adversaries of the Lord and anti-Christ[s] [having departed] from love (*caritate*) and from the oneness/unity of the catholic church»⁴⁰⁹.

⁴⁰⁶ Ep. 68,5: «*Seruandus est enim antecessorum nostrorum beatorum martyrum Cornelii et Lucii honor gloriosus. Quorum memoriam cum nos honoremus, multo magis tu, frater carissime, honorificare et seruare gravitate et auctoritate tua debes, qui uicarius et successor eis factus es*», CCL III C, 468.

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. Ep. 69,1 (CCL III C, 469-470).

⁴⁰⁸ Ep. 69,1: «*...inter ceteros haereticos eos quoque qui a Nouatiano ueniant post profanum eius lauacrum baptizari et sanctificari in ecclesia catholica legitimo et uero et unico ecclesiae baptismo...dicimus omnes omnino haereticos et schismaticos nihil habere potestatis ac iuris*», CCL III C, 469-470.

⁴⁰⁹ Ep. 69,1: «*...aduersarios domini et antichristos omnes...a caritate atque ab unitate ecclesiae catholicae recessisse*», CCL III C, 471. Cyprian explains Novatian's status in

Heretics and schismatics unable to administer baptism are likewise unable to celebrate what Exodus 12,46 describes as the «sacrament of Passover and of the lamb, which lamb indicated Christ»⁴¹⁰. Interpreting this passage Cyprian maintains the Church «neither to be outside, nor able to be rent asunder or divided against itself but...to hold the oneness/unity of an inseparable and undivided house...By which sacrament is declared to be gathered into one house alone, i.e. the Church, the ones to overcome and escape from the world's destruction»⁴¹¹. «If Novatian was united to this Lordly bread, himself...mingled with the cup of Christ, he will have been able to seem to have the grace of the unique ecclesiastic baptism, if he will have agreed to hold this oneness/unity of the Church »⁴¹².

The Church's oneness/unity comes from God himself. Jn 10,30 recalls Jesus' words that «I and the Father are one»⁴¹³. Cyprian interprets this passage as «the Lord insinuating to us oneness/unity [as] coming from divine authority»⁴¹⁴. The Lord says in Jn 10,16 that «there shall be one

Ep. 69,3. «On account that since the church alone has the vital water and power of baptizing and of cleansing man, let one who says that Novatian is able to baptize and sanctify anyone first teach and show Novatian either to preside in the Church or to be in the church. For the church is one, which one [church] cannot be both inside and outside. For if she is with Novatian she was not with Cornelius. If she was really with Cornelius, who succeeded Fabian as bishop by legitimate ordination and whom [i.e. Fabian] the Lord glorified also beyond honor with bishop/priest martyrdom, Novatian is not in the church nor can he be counted a bishop, who, succeeding to no one, with contempt for the evangelical and apostolic tradition has originated/proceeded by himself from himself. He who has not been ordained in the church cannot have or in any way hold the church» («*Propter quod cum sola ecclesia habeat aquam uitalem et baptizandi atque abluendi hominis potestatem, qui dicit apud Nouatianum baptizari et sanctificari aliquem posse, prius ostendat et doceat Nouatianum in ecclesia esse aut ecclesiae praesidere. Ecclesia enim una est, quae una et intus esse et foris non potest. Si enim apud Nouatianum est, apud Cornelium non fuit. Si uero apud Cornelium fuit, qui Fabiano episcopo legitima ordinatione successit et quem praeter sacerdotii honorem martyrio quoque dominus glorificauit, Nouatianus in ecclesia non est nec episcopus computari non potest, qui euangelica et apostolica traditione contempta nemini succedens a se ipso ortus est. Habere namque aut tenere ecclesiam nullo modo potest qui ordinatus in ecclesia non est*», CCL III C, 473-474).

⁴¹⁰ *Ep. 69,4:* «...de sacramento paschae et agni, qui agnus Christum designabat», CCL III C, 474.

⁴¹¹ *Ep. 69,4:* «*Foris enim non esse ecclesiam nec scindi aduersum se aut diuidi posse, sed inseparabilis atque indiuiduae domus unitatem tenere*», CCL III C, 474.

⁴¹² *Ep. 69,5:* «*Si Nouatianus huic pani dominico adunatus est, si Christi poculo et ipse commixtus est, poterit uideri et unici ecclesiastici baptismi habere gratiam posse, si eum constiterit ecclesiae unitatem tenere*», CCL III C, 477.

⁴¹³ *Ep. 69,5:* «...ego et pater unum sumus», CCL III C, 475.

⁴¹⁴ *Ep. 69,5:* «...dominus insinuans nobis unitatem de diuina auctoritate uenientem», CCL III C, 475.

flock and one shepherd, to which oneness/unity he [is] guiding his Church»⁴¹⁵. Cyprian rhetorically inquires how a heretic and schismatic like Novatian can be numbered among the flock since «not dwelling in God's house, i.e. God's Church, [such a one is an] enemy of Lordly peace and of divine oneness/unity, in which none save concordant and unanimous ones dwell, with the Holy Spirit speaking in the Psalms saying: God is he who makes unanimous ones to dwell in [his] house»⁴¹⁶.

«The mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity is as inseparable as they are without hope and acquire the greatest perdition for themselves from the indignation of God who establish for themselves some false bishop outside, the bishop having been left»⁴¹⁷. The ten tribes divided from the tribes of Benjamin and Judah in the fourth book of Kings (17,20-21) established their own king⁴¹⁸. The Lord, consequently, «gave them unto perdition because they had established another king for themselves and were scattered from oneness/unity»⁴¹⁹. Novatian and company have «rebelled against God's bishops/priests (*sacerdotes*) with hostility, rending asunder the Church, revolting against the peace and oneness/unity of Christ, attempting to establish a chair for themselves and assume primacy, and claiming the license of baptizing and offering»⁴²⁰.

Summary

Heretics and schismatics, who as Christ's enemies and adversaries are anti-Christ, have neither «*ius*» nor «*potestas*» to baptize because they have left the «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*». The «*sacramentum*» of the «*Pasch*» can be celebrated only in one «*domus*», which is the «*ecclesia*», whose «*unitas*» is «*indivisa*» and «*inseparabilis*». «*Unitas*» derives from the «*auctoritas divina*» of God. Consequently, the «*grex*» is one with one

⁴¹⁵ Ep. 69,5: «*Ad quam unitatem redigens ecclesiam suam denuo dicit: et erit unus grex et unus pastor*», CCL III C, 475.

⁴¹⁶ Ep. 69,5: «*...dominicae pacis ac diuinae unitatis inimicus, non habitans in domo dei, id est in ecclesia dei, in qua non nisi concordantes atque unanimiter habitant, loquente in psalmis spiritu sancto et dicente: deus qui inhabitare facit unanimiter in domo*», CCL III C, 475-476.

⁴¹⁷ Ep. 69,6: «*Denique quam sit inseparabile unitatis sacramentum et quam sine spe sint et perditionem sibi maximam de indignatione dei adquirant qui schisma faciunt et relicto episcopo alium sibi foris pseudoepiscopum constituunt*», CCL III C, 477.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. Ep. 69,6 (CCL III C, 477-478).

⁴¹⁹ Ep. 69,6: «*...dominum dixit et eos in perditionem dedisse quod ab unitate dissipati essent atque alterum sibi regem constituissent*», CCL III C, 477-478.

⁴²⁰ Ep. 69,8: «*...contra dei sacerdotes..hostiliter rebellauerant...ecclesiam scindentes et contra pacem atque unitatem Christi rebelles cathedram sibi constituere et primum adsumere et baptizandi atque offerendi licentiam uindicare conantur*», CCL III C, 482.

«*pastor*», and one who is not in this one «*grex*», this one «*domus*», this one «*ecclesia*» is an enemy of the Lord's «*pax*» and «*unitas divina*». Only by holding the «*unitas ecclesiae*» can one have the «*gratia*» of «*baptisma*». One who attempts to establish a «*pseudoepiscopus*» is scattered from the «*sacramentum unitatis inseparabilis*». Schismatic supporters of Novatian rebelling against the «*sacerdotes dei*» and the «*pax Christi*» attempt to establish a «*cathedra*» for themselves and assume «*primatus*».

4.2.2.iii *Epistula 70*

Cyprian addresses this collective letter signed by an additional thirty bishops to another eighteen bishops who had apparently requested the counsel of the former regarding the validity of baptism as administered by heretics and schismatics⁴²¹. The one baptism, like the Eucharist, can be administered only in the one Church and not outside⁴²². One who is outside the Church and not with the Holy Spirit cannot give the Holy Spirit and, subsequently, cannot baptize «when both baptism is one and the Holy Spirit is one and one the Church founded upon Peter by Christ our Lord, the origin and principle/reason of oneness/unity»⁴²³.

«We who are with the Lord hold the oneness/unity of the Lord and administer his priesthood in the Church must repudiate and reject and hold as profane whatever his adversaries and anti-Christ do»⁴²⁴. Likewise, these same ones who are in the Church must «give through all the mysteries/sacraments of divine grace the truth of faith and of oneness/unity to those who, coming from depravity and error, acknowledge the true faith of the one Church»⁴²⁵.

Summary

The «*spiritus sanctus*» is one, «*baptisma*» is one, and one is the «*ecclesia*» which «*Christ*», the «*ratio*» and «*origo*» of «*unitas*», founded

⁴²¹ Cf. *Ep. 70,1* (CCL III C, 501).

⁴²² Cf. *Ep. 70,1-2* (CCL III C, 503.507.509).

⁴²³ *Ep. 70,3*: «...quando et baptisma unum sit et spiritus sanctus unus et una ecclesia a Christo domino nostro super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata», CCL III C, 511.

⁴²⁴ *Ep. 70,3*: «Quare qui cum domino sumus et unitatem domini tenemus et secundum eius dignationem sacerdotium eius in ecclesia administramus, quaecumque aduersarii eius et antichristi faciunt repudiare et reicere et pro profanis habere debemus», CCL III C, 515.

⁴²⁵ *Ep. 70,3*: «...et eis qui de errore et prauitate uenientes agnoscunt unius ecclesiae ueram fidem, dare illis per omnia diuinae gratiae sacramenta unitatis et fidei ueritatem», CCL III C, 515.

upon «*Petrus*». The «*sacramenta*» of «*gratia divina*» like «*baptisma*» and the «*eucharistia*» can be administered only by the «*una ecclesia*». Those who hold the «*ecclesiae unitas*» must reject the enemies of such «*unitas*», which adversaries are anti-Christ. Similarly to those who formerly erred and now acknowledge the «*vera fides*» of the «*una ecclesia*» must be given the «*veritas*» of «*fides*» and «*unitas*» through all the «*sacramenta*» of «*gratia divina*».

4.2.2.iv *Epistula 71*

Cyprian responds to a bishop in Mauretania, Quintus, who has inquired as to the validity of heretical and schismatic baptism⁴²⁶. Though Cyprian not once mentions Stephen's name, Cyprian refers a few times to the presumptions of a certain one of his colleagues that maintain heretical and schismatic baptism to be valid⁴²⁷. Cyprian agrees that those who have been baptized in, depart from, and later return the Church do not need to be baptized but only reconciled after doing penance⁴²⁸. Cyprian explains that there exists «one baptism only, which is certainly one in the Catholic Church because the Church is one and baptism cannot be beyond the Church»⁴²⁹. «Those who are not in the Church are to be counted among the dead, and one cannot be restored to life by another who oneself does not live, when the Church is one, the life of which eternal [Church] grants grace and lives forever gives life to God's people»⁴³⁰. Consequently, those claiming to have been baptized by schismatics are not «rebaptized by us but baptized»⁴³¹. Such a one needs to be baptized «in order that one become a sheep, because the holy Church is the one water which makes sheep»⁴³². Mindful of the preceding argument the bishops «must hold the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church ceding nothing of the faith and of truth to the enemies»⁴³³.

⁴²⁶ Cf. *Ep. 71,1* (CCL III C, 516).

⁴²⁷ Cf. *Ep. 71,1* (CCL III C, 516).

⁴²⁸ Cf. *Ep. 71,2* (CCL III C, 518).

⁴²⁹ *Ep. 71,1*: «...unum baptisma...quod unum scilicet in ecclesia catholica est, quia ecclesia una est et esse baptisma praeter ecclesiam non potest», CCL III C, 517.

⁴³⁰ *Ep. 71,1*: «...eos qui non sunt in ecclesia Christi inter mortuos computari nec posse ab eo uiuificari alterum qui ipse non uiuat, quando una sit ecclesia, quae uita aeternae gratiam consecuta et uiuit in aeternum et uiuificat dei populum», CCL III C, 518.

⁴³¹ *Ep. 71,1*: «...non rebaptizari apud nos, sed baptizari», CCL III C, 517.

⁴³² *Ep. 71,2*: «...baptizandus est ut ovis fiat, quia una est aqua in ecclesia sancta quae oves faciat», CCL III C, 519.

⁴³³ *Ep. 71,2*: «...debemus ecclesiae catholicae unitatem tenere nec in aliquo fidei et ueritatis hostibus cedere», CCL III C, 519.

Those who consider heretical and schismatic baptism valid «say themselves to follow old custom in this [matter]»⁴³⁴. Cyprian invokes reason over custom for determining correct doctrine and practice in this matter. «For it is not to be prescribed from custom but conquered with reason»⁴³⁵. Paul, who formerly persecuted the Christians and had been a believer for a lesser amount of time than Peter, debated the issue of circumcising the Gentile converts with Peter, «whom the Lord chose [to be?] first»⁴³⁶ and upon whom he built his Church»⁴³⁷. Peter in this context did not «insolently claim or arrogantly assume anything for himself, with the result that he said himself to hold primacy»⁴³⁸ and [was] to be obeyed»⁴³⁹.

«Rather [Peter] admitted the counsel of truth and easily consented to the legitimate reason Paul was vindicating, furnishing us indeed a document of concord and patience, with the result that we do not love our [opinions] stubbornly, but rather we consider our own [those things], if they be legitimate and true, which are usefully and beneficially suggested by one from our brothers and colleagues»⁴⁴⁰.

«For we priests of God and prelates of his Church are not overcome when better things are offered to us, but we are instructed, mostly in these things which pertain to the oneness/unity of the Church and to the truth of our hope and faith»⁴⁴¹. Whoever «from his authority awards them [i.e. heretics and schismatics] this protection concedes and agrees with them with the result that it seems the enemy and adversary of Christ has the

⁴³⁴ Ep. 71,2: «...dicunt se in hoc ueterem consuetudinem sequi», CCL III C, 518.

⁴³⁵ Ep. 71,3: «Non est autem de consuetudine praescribendum, sed ratione uincendum», CCL III C, 519.

⁴³⁶ «Primum» has been translated here as an adjective referring to Peter. Were «primum» to be considered as an adverb, the implication would seem to be that the Lord chose Peter chronologically first before the other Apostles.

⁴³⁷ Ep. 71,3: «...Petrus quem primum dominus elegit et super quem aedificauit ecclesiam suam», CCL III C, 519-520.

⁴³⁸ Cyprian is in no way denying «primacy» to Peter.

⁴³⁹ Ep. 71,3: «...uindicauit sibi aliquid insolenter aut adroganter adsumpsit, ut diceret se primum tenere et obtemperari», CCL III C, 519.

⁴⁴⁰ Ep. 71,3: «...sed consilium ueritatis admisit et rationi legitimae quam Paulus uindicabit facile consensit, documentum scilicet nobis et concordiae et patientiae tribuens, ut non pertinaciter nostra amemus, sed quae aliquando a fratribus et collegis nostris utiliter et salubriter suggeruntur, si sint uera et legitima, ipsa potius nostra ducamus», CCL III C, 520.

⁴⁴¹ Ep. 71,3: «Non enim uincimur quando offeruntur nobis meliora, sed instruimur, maxime in his quae ad ecclesiae unitatem pertinent et spei ac fidei nostrae ueritatem, ut sacerdotes dei et ecclesiae eius de ipsius dignatione praepositi», CCL III C, 521.

power of cleansing and purifying and sanctifying man»⁴⁴². The remission of sins can be given only in the Church, and Christ's adversaries cannot claim anything of Christ's grace⁴⁴³.

Summary

The «*unum baptisma*» can be administered in and by only the «*una ecclesia*» alone. This argument based not on «*consuetudino*» but on «*ratio*» demands that the «*praepositi ecclesiae*», i.e. the «*sacerdotes dei*», i.e. the «*episcopi*», hold the «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*». The Lord chose as «*primus*» and founded His «*ecclesia*» on «*Petrus*». When confronted by Paul's legitimate and true suggestions, Peter did not assume or claim «*primatus*» for himself «*arroganter*» or «*insolenter*» or demand to be obeyed by those younger than he either in age or religion. Rather he considered those suggestions, demonstrating «*concordia*» and «*patientia*», and consented (*consentire*) to them. «*Sacerdotes dei*» and «*praepositi ecclesiae*», i.e. «*episcopi*», must do the same especially in matters pertaining to the «*veritas*» of «*spes*» and «*fides*» and to the «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia*».

4.2.2.v Epistula 72

Cyprian and others inform the bishop of Rome, Stephen, of their judgment concerning the validity of heretical and schismatic baptism reached at the Seventh Council of Carthage, which was an assembly of eighty-six bishops presided over by Cyprian⁴⁴⁴. The council realized the need for «*conferring with your [i.e. Stephen's] gravity and wisdom...as [this issue] pertains to the episcopal/priestly (*sacerdotalem*) authority and to the dignity equally with the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church, coming from the ordination of divine arrangement*»⁴⁴⁵.

The council has determined that it is not enough «*to impose a hand unto the receiving of the Holy Spirit upon those having been dipped and stained outside the Church among heretics and schismatics with the taint of profane water, when it behooves [them that] they come to us and to the Church,*

⁴⁴² Ep. 71,1: «...hoc illis patrociniū de auctoritate sua praestat, cedit illis et consentit ut hostis et aduersarius Christi habere videatur abluendi et purificandi et sanctificandi hominis potestatem», CCL III C, 517.

⁴⁴³ Cf. Ep. 71,3 (CCL III C, 521).

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. Ep. 72,1 (CCL III C, 521).

⁴⁴⁵ Ep. 72,1: «...cum tua grauitate ac sapientia conferendum fuit quod magis pertineat et ad sacerdotalem auctoritatem et ad ecclesiae catholicae unitatem pariter ac dignitatem de diuinae dispositionis ordinatione uenientem», CCL III C, 523.

which is one, to be baptized»⁴⁴⁶. Imposing hands on such does not suffice to render them sons of God, which can occur only if they are born by each sacrament and, subsequently, fully sanctified⁴⁴⁷. Such must «receive the baptism of the Church»⁴⁴⁸. Even though the Holy Spirit descended upon and filled the centurion, Cornelius, the Apostle Peter ordered that such be baptized in order that they preserve «by apostolic magisterium the law of the divine precept and of the Gospel»⁴⁴⁹. «What the heretics use [is] not...baptism»⁴⁵⁰.

The council determined, also, that any priests or deacons ordained as such by false bishops and anti-Christ, as well as any of the former who had departed from the Church and now seek reconciliation and have attempted to offer sacrifice in opposition to the one altar, be received with the condition «that they communicate as laymen»⁴⁵¹.

Cyprian suggests that some will keep their former opinions mindful, nonetheless, of the «bond of peace and concord»⁴⁵². Stephen is assured that the bishops of north-Africa «neither do violence to nor impose law upon anyone, when each prelate has the free judgment of his will in the administration of the Church, the reason of his action to be rendered to the Lord»⁴⁵³.

Summary

«*Imponere manus*» is not enough to render as «*filii dei*» those dipped and «*maculati*» in «*aqua profana*» by heretics and schismatics «*extra ecclesiam*». The «*magisterium apostolicum*», which preserves («*servare*») the «*lex evangelii*» and the «*praeceptum divinum*», maintains that what heretics administer is not «*baptisma*». Such must receive the «*ecclesiae baptismum*». Former heretics and schismatics that had left the «*ecclesia*» as priests or deacons, and those ordained as such by heretics and schismatics,

⁴⁴⁶ Ep. 72,1: «...eos qui sint foris extra ecclesiam tincti et apud haereticos et schismaticos profanae aquae labe maculati, quando ad nos atque ad ecclesiam quae una est uenerint, baptizari oportere, eo quod parum sit eis manum inponere ad accipiendum spiritum sanctum», CCL III C, 523-524.

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. Ep. 72,1 (CCL III C, 524).

⁴⁴⁸ Ep. 72,1: «...accipiant et ecclesiae baptismum», CCL III C, 524.

⁴⁴⁹ Ep. 72,1: «... diuini praecepti atque euangelii legem apostolica magisteria seruarent», CCL III C, 525.

⁴⁵⁰ Ep. 72,1: «Baptismus autem non esse quod haeretici utuntur», CCL III C, 525.

⁴⁵¹ Ep. 72,1: «...ut communicent laici», CCL III C, 525-526.

⁴⁵² Ep. 72,2: «...pacis et concordiae uinculo», CCL III C, 525-526.

⁴⁵³ Ep. 72,3: «Qua in re nec nos uim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, quando habeat in ecclesiae administratione uoluntatis suae arbitrium liberum unusquisque praepositus, rationem actus sui domino redditurus», CCL III C, 528.

may «*communicare*» only as «*laici*» upon their return to the «*ecclesia*». Consultation with the «*gravitas*» and «*sapientia*» of the bishop of Rome, Stephen, was deemed necessary concerning this matter as it pertains to the «*sacerdotalis auctoritas*» and the «*dignitas*» and «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*», which dignity, authority, and oneness/unity come from the «*ordinatio*» of «*divina dispositio*». The Council of Carthage imposes no «*lex*» on anyone as each «*praepositus*» enjoys the «*arbitrium liberum*» of his «*voluntas*». While each is entitled to maintain his own opinion, it behooves the «*collegae*» to retain the «*vinculum*» of «*pax*» and «*concordia*», mindful that each will have to provide «*ratio*» to the Lord for his «*actus*».

4.2.2.vi *Epistula 73*

Cyprian responds to an enquiry of a bishop in Mauretania, Jubianus, concerning the validity of heretical and schismatic and particularly Novatianist baptism⁴⁵⁴. Heretics «established outside the Church claim a thing for themselves neither of their law/right (*iuris sui*) nor of power (*potestatis*)...[and we] holding one baptism to be what was established in the Catholic Church»⁴⁵⁵. «We, however, who hold the head and root of the one Church certainly know and trust nothing to be allowed to that one outside the Church»⁴⁵⁶. Such is the case regarding baptism, too, «which is only one...where [Novatian] himself had been baptized when he used to hold the truth and reason/principle of divine oneness/unity»⁴⁵⁷.

Cyprian's argument for the invalidity of heretical and schismatic baptism has the full support of both the Old and New Testaments⁴⁵⁸. Those coming from the Marcionite heresy «seem to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ...[while] after the resurrection the Lord sending his disciples instructs and teaches how they must baptize saying:...teach all the nations dipping them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. *Ep. 73,1* (CCL III C, 529).

⁴⁵⁵ *Ep. 73,1*: «...extra ecclesiam constituti uindicant sibi rem nec iuris sui nec potestatis....[et nos] statuentes unum baptismum esse quod sit in ecclesia catholica constitutum», CCL III C, 529-530.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ep. 73,1*: «Nos autem qui ecclesiae unius caput et radicem tenemus pro certo scimus et fidimus nihil illi extra ecclesiam licere», CCL III C, 531.

⁴⁵⁷ *Ep. 73,1*: «...quod est unum...ubi et ipse baptizatus prius fuerat, quando diuinam unitatis et rationem et ueritatem tenebat», CCL III C, 531.

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. *Ep. 73,8* (CCL III C, 538).

Spirit»⁴⁵⁹. The Lord «insinuates the Trinity, with whose sacrament the nations are dipped»⁴⁶⁰.

«Those who are vanquished by reason likewise oppose us uselessly with certain custom»⁴⁶¹. Cyprian finds the logic of his argument to be irrefutable, especially when challenged by an appeal to custom. «Where and through whom the remission of sins, which is given certainly in baptism, can be given was demonstrated. Now the Lord gave this power to Peter, upon whom he built the Church and from where he instituted the origin of oneness/unity»⁴⁶². The result is «what that (*ille*) loosed was loosed on earth»⁴⁶³. After his resurrection the Lord told the Apostles, «as the Father has sent me so I send you...Receive the Holy Spirit. Whose sins you will have remitted shall be remitted him. Whose you will have retained will be retained»⁴⁶⁴. Cyprian concludes «whence we understand by evangelical law and lordly ordination only the prelates founded in the Church to be allowed to baptize and to grant remission of sins»⁴⁶⁵.

«Why do we, who know none save one Christ and his one Church, even consider a foreign and adulterous enemy of divine oneness/unity»⁴⁶⁶? Life-giving water flows from the Lord's womb «where one who thirsts is to come, beyond which there is absolutely no other source and river of vital water»⁴⁶⁷. Rather one will venture «unto the Church, which is one and by

⁴⁵⁹ Ep. 73,4: «...ut nec ab ipso uenientes dicat baptizari oportere, quod iam in nomine Iesu Christi baptizati esse uideantur...Dominus enim post resurrectionem discipulos suos mittens quemadmodum baptizare deberent instruit et docet dicens:...docete gentes omnes tinguentes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti», CCL III C, 533-535.

⁴⁶⁰ Ep. 73,4: «...Insinuat trinitatem, cuius sacramento gentes tingerentur», CCL III C, 535.

⁴⁶¹ Ep. 73,13: «Proinde frustra quidam qui ratione uincuntur consuetudinem nobis opponunt», CCL III C, 543.

⁴⁶² Ep. 73,7: «Manifestum est autem ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum dari possit, quae in baptismo scilicet datur. Nam Petro primum dominus, super quem aedificauit ecclesiam et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit», CCL III C, 537.

⁴⁶³ Ep. 73,7: «...ut id solueretur in terris quod ille soluisset», CCL III C, 537.

⁴⁶⁴ Ep. 73,7: «Et post resurrectionem quoque ad apostolos loquitur dicens: sicut misit me pater, et ego mitto uos...accipite spiritum sanctum. Si cuius remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi: si cuius tenueritis, tenebuntur», CCL III C, 537.

⁴⁶⁵ Ep. 73,7: «Vnde intellegimus non nisi in ecclesia praepositis et euangelica lege ac dominica ordinatione fundatis licere baptizare et remissam peccatorum dare», CCL III C, 537.

⁴⁶⁶ Ep. 73,10: «Quid adultera et aliena et diuinae unitatis inimica in acceptum referimus, qui non nisi unum Christum et unam eius ecclesiam nouimus», CCL III C, 540.

⁴⁶⁷ Ep. 73,11: «...Quo venturus est qui sitit, utrumque...ubi fons et fluuius aquae uitalis omnino non est?», CCL III C, 541.

the Lord's voice was founded upon one who received his keys»⁴⁶⁸. This Church, in whom «we preside...for[whose] honor and oneness/unity we fight, and [whose] glory and grace we defend with faithful devotion, is one, which [Church] holds and possesses all the power of her Lord and Spouse»⁴⁶⁹.

«If we hold the law/right of our possession, if we acknowledge the sacrament of oneness/unity, why do we esteem prevaricators of the truth...[and] betrayers of oneness/unity»⁴⁷⁰. Nonetheless, «each of the bishops may do what he decides having free power of his judgment»⁴⁷¹. The Apostle Paul maintains there to be no custom in the Church whereby the bishops in discussing this matter should allow themselves to be embittered against one another because of heretics⁴⁷². Rather they must «hold the divine concord and Lordly peace...[as] the love (*caritas*) of soul, the honor of the college, the bond of faith, and the concord of the priesthood/episcopate (*sacerdotii*) is preserved patiently and leniently»⁴⁷³. They, also, «must hold firmly the faith and truth of the Catholic Church and teach and show through all the evangelic and apostolic precepts the reason/principle of divine arrangement and of oneness/unity»⁴⁷⁴.

Summary

One who holds the «*veritas*» and «*ratio*» of «*unitas divina*» and the «*caput*» and «*radix*» of the «*una ecclesia*» knows that anyone «*extra ecclesiam*» does not possess the «*ius*» or «*potestas*» to baptize because such is established only in the «*ecclesia catholica*». This «*potestas*» to administer the «*unum baptismum*» was given to «*Petrus*», upon whom the

⁴⁶⁸ Ep. 73,11: «...an ad ecclesiam quae una est et super unum qui et claves eius accepit domini uoce fundata est», CCL III C, 541.

⁴⁶⁹ Ep. 73,11: «Haec est una quae tenet et possidet omnem sponsi sui et domini potestatem. In hac praesidemus, pro honore eius atque unitate pugnamus, huius et gratiam pariter et gloriam fidei deuotione defendimus», CCL III C, 541.

⁴⁷⁰ Ep. 73,11: «Si possessionis nostrae ius tenemus, si sacramentum unitatis agnoscimus, cur praeuaricatores ueritatis, cur proditores unitatis existimus?», CCL III C, 541-542.

⁴⁷¹ Ep. 73,26: «...unusquisque episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem», CCL III C, 561.

⁴⁷² Cf. Ep. 73,26 (CCL III C, 561).

⁴⁷³ Ep. 73,26: «...cum quibus diuinam concordiam et dominicam pacem tenemus... Seruatur a nobis patienter et leniter caritas animi, collegii honor, uinculum fidei, concordia sacerdotii», CCL III C, 561.

⁴⁷⁴ Ep. 73,20: «Quare ecclesiae catholicae fidem ac ueritatem, frater carissime, et tenere debemus firmiter et docere et per omnia euangelica et apostolica praecepta rationem diuinæ dispositionis atque unitatis ostendere», CCL III C, 554.

Lord built his «*ecclesia*» and from whom he instituted the «*origo*» of «*unitas*», with the result that whatever «*ille*» loosed was loosed on earth. By the «*lex evangelica*» and «*praecepta divina*» this power was given through Peter to the «*praepositi*». One who thirsts for the «*aqua vitalis*» of «*baptisma*» will go to the «*una ecclesia*», which the Lord founded upon «*unus*» to whom he gave his «*claves*». Those in the «*ecclesia*» defending the invalidity of heretical and schismatic baptism are not «*proditores unitatis*» but acknowledge the «*sacramentum unitatis*». Thus, they defend and fight for the «*honor*», «*gloria*», «*gratia*» and «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia*». Each «*episcopus*» enjoys the «*libera potestas*» of his «*arbitrium*». The «*episcopi*» while «*patienter*» discussing the matter at hand must preserve (*servare*) the «*concordia divina*», the «*pax dominica*», the «*caritas animi*», the «*collegii honor*», the «*vinculum fidei*», «*concordia sacerdotii*». They must hold «*firmiter*», also, the «*fides*» and «*veritas*» of the «*ecclesia catholica*» and teach and show through all the «*praecepta evangelica et divina*» the «*ratio*» of «*divina dispositio*» and of «*unitas*».

4.2.2.vii *Epistula 74*

Cyprian replies to the request of a brother bishop, Pompey, for a copy of Stephen's reply (now lost) to Cyprian and the north-African bishops regarding the validity of heretical and schismatic baptism⁴⁷⁵. Cyprian quotes in this letter a portion of Stephen's answer and summarizes the latter's judgment on the issue: «He has prohibited one coming from any heresy whatever to be baptized in the Church, i.e. [Stephen] has judged the baptism of all heretics to be lawful and legitimate...and has ordered nothing else to be innovated save what was handed down»⁴⁷⁶. Stephen requires only that a «hand be imposed on them unto penance»⁴⁷⁷. Cyprian takes offense at what he regards to be an erroneous judgment. «As if one innovates who, holding oneness/unity, claims one baptism for the one Church and that one who, forgetful of oneness/unity, indeed does usurp by mendacity and by the contagion of profane dipping»⁴⁷⁸.

Cyprian appears befuddled that one would make such an argument. «Where is this tradition from? Is it [a tradition] descending from the

⁴⁷⁵ Cf. *Ep. 74,1* (CCL III C, 563-564).

⁴⁷⁶ *Ep. 74,1*: «A quacumque haeresi uenientem baptizari in ecclesia uetuit, id est omnium haereticorum baptismata iusta esse et legitima iudicauit... Et praecepit nihil aliud innouari nisi quod traditum est», CCL III C, 564.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ep. 74,1*: «...manus illis inponatur in paenitentiam», CCL III C, 564.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ep. 74,2*: «...quasi is innouet qui unitatem tenens unum baptisma uni ecclesiae uindicat, et non ille utique qui unitatis oblitus mendacia et contagia profanae tinctionis usurpat», CCL III C, 565.

Lordly and evangelic authority or coming from the commands and epistles of the Apostles»⁴⁷⁹? For Cyprian it is sheer «obstinacy or presumption to place human tradition before divine arrangement...human tradition [that] has worn down and dissolved divine precepts»⁴⁸⁰. Cyprian sarcastically lauds what «is proposed by our brother Stephen teaching a plainly magnificent and legitimate tradition, which provides us with a capable authority»⁴⁸¹.

Cyprian makes his case. The Church is not with heretics «because it is one and cannot be divided»⁴⁸². The Holy Spirit is not with heretics «because He is one and cannot be with profane ones and outsiders»⁴⁸³. Likewise «baptism, which consists in the same oneness/unity [cannot be] with heretics because it can be separated neither from the Church nor from the Holy Spirit»⁴⁸⁴. One who supports the validity of heretical and schismatic baptism «against the Church attacks the mystery/sacrament of divine tradition»⁴⁸⁵. «For it was handed down to us that only one God, and only one Christ, and only one hope, and only one faith, and only one Church, and only one baptism has not been constituted save in the one Church only, from which oneness/unity whosoever will have departed is found with heretics»⁴⁸⁶. If not irrationality then «what blindness of soul, what depravity really is unwilling to recognize the oneness/unity of faith coming from God the Father and from the tradition of Jesus Christ our Lord and God»⁴⁸⁷?

⁴⁷⁹ Ep. 74,2: «Vnde est ista traditio? Vtrumque de dominica et euangelica auctoritate descendens an de apostolorum mandatis atque epistulis ueniens?», CCL III C, 565.

⁴⁸⁰ Ep. 74,3: «...obstinatio est quaeue praesumptio humanam traditionem diuinæ dispositioni antepone...diuina praecepta soluit et praeterit humana traditio», CCL III C, 567.

⁴⁸¹ Ep. 74,4: «Praeclara plane ac legitima traditio Stephano fratre nostro docente proponitur, quae auctoritatem nobis idoneam praebeat», CCL III C, 568.

⁴⁸² Ep. 74,4: «...quia una est et diuidi non potest», CCL III C, 569.

⁴⁸³ Ep. 74,4: «...quia unus est et esse apud profanos et extrarios non potest», CCL III C, 569.

⁴⁸⁴ Ep. 74,4: «...baptisma quod in eadem unitate consistit...quia separari neque ab ecclesia neque a sancto spiritu potest», CCL III C, 569.

⁴⁸⁵ Ep. 74,11: «...contra ecclesiam...sacramentum diuinæ traditionis inpugnat», CCL III C, 578.

⁴⁸⁶ Ep. 74,11: «Traditum est enim nobis quod sit unus deus et Christus unus et una spes et fides una et una ecclesia et baptisma unum non nisi in una ecclesia constitutum, a qua unitate quisque discesserit cum haereticis...inueniatur», CCL III C, 578.

⁴⁸⁷ Ep. 74,4: «Quae uero est animi caecitas, quae prauitas, fidei unitatem de deo patre et de Iesu Christi domini et dei nostri traditione uenientem nolle cognoscere?», CCL III C, 568.

«We see the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity expressed out [of the mouth] of the person of Christ in the Cantic of Canticles [4,12.13.15]: an enclosed garden, my sister, my spouse, a source/font sealed/signed, a well of living water, paradise with the fruit of fruit-trees»⁴⁸⁸. Cyprian asks, «if, however, his Church is an enclosed garden and a sealed source/font, how is one who is not in the Church able to enter into the same garden and drink from his source/font»⁴⁸⁹? Cyprian refers to the first letter of Peter 3,20-21: «Peter himself, also demonstrating and vindicating oneness/unity, commanded and warned us to be able to be saved through the one baptism alone of the one Church»⁴⁹⁰. In his letter Peter «manifested the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity...[by explaining that] the few eight souls of men in Noah's ark had been made saved through water, whereas baptism similarly makes you saved»⁴⁹¹. Just as those who were not in Noah's ark were not saved, so are only those saved who are baptized in the Church, «which [Church] was founded by the Lordly oneness/unity unto the mystery/sacrament of one ark»⁴⁹².

«Does the friend of heretics and enemy of Christians, who considers God's bishops/priests (*sacerdotes*) keeping the truth of Christ and the oneness/unity of the Church [to be] kept away (*abstineos*) [i.e. excommunicated]⁴⁹³, give honor to God»⁴⁹⁴? Cyprian rhetorically inquires,

⁴⁸⁸ Ep. 74,11: «*Cuius unitatis sacramentum expressum uidemus etiam in cantico canticorum ex persona Christi dicentis: hortus conclusus, soror mea, sponsa, fons signatus, puteus aquae uiuae, paradisus cum fructu pomorum*», CCL III C, 578.

⁴⁸⁹ Ep. 74,11: «*Si autem ecclesia eius hortus conclusus est et fons signatus, quomodo in eundem hortum introire aut bibere de fonte eius potest qui in ecclesia non est?*», CCL III C, 578.

⁴⁹⁰ Ep. 74,11: «*Item Petrus ipse quoque demonstrans et uindicans unitatem mandauit et monuit per unum solum baptisma unius ecclesiae saluari nos posse*», CCL III C, 579.

⁴⁹¹ Ep. 74,11: «*Quo breui et spiritali conpendio unitatis sacramentum manifestauit. In arca, inquit, Noe pauci, id est octo animae hominum saluae factae sunt per aquam, quod et uos similiter saluos faciet baptisma*», CCL III C, 579.

⁴⁹² Ep. 74,11: «*...quae ad arcae unius sacramentum dominica unitate fundata est*», CCL III C, 579.

⁴⁹³ Cyprian employs the term «*abstentus*», i.e. «one having been kept away», to refer to those heretics and schismatics that are not in communion with the Church (cf. Ep. 3 in CCL III B, 15; Ep. 59 in CCL III C, 336; Ep. 68 in CCL III C, 464-465). The meaning implied of «one having been excommunicated» is certainly true. Such a translation has been avoided, however, so as not to imply that Cyprian actually uses the Latin term «*excommunicatus*».

⁴⁹⁴ Ep. 74,8: «*Dat honorem deo qui haereticorum amicus et inimicus christianorum sacerdotes dei ueritatem Christi et ecclesiae unitatem tuentes abstinentos putat?*», CCL III C, 573-574. Cyprian could be implying with this rhetorical question Stephen, who protected heretics and schismatics in Cyprian's eyes by recognizing their baptism as valid.

also, if one «not holding heresies against the Church, who vindicates the truth and oneness/unity coming from divine law, gives honor to God»⁴⁹⁵? Cyprian implores his fellow bishops to «return both to the Lordly origin and unto the apostolic tradition and thence the reason of our action may arise from where both the order and origin have arisen»⁴⁹⁶.

Summary

Claiming there to exist only «*unum baptisma*» in the «*una ecclesia*» is to hold «*unitas*». Like the «*unus Spiritus Sanctus*», which is not found with heretics, and the «*una ecclesia*», which being «*indivisa*» is not with heretics, the «*unum baptisma*», which cannot be separated from the «*unitas*» shared by the «*ecclesia*» or the «*Spiritus Sanctus*», is not found with heretics. One is considered a heretic if one has departed from the «*unitas*» of «*unus deus*», «*unus Christus*», «*una spes*», «*una fides*», constituted nowhere except in the «*una ecclesia*». The «*unitas*» of «*fides*» comes from «*deus pater*» and from the «*traditio*» of Jesus Christ our «*dominus*» and «*deus*». The «*sacramentum unitatis*», i.e. the «*ecclesia*», is described by Christ as being an enclosed «*hortus*» and a «*fons*» of «*aqua viva*». One who is not in this «*ecclesia*» cannot drink from her «*fons*». «*Petrus*» defended this «*unitas*» by teaching that salvation could occur only through the «*unum baptisma*» of the «*una ecclesia*». Peter teaches that the «*sacramentum unitatis*», i.e. the «*ecclesia*», is prefigured in Noah's ark, i.e. the «*sacramentum unius arcae*». The «*inimicus Christianorum*», i.e. the «*adversarius Christi*» considers «*abstenti*» (kept away) those «*sacerdotes dei*», that hold the «*veritas Christi*» and the «*unitas ecclesiae*» as coming

⁴⁹⁵ Ep. 74,8: «*Dat honorem deo qui unitatem et ueritatem de diuina lege uenientem non tenens haereses contra ecclesiam uindicat?*», CCL III C, 573.

⁴⁹⁶ Ep. 74,10: «*...ad originem dominicam et ad euangelicam atque apostolicam traditionem reuertamur et inde surgat actus nostri ratio unde et ordo et origo surrexit*», CCL III C, 578. Cyprian is not introducing here a new origin as the north-African bishop expends his entire episcopate, and much of this and the previous letter, vindicating the oneness/unity of God and of the Church. Rather Cyprian seems to be emphasizing that the origin of oneness/unity and, consequently, Church teaching is God himself. According to Cyprian, Rome's bishop, Stephen, who finds himself in the place of Peter as successor and vicar of all his predecessor bishops, is arguing illogically from custom and not from the apostolic tradition from God himself. Moreover, Cyprian's argument is logically sound and is maintained by not a few bishops. Stephen is in the place of the foundation and origin of the Church's oneness/unity and the beginning/webbing out of honor and power, and his gravity and wisdom along with the magnitude of the Church in Rome would benefit tremendously from offering their consent to what is the undeniable truth and reality of operative sacramental grace as effected in and by the Church according to Cyprian.

from the «*lex divina*». Such a «*sacerdos dei*» and not the «*adversarius Christi*» gives «*gloria*» to «*deus*».

4.2.3 Conclusion

Peter taught that the Church (*ecclesia*) is the people (*plebs*) united to (*adunata*) the bishop (*sacerdos/episcopus*) (*Ep.* 66). The bishop, who himself is in the Church, contains in himself the Church, also (*Ep.* 66). Consequently, whoever is not with the bishop is not in the Church (*Ep.* 66). There is only one (*unus*) lawful bishop, who is in Christ's stead (*vicis Christi*), in one (*una*) Church (*Ep.* 59). Not to communicate (*communicare*) with the unlawful bishop and to hold *consensus* with the lawful bishop means that one adheres to the Catholic Church (*ecclesia catholica*) and maintains the concord (*concordia*) of the episcopal/sacerdotal college (*collegium sacerdotalis*) (*Ep.* 55).

The cement (*gluten*) of the bishops cohering (*sacerdotes cohaerentes*) with one another is the principle connecting the various churches (*ecclesiae*) joined to their respective bishops around the world (*Ep.* 66). The principle underlying this cement is the bond (*vinculum*) of oneness/unity (*Ep.* 66). The Church is, subsequently, Catholic (*catholica*) (*Ep.* 66). The great mystery/sacrament (*sacramentum*) that is the oneness/unity of the Church (*unitas ecclesiae*) shares an inseparable and indivisible spousal relationship with the oneness/unity of Christ (*unitas Christi*) because of the indivisible connections (*individui nexus*) by which both cohere equally with each other (*Ep.* 52). One who is not in the Church is neither with Christ and is not able to be a lawful bishop (*Ep.* 52). One who is not in Christ's Church is not a Christian (*christianus*) (*Ep.* 55).

The chair of Peter (*cathedra Petri*) is found in Rome, which is the principle Church (*ecclesia principalis*) from which the episcopal/sacerdotal oneness/unity (*sacerdotalis unitas*) proceeds/originates (*exoritur*) (*Ep.* 59). Rome's bishop occupies the chair there (*Ep.* 55). Remaining in the love (*caritas*) and oneness/unity of the Catholic Church requires that one communicate with Rome's bishop, who is the womb (*matrix*), root (*radix*), and reason/principle (*ratio*) of the Catholic Church (*Ep.* 48). To communicate with Rome's bishop is to communicate with the Catholic Church as he is in the place of Peter (*locus Petri*) (*Ep.* 55)⁴⁹⁷. Faithlessness (*perfidia*) has no access (*accessum*) to the Church in Rome. Such a

⁴⁹⁷ Cyprian never refers to any bishop other than that of Rome as being in «*locus Petri*». As there can be only one bishop in the «*vicis Christi*» in any one Church, only the one bishop of Rome can be in the «*locus Petri*» and sit on the «*cathedra Petri*» there.

magnitude (*magnitudo*) affords Rome a certain capacity to precede (*praecedere*) other churches (*Ep.* 52).

God's bishops (*sacerdotes dei*), must be vigilant against the devil, who desires to rupture the concord of Catholic oneness/unity (*unitas catholica*) (*Ep.* 55). The bishops, who as the successors of the Apostles (*successores apostolorum*) are charged with maintaining this oneness/unity given them by the Lord, must labor to join any scattered sheep to the bond of Christian love (*caritas christiana*) and gather them back into the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church (*Ep.* 45). Bishops not in agreement with each other are not permitted thereby to break the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church (*Ep.* 55). Rather they are obliged to maintain the bond of concord (*«concordiae vinculum*) and the undivided (*indivisum*) mystery/sacrament of the Catholic Church, especially if they wish to hold their episcopate (*episcopatum*) (*Ep.* 55). The bishop who does not hold and separates himself from the fraternal love (*fraterna caritas*), the ecclesiastical (*ecclesiastica*) oneness/unity, the oneness/unity of the Spirit (*unitas Spiritus*), the conjunction of peace (*coniunctio pacis*), the bond of the Church (*ecclesiae vinculum*), the college of bishops (*sacerdotum collegium*), the peace (*pax*), the episcopate, and the oneness/unity holds neither the honor (*honor*) nor power (*potestas*) of the bishop (*Ep.* 55). Such an apostate and enemy is incapable of being admitted to the peace of the Church since one holds the oneness/unity neither of the Spirit nor of the Church (*Ep.* 55). The same is true for any Christian (*Ep.* 55). As the coexistence of faith (*fides*) and faithlessness is impossible, the enemy of Christ cannot cohere with Christ's Church (*Ep.* 59).

As there can exist only one bishop in one place, one who establishes oneself or supports another in opposition to the lawful bishop rends oneself asunder from the oneness/unity of the mother (*mater*) Church and, consequently, is outside (*foris*) and not in (*in*) the Church (*Ep.* 46.55). Establishing an unlawful head (*caput*), i.e. bishop, against the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity (*sacramentum unitatis*), i.e. the Church, renders one outside the Church (*extra ecclesiam*) as one rejects the embrace (*complexum*) and womb (*sinum*) of the root and mother, i.e. the Church (*Ep.* 45). Disobedience to the lawful bishop is to establish a profane altar (*altare*), to wage war against the peace of Christ and the ordination (*ordinatio*) and oneness/unity of God, cut oneself off from the Church (*Ep.* 3). Such disobedience to the lawful bishop gives rise to heresy and schism and, subsequently, leads one to rend asunder Christ's Church by dividing the oneness/unity (*Ep.* 59). Since the ecclesiastical body (*ecclesiastice corpus*) is ultimately incapable of being broken, such individuals, considered deposed (*depositi*) and kept away (*abstenti*),

succeed only in cutting themselves off from the body of fellow bishops (*coepiscoporum corpus*) and the oneness/unity of the Church (*Ep. 55*). Treacherous heresy and schism cannot completely or permanently violate the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church (*Ep. 51*).

Those who are outside the Church and not in possession of Christ's Gospel (*evangelium Christi*) cannot be forced to rejoin but of their own free will must return to the flock (*grex*), peace, and concord of Christ from which they have separated themselves (*Ep. 45.46*). Those who do return to the home of truth (*veritas*) and oneness/unity, i.e. the Church, avoid tempting the faith and love (*caritas*) of oneness/unity, unite themselves to the truth of the Church and the oneness/unity of the Gospel and the mystery/sacrament, i.e. the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church, with and in the oneness/unity of love (*caritas*) and peace (*Ep. 51.52*).

Oneness/unity comes from God's divine authority (*auctoritas divina*) (*Ep. 69*). The oneness/unity of faith comes from God the Father (*pater*) and from the tradition (*traditio*) of the Lord God Jesus Christ (*Ep. 74*). The Holy Spirit is one, baptism (*baptisma*) is one, and the Church, which Christ, the origin (*origo*) and reason/principle (*ratio*) of oneness/unity, founded upon Peter (*Petrus*), is one (*Ep. 70*). The one Holy Spirit, the one Church, and the one baptism are inseparable from the oneness/unity shared among them (*Ep. 74*).

The oneness/unity of the Church is undivided and inseparable (*inseparabilis*) (*Ep. 69*). This mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity, i.e. the Church, is an enclosed garden (*hortus*) and a source (*fons*) of living water (*aqua viva*) (*Ep. 74*). Peter taught that salvation can occur only through the one baptism of the one Church, the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity prefigured in the mystery/sacrament of Noah's one ark (*Ep. 74*). The various divine mysteries/sacraments like the one baptism and the *Pasch*, i.e. the eucharist (*eucharistia*), can be administered in and by only the one Lord, i.e. the one Church (*Ep. 69.70.71*). Only by holding the oneness/unity of the Church can one have the grace (*gratia*) of one baptism (*unum baptisma*) (*Ep. 69*). One who is not in this Church is unable to drink from her source (*Ep. 74*). One who thirsts for the living (*vitalis*) water of baptism will go to the Church because salvation is not outside the Church (*salus extra ecclesiam non est*) (*Ep. 73*). The one flock has one *pastor*, and one who is not in this one flock, this one house (*domus*), this one Church, is an enemy of the Lord's peace and oneness/unity (*Ep. 69*). Neither the one Holy Spirit, nor the one Church, nor the one baptism is found with heretics (*Ep. 74*).

Christ's enemy and adversary (*adversarius*) would consider God's bishops that hold this argument and, subsequently, Christ's truth and the

oneness/unity of the Church, to be kept away (*Ep. 74*). Those in the Church defending the invalidity of heretical and schismatic baptism are not betrayers (*proditores*) of oneness/unity but acknowledge the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity (*Ep. 73*). Thus, they defend and fight for the honor, glory, grace, and oneness/unity of the Church (*Ep. 73*). Those who hold the oneness/unity of the Church must reject the enemies of such oneness/unity (*Ep. 70*).

Christ's enemies and adversaries and anti-Christ's are heretics (*haeretici*) and scismatics (*schismatici*), who possess neither the law/right (*ius*) nor the power to administer baptism because they have left the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church (*Ep. 69*). These individuals have departed from such oneness/unity of one God, one Christ, one hope, one faith, and one Catholic Church either by communicating with one deemed to be outside the Church by the body of bishops (*corpus sacerdotum*) or by attempting to establish a false bishop (*pseudoepiscopus*) (*Ep. 68.69.74*). Such individuals rebelling against God's bishops/priests and Christ's peace attempt to establish for themselves a chair and assume primacy (*primatus*) (*Ep. 69*).

To impose hands (*imponere manus*) is not enough to render as God's sons (*fili*) those dipped (*tincti*) and stained (*maculati*) in profane (*profana*) water by heretics and schismatics (*Ep. 72*). Such must receive the Church's baptism (*Ep. 72*). Former heretics and schismatics that had left the Church as priests or deacons, and those ordained as such by heretics and schismatics, may communicate only as (*laici*) upon their return to the Church (*Ep. 72*). All such who formerly erred and now acknowledge the true faith of the one Church must be given the truth of faith and oneness/unity through all the mysteries/sacraments of divine grace (*Ep. 70*).

One who holds the truth and reason/principle of divine oneness/unity and the head and root of the one Church knows that no one outside the Church possesses the law/right or power to administer baptism because such is established only in the Catholic Church (*Ep. 73*). Such power was given to Peter, upon whom the Lord built his Church and from whom he instituted the origin and reason/principle of oneness/unity (*Ep. 73*). The Lord gave his keys (*claves*) to this one man (*unus*), i.e. Peter, with the result that whatever that man (*ille*) loosed was loosed on earth (*Ep. 73*). This power was given to the prelates (*praepositi*) through Peter by the Gospel law (*lex evangelica*) and divine precepts (*praecepta divina*) (*Ep. 73*).

The entire foregoing argument is based not on custom (*consuetudo*) but on reason (*ratio*) (*Ep. 71*). Nevertheless, consultation with the wisdom (*sapientia*) and gravity (*gravitas*) of Rome's bishop, who is the successor

(*successor*) and vicar (*vicarius*) of his predecessor bishops there⁴⁹⁸, is necessary as this matter pertains to the episcopal/sacerdotal authority (*auctoritas sacerdotalis*) and the dignity (*dignitas*) and oneness/unity, all of which come from the ordination of the divine arrangement (*dispositio*) of the Catholic Church (*Ep.* 72).

The body of bishops, joined together by the cement of mutual concord (*concordia mutua*) and by the bond of oneness/unity, is obliged to protect Christ's flock from any who would attempt to harm his sheep (*Ep.* 68). They must hold firmly (*firmiter*), also, the faith and truth of the Catholic Church and teach and show through all the divine and Gospel precepts the reason/principle of divine arrangement and of oneness/unity (*Ep.* 73). Each bishop enjoys the free (*libera*) power of his judgment (*arbitrium*) and the free judgment of his will (*voluntas*) (*Ep.* 72.73). While each is entitled to maintain his own opinion, it behooves the colleagues to retain the bond of peace and concord, mindful that everyone will have to provide reason to the Lord for his action (*Ep.* 72).

Such a serious issue as baptism must be discussed carefully. The Lord chose as the first one (*primus*) and founded his Church on Peter (*Ep.* 71). When confronted by Paul's legitimate and true suggestions, Peter did not arrogantly (*arroganter*) or insolently (*insolenter*) assume or claim primacy for himself or demand to be obeyed by those younger than he either in age or religion (*Ep.* 71)⁴⁹⁹. Rather he considered those suggestions,

⁴⁹⁸ If any one bishop is the «*successor*» and «*vicarius*» of some of his predecessor bishops, then he is by Cyprian's definition of bishop as the only legitimate one in the «*vicis Christi*» in «*una ecclesia*» in one «*locus*», the successor and vicar of all his predecessor bishops. The bishops are the «*successores apostolorum*» (*Ep.* 45). The bishop who finds himself in the «*locus Petri*» is, therefore, the successor and vicar of the first bishop of Rome, the Apostle Simon bar Jonah, to which Apostle Jesus of Nazareth gave the title «*Petrus*» after this latter had professed the former as the «*Christus*». As each bishop is in the «*vicis Christi*» in the one Church in any one place, each is likewise a «*vicarius Christi*» in the one Church in that one place. As Christ, who is the «*origo et ratio unitatis*» (*Ep.* 70), founded his one Church upon Peter, whom he also established as the «*origo et ratio unitatis*», this latter is the «*vicarius Christi*» of the «*una ecclesia*» in one place. This one place, i.e. the «*locus Petri*», is the «*ecclesia principalis*» from which the «*sacerdotalis unitas*» proceeds/originates («*exoritur*»). Rome's bishop sitting on the «*cathedra Petri*» is the «*matrix, radix, et ratio*» of the Church. Hence, her «*magnitudo*» allows her to «*praecedere*», and «*perfidia*» has no access to her.

⁴⁹⁹ Cyprian is in no way here denying that which he already has stated explicitly in *De Unitate* (PT) and indirectly implied in *Ep.* 69, viz. that «*primatus*» is given only to Peter alone in *De Unitate* (PT) and that Novatian's supporters illicitly claim for themselves «*primatus*» (and «*cathedra*» for that matter) in opposition to Rome's lawful bishop, Cornelius in *Ep.* 69. Even if one were to argue that «*primatus*» is possessed by each lawful bishop, a claim Cyprian never makes nor even insinuates but applies explicitly

demonstrating concord and patience, and consented (*consentire*) to them (*Ep.* 71). The bishops must do the same especially in matters pertaining to the truth of hope and faith and to the oneness/unity of the Church (*Ep.* 71). The bishops must hold the oneness/unity of the Catholic Church (*Ep.* 71).

There is no evidence of any change, confusion, or contradiction in Cyprian's thought as presented in any individual letter, among these letters taken together, or in light of *De Unitate* prior to the period of the baptismal controversy. There is an apparent contradiction, which must be emphasized here to be only a seeming contradiction, between Cyprian's usual and most frequent reference to the nature of oneness/unity as indivisible and undivided and his occasional mention of dividing the oneness/unity. As observed in this chapter (cf. section «4.1.9») Cyprian intimates in *Ep.* 59 that disobedience to the bishop leads one to «rend asunder Christ's Church by a division of oneness/unity». Cyprian would seem to contradict himself by stating in *Ep.* 69 (cf. section «4.2.2») that the Church is not «able to be rent asunder or divided against itself but...[that she enjoys] the oneness/unity of an inseparable and undivided house». This dilemma will be addressed and resolved in the following chapter.

and exclusively to Peter, «*primatus*» definitely remains then some kind of «*officium*» or «*potestas*» licitly held at least by any lawful bishop if not, according to Cyprian, by Peter alone. Cyprian is indirectly addressing Stephen, whose claim of «*primatus*» Cyprian does not contest. Apart from what Cyprian conceives as the only logical and truthful understanding of the nature of the Church's baptism and Stephen's mistaken opinion on the issue of heretical and schismatic «dipping in profane water», Cyprian takes issue with Stephen's further patronizing and paternalistic attitude and action toward his brother bishops, all of whom share a responsibility for the one Church. He does not thereby deny or even insinuate denial of «*primatus*» held by Peter.

CHAPTER THREE

Three Treatises of Cyprian

Four of Cyprian's thirteen treatises contain the term «*unitas*». The third chapter of this thesis analyzes *De Unitate*, that treatise dedicated to an explanation of «*unitas*» in which Cyprian uses the term twenty-seven times. He employs the term nine more times in three different treatises. Most scholars date *De dominica oratione*⁵⁰⁰, in which «*unitas*» is found five times, to the period shortly before or after the Decian persecution and the composition of the first version of *De Unitate*, i.e. between 250 and the middle of 252. Cyprian uses the term «*unitas*» three times in *De bono patientiae*⁵⁰¹, usually assigned to the height of the baptismal controversy

⁵⁰⁰ Clarke suggests Cyprian composed *De dominica oratione* either from his hiding place outside of Carthage during the Decian persecution in 251 or following his composition of *De Unitate* and so in late 251 or early 252, Cf. G.W. CLARKE, 690.707-708. Moreschini is of the same opinion, though he mentions Reveillaud's theory that Cyprian composed one of his earliest treatises in 250 as there is no explicit mention of the lapsed or schismatics in *De dominica oratione*, cf. C. MORESCHINI, «*Praefatio* [to *De dominica oratione*]», 88. Deferrari agrees that Cyprian composed the treatise in early 252 immediately following *De Unitate*, cf. R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises...*, 125.

⁵⁰¹ Clarke thinks Cyprian to have written *De bono patientiae* during the latter's dispute with Stephen over what amounts to the operation of grace in baptism. Cyprian mentions to Jubianus at the end of *Ep. 73* that he has written and attached the treatise to same letter, cf. *CCL III C*, 562. Jubianus was present at the annual Council of Carthage in September of 256 (*Sent. Episc. LXXXVII*), at which the contents of Cyprian's letter to Jubianus were read aloud. Thus, *De bono patientiae* was written certainly before this

between Cyprian and Stephen, probably in early 256. The term «*unitas*» appears only once in the less easily datable *De zelo et livore*⁵⁰², thought to have been composed around the same time as *De bono patientiae*.

This chapter's presentation will differ from the preceding two chapters in two respects. Three treatises, which as such are systematic in their nature, are analyzed in this chapter. None of them is a presentation on the concept of oneness/unity. Consequently, the few references to the term in each treatise do not allow for a thematic presentation of content. Similarly, so few references are not conducive to a significantly helpful synthesis beyond that provided in the summaries after each section. Cyprian's use of «*unitas*» in each of these three treatises will be analyzed in this chapter treatise by treatise. Any apparent change, confusion, contradiction, or continuity in his thought will be assessed in conclusion.

4.3.1 «*Unitas*» in *De dominica oratione*

The thirty-six chapters of this treatise, partially inspired by and modelled on but not theologically or even stylistically dependent on Tertullian's

council convened during the late summer of 256. The earliest date of the treatise's composition would follow a series of letters written during the years 254-255 again over the issue of heretical baptism. Clarke consequently assigns *De bono patientiae*'s composition to Spring of 256. Cf. G.W. CLARKE, 689.702-704.708-709. Also in agreement with dating the treatise to 256 is C. MORESCHINI, «*Praefatio* [to *De bono patientiae*]», 116. Conway agrees that while the treatise, which Cyprian himself acknowledges as a «*libellus*» («treatise») in *Ep.* 73, was unarguably «circulated» in the spring of 256, *De bono patientiae*'s homiletic style and content suggest the treatise possibly originated as a sermon. A variety of events during Cyprian's decade long episcopate could have occasioned such a treatise on the good of patience: the persecutions of Decius (250-251) and Valerian (257-258), the schisms of Novatian (Rome) and Felicissimus (Carthage) and the subsequent dilemma of the *lapsi* and the baptismal controversy, plague, and the looming threat of exile, to name a few. Cf. R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises...*, 260-261.

⁵⁰² Simonetti insists that *De zelo et livore* can be dated with certainty only to the interval between the persecutions of Decius (250-251) and Valerian (257-258), cf. M. SIMONETTI, ed., «*Praefatio* [to *De zelo et livore*]», 74. Clarke maintains Cyprian to have composed the treatise in 256 immediately following *De bono patientiae*, cf. G.W. CLARKE, 689.709. Deferrari observes that while many have followed Cyprian's contemporary and biographer in Carthage, the deacon Pontus, in associating the treatise's composition with the period immediately following *De bono patientiae*, others like H. Koch maintain that the internal evidence itself suggests an association not with the baptismal controversy but closer in its thematic nature to *De lapsis* much earlier during the two schisms of 251. Cf. R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises...*, 291.

treatise on the Lord's Prayer, may be divided into three sections⁵⁰³. Cyprian explains in the first seven chapters why the Lord's Prayer, the «Our Father», is the best prayer. Chapters eight through twenty-five exegete each of the seven principle clauses of the Lord's Prayer. Cyprian explains in the last eleven chapters how, where, when, why and for what one should pray.

The north-African bishop famous for his preoccupation with the Church's oneness/unity begins his exegesis of the very first two words of the Lord's prayer with an appeal to the *magister unitatis* himself⁵⁰⁴. Explaining why Christians say not «*Pater meus*» but «*Pater noster*», Cyprian reminds in chapter eight that «before everything the doctor of peace and the master of oneness/unity did not want prayer to be made individually or privately with the result that when one prays one prays merely for/on behalf of oneself»⁵⁰⁵. Prayer for the Church is public and common because «when we pray not for one but for the whole people, because we the whole people are one thing»⁵⁰⁶. «The God of peace and master of concord, who taught oneness/unity, thus wanted one to pray for/on behalf of all as He Himself bore all in one»⁵⁰⁷. Providing scriptural support from Dn 3,51, Ps 68,6, and Acts 1,14 Cyprian insists that God, «who makes those of one mind dwell in one home does not admit into the divine and eternal home except those with whom prayer is unanimous»⁵⁰⁸.

Exegeting the clause beseeching the Lord's forgiveness as we forgive those indebted to us because of transgressions against us, Cyprian recalls at the end of the twenty-third chapter that God accepts not the sacrifice of the dissident⁵⁰⁹. One must first be reconciled with one's brother in order that

⁵⁰³ Cfr. R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises...*, 125-126; J.P. MIGNE, ed., «Argumentum» to *De dominica oratione* in *Sancti Cypriani Tomus Unicus*, PL 4 (519 C); C. MORESCHINI, «Praefatio [to *De dominica oratione*]», 88.

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. *De dominica oratione* 7 (CCL III A, 93).

⁵⁰⁵ *De dominica oratione* 8: «Ante omnia pacis doctor atque unitatis magister singillatim noluit et privatim precem fieri, ut quis cum precatur pro se tantum precetur», CCL III A, 93.

⁵⁰⁶ *De dominica oratione* 8: «quando oramus, non pro uno sed pro populo toto rogamus, quia totus populus unum sumus», CCL III A, 93. Nor does Cyprian discredit private prayer as in the fourth chapter recalling that the Lord Himself «commanded us to pray secretly» («secrete orare nos praecepit», CCL III A, 91).

⁵⁰⁷ *De dominica oratione* 8: «Deus pacis et concordiae magister qui docuit unitatem, sic orare unum pro omnibus uoluit quomodo in uno omnes ipse portauit», CCL III A, 93.

⁵⁰⁸ *De dominica oratione* 8: «...quia Deus qui inhabitare facit unanimes in domo non admittit in diuinam et aeternam domum nisi apud quos est unanimes oratio», CCL III A, 93.

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. *De dominica oratione* 23 (CCL III A, 105).

God may be appeased with peaceful prayers⁵¹⁰. For «our peace and fraternal concord is the greater sacrifice to God and a people having been united of/from/out of the oneness/unity of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit»⁵¹¹.

Cyprian observes in the thirtieth chapter that the Lord prays that Peter's faith not fail and that all believe in him through the word of those whom he had sent «in order that they all be one, just as You, Father, in me and I in You in order that that they themselves may be in us»⁵¹². Cyprian marvels at the Lord's desire that the Christians remain not in a mere unanimity of mutual agreement but «in order that just as the Father and the Son are one so we, too, remain in that oneness/unity itself: so that from this it may be able to be understood how much one transgresses who rends assunder peace and oneness/unity...the Lord knew discord not to come into the kingdom of God»⁵¹³.

The notion that the *magister unitatis* taught oneness/unity does not pose any particular problem of change, confusion, or contradiction in itself or in Cyprian's thought. Cyprian speaks of oneness/unity as coming from God the Father himself throughout the *De Unitate* and reiterates there in the fifteenth chapter that «the Lord in the Gospel...taught the same oneness/unity and love by his teaching». Though Cyprian calls the Lord the «master of concord», he is not thereby equating concord with the Church's oneness/unity. Just as the principle of oneness/unity itself is grounded by a fundamental principle, i.e. Peter, as demonstrated in *De Unitate*, so the principle of concord is the Church's oneness/unity itself.

Cyprian reiterates the precedence of oneness/unity to concord in his next usage of the term «*unitas*», insisting that the greater sacrifice to God is one of both peace and concord by a people having been united [i.e. already] in the oneness/unity of/from/out of the Trinity itself. That this prayer and sacrifice can occur only in the Church is a given for Cyprian. Cyprian recalls in *Ep.* 66,8 that the Church was built on Peter, who speaks teaching

⁵¹⁰ Cf. *De dominica oratione* 23 (CCL III A, 105).

⁵¹¹ *De dominica oratione* 23: «*Sacrificium Deo maius est pax nostra et fraterna concordia et de unitate Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti plebs adunata*», CCL III A, 105. Cf. other translations of «*de unitate*» as «in the unity» in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* translation A.C. COXE – J. DONALDSON, – A. ROBERTS, ed., «Cyprian», 454; and the CUA translation in R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises...*, 148. L&S indicates no translation under the entry of «*de*» as «in».

⁵¹² *De dominica oratione* 30: «*ut omnes unum sint, sicut et tu pater in me et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis sint*», CCL III A, 108.

⁵¹³ *De dominica oratione* 30: «*ut quomodo unum sunt pater et filius, sic et nos in ipsa unitate maneamus: ut hinc quoque possit intellegi quantum delinquat qui unitatem scindit et pacem,...sciret ad regnum Dei discordiam non uenire*», CCL III A, 108.

and showing that «the people having been united to the bishop are the Church...and one who is not with the bishop [is] not in the Church»⁵¹⁴. Cyprian throughout the *De Unitate* expounds on the logical necessity of remaining attached to Mother Church, whose oneness/unity and love are preserved in her one source, root, head, womb, and origin, Peter, all of which originates in the Triune God.

Cyprian's insistence that Christians remain not in a mere unanimity of mutual concord but in oneness/unity itself is found in *De Unitate*, also. Remaining in the oneness/unity of the Father and Son is imperative and reechoed in *De Unitate*. Cyprian maintains in *De Unitate* that the grave transgression of introducing schisms, breaking peace, and not remaining in this oneness/unity bars one from entering heaven. One who rends asunder peace and oneness/unity, or rather attempts to do so, ultimately succeeds only in separating oneself from the peace and oneness/unity of God's Church. The seeming contradiction of rending asunder oneness/unity and the indivisibility of the same oneness/unity is resolved by Cyprian himself in *De Unitate*. Oneness/unity cannot be rent assunder, and anything separated from the womb/origin of such oneness/unity dies. The Church does not abandon the schismatics. Rather the schismatics' rending asunder the Church's oneness/unity never succeeds because the same schismatics in forsaking the Church, whose oneness/unity cannot be rent, abandon the head and origin of truth.

Summary

The «magister» of «unitas» teaches that the «ecclesia» is to remain in the very «unitas» shared by the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, the «origo» of such «unitas». This inseparable «unitas» is itself the indivisible «unitas» of the «ecclesia». *De Unitate* teaches that this very «unitas» is preserved (*servatur*) in and proceeds/originates from (*exoritur*) «ille/unus», i.e. «Petrus», upon whom Christ founded his «ecclesia». There appears no change, confusion, or contradiction either within *De dominica oratione*

⁵¹⁴ Ep. 66,8: «illi sunt ecclesia, plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori suo grex adhaerens...et si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse», CCL III C, 443. The Church Catholic, i.e. the Church spread all over the earth like the many limbs of one tree grounded in its one root, is connected and joined by the glue of the bishops cohering among themselves, which not only does not exclude but logically necessarily includes the origin (*origo*) of the Church's oneness/unity and the beginning/webbing out (*exordium*) of Apostolic honor and power. Cf. «ecclesia quae catholica una est scissa non sit neque diuis, sed sit utique conexa et cohaerentium sibi invicem sacerdotum glutino copulata», CCL III C, 443.

itself or between this treatise and Cyprian's thought as expressed in *De Unitate* and his *Epistolae*.

4.3.2 «Unitas» in *De bono patientiae*

While Cyprian reiterates many of Tertullian's ideas on what Carthage's mid-third century bishop revered as the most advantageous and necessary of virtues, Cyprian's *De bono patientiae* is in no way overshadowed by the work on the goodness of patience by his *magister*, as Cyprian is purportedly to have regarded Tertullian⁵¹⁵. Cyprian briefly contrasts pagan patience with Christian patience in the first three chapters before exegeting passages from Genesis to the Apocalypse throughout the treatise's remaining twenty-one chapters. Cyprian refers to oneness/unity three times in the fifteenth chapter.

«The bond of fraternity, the foundation of peace, the tenacity and strength of oneness/unity is love (*caritas*), which is greater than both faith and hope, which precedes both works and martyrdoms, which will endure with us always eternal in the heavenly kingdoms»⁵¹⁶. Cyprian advises that charity will not last if deprived of patience⁵¹⁷ and the substantial reality of needing to be sustained and tolerated, nor will it persevere with any virtues or roots⁵¹⁸. The Apostle Paul says that tolerance and patience are joined to charity, and that charity consists in, among other things, enduring everything⁵¹⁹. Cyprian says that from this Paul shows that what becomes acquainted with enduring everything is able to persevere tenaciously⁵²⁰. Paul urges that the brethren should be «endeavoring to preserve the oneness/unity of the Spirit in the conjunction of peace»⁵²¹. Cyprian maintains that Paul «proved neither peace nor oneness/unity able to be

⁵¹⁵ R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises...*, 262; C. MORESCHINI, «Praefatio [to *De bono patientiae*]», 116.

⁵¹⁶ *De bono patientiae* 15: «*Caritas fraternitatis uinculum est, fundamentum pacis, tenacitas ac firmitas unitatis, quae et spe et fide maior est, quae et opera et martyria praecedat, quae nobiscum semper aeterna in regnis caelestibus permanebit*», CCL III A, 126.

⁵¹⁷ Cyprian emphasizes the importance of patience as instrumental in really uniting others to us, cf. *Ep.* 52,4 (CCL III B, 249).

⁵¹⁸ Cf. *De bono patientiae* 15 (CCL III A, 126-127).

⁵¹⁹ Cf. *De bono patientiae* 15 (CCL III A, 127).

⁵²⁰ *De bono patientiae* 15: «*Ostendit inde illam perseuerare tenaciter posse quod nouerit omnia sustinere*», CCL III A, 127.

⁵²¹ *De bono patientiae* 15: «*sustinentes...inuicem in dilectione, satis agentes seruare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis*», CCL III A, 127.

preserved unless the brethren cherish one another with mutual tolerance and care for the bond of concord with interceding patience»⁵²².

Cyprian refers to love (*caritas*) in *De bono patientiae* not as the principle but as the strength and tenacity of oneness/unity, which love (*caritas*) and oneness/unity together exist eternally and inseparably in their origin in the kingdom of both heaven, i.e. the Triune God, and the Church, i.e. Peter. Cyprian states that love (*caritas*) among the brethren, however, will not last unless patience and mutual tolerance are maintained. This mutual tolerance and patience form the roots and strengths of brotherly love (*caritas*), i.e. the brethren cherishing one another and vigilantly guarding the bond of concord. This love (*caritas*) among the brethren, i.e. this inseparably cohering concord as described in *De Unitate*, likewise is grafted onto the Church, i.e. the mystery/sacrament of oneness/unity itself and the bond, or principle, of such concord, or fraternal love (*caritas*), which necessarily includes being grafted onto the origin in which is preserved the Church's oneness/unity, Peter. The inseparably cohering concord, the fraternal love (*caritas*), is joined to the Church and necessarily her origin, Peter, by the glue/cement of concord itself. Such concord demands mutual tolerance, patience, and a real effort at preserving the «oneness/unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace». Only thus are peace and oneness/unity preserved. Only with such an admittedly not very easily maintained disposition is demonstrated credibly the one episcopate of the one Catholic Church, neither divided nor rent asunder «but indeed connected and joined by the glue of the bishops cohering with one another»⁵²³.

Summary

Only a real effort at «*tolerantia mutua*» and «*patientia*» that achieves «*caritas fraterna*» can guarantee not that the «*unitas*» in itself of the «*ecclesia*» be preserved. Such is the case already, as the «*unitas*» is preserved in the «*origo*» as explained in *De Unitate*. Rather an «*inseparabilis cohaerentis concordia*» strengthened by «*patientia*» and «*tolerantia mutua*» preserves «*pax*» and «*unitas*» for the sake of that same «*concordia*» itself by being joined to the «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia*».

⁵²² *De bono patientiae* 15: «*Probauit nec unitatem seruari posse nec pacem, nisi se inuicem fratres mutua tolerantia foueant et concordiae uinculum patientia intercedente custodiant*», CCL III A, 127.

⁵²³ Cf. *Ep.* 66,8: «*...quando ecclesia quae catholica una est scissa non sit neque diuisa, sed sit utique conexas et cohaerentium sibi inuicem sacerdotum glutino copulata*», CCL III C, 443.

4.3.3 «Unitas» in *De zelo et livore*

This often called «companion» treatise to *De bono patientiae*⁵²⁴ explains in the first four chapters that jealousy and envy are especially wicked, the origin of which is the devil, who himself was moved to rebellion by envy of man's creation in God's own image and likeness⁵²⁵. Cyprian in chapters five and seven through seventeen warns against jealousy and envy and implores Christians to avoid these evils, instead imitating the good examples evidenced throughout Sacred Scripture. The final chapter maintains that one will please the Lord forever in heaven provided one please him first in this world. Cyprian encourages Christians to consider the heavenly kingdom «Consider the heavenly kingdom, unto which the Lord admits none save the concordant and one-minded»⁵²⁶. «Peacemakers alone can be called the sons of God, who, having been united by birth and the divine law, correspond to the likeness of God the Father and Christ»⁵²⁷.

Cyprian in the sixth chapter asserts that jealousy, the root of all evils, and likewise envy instigate all sorts of other sins including avarice, ambition, pride, treachery, savageness, impatience, discord, and wrath⁵²⁸. «One is hastened into heresies and schisms so long as priests are disparaged, bishops envied, or because one complains that rather he himself had not been ordained or disdains to bear another chief»⁵²⁹. From all these things «the bond of the Lord's peace is broken, fraternal charity is violated, the truth is adulterated, oneness/unity is rent assunder»⁵³⁰. Such a one is «the enemy not of man but of honor»⁵³¹.

This last reference to oneness/unity must not be taken out of context so as to imply a change, or confusion, or contradiction in Cyprian's theory of

⁵²⁴ R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises...*, 262; M. SIMONETTI, «*Praefatio* [to *De zelo et livore*]», 291.

⁵²⁵ CCL III A, 75.

⁵²⁶ *De zelo et livore* 18: «*Cogita caeleste regnum, ad quod nisi concordēs adque unanimes Dominus admittit*», CCL III A, 85.

⁵²⁷ *De zelo et livore* 18: «*...filii Dei hi soli possint vocari qui sint pacifici, qui natiuitate et lege diuina ad similitudinem Dei Patris et Christi respondeant adunati*», CCL III A, 85-86.

⁵²⁸ Cf. *De zelo et livore* 6 (CCL III A, 78).

⁵²⁹ *De zelo et livore* 6: «*...ad haereses adque schismata prosilitur, dum obtrectatur sacerdotibus, dum episcopis inuidetur, dum quis aut queritur non se potius ordinatum aut dedignatur alterum ferre praepositum*», CCL III A, 78.

⁵³⁰ *De zelo et livore* 6: «*Hinc dominicae pacis uinculum rumpitur, hinc caritas fraterna violatur, hinc adulteratur ueritas, unitas scinditur*», CCL III A, 78.

⁵³¹ *De zelo et livore* 6: «*...non hominis sed honoris inimicus*», CCL III A, 78. How might this be understood in light of the TR's notion that Peter is the «*exordium honoris et potestatis*»?

the indivisibility of oneness/unity. The discourse on oneness/unity here is to be understood as that treated in *De bono patientiae*. Like the effects of impatience and intolerance on fraternal charity spoken of in *De bono patientiae*, Cyprian warns in *De zelo et livore* that similar sins instigated by jealousy and envy will severely damage the integrity of that same fraternal charity, or inseparably cohering concord, the principle of which is oneness/unity by means of that concord's being grafted onto the Church's oneness/unity, the origin of which is Peter.

Summary

As similarly explained about the advantage of mutual tolerance and the good of patience in his treatise of the same title, the grave sins of «*zelus et livor*» lead to schism. The ability of the «*inseparabilis cohaerentis concordia*», or «*caritas fraterna*», to remain grafted onto the «*unitas*» of the «*ecclesia*» and necessarily her «*origo*», «*Petrus*», consequently is jeopardized. Avoiding jealousy and envy prevents schism and so preserves the «*unitas*» of that same «*inseparabilis cohaerentis concordia*», or «*caritas fraterna*», by remaining in the «*ecclesiae unitas*».

4.3.4 Conclusion

An analysis of Cyprian's use of the term «*unitas*» in these three treatises that subsequently removes phrases from their context and/or refrains from studying them in the context of the whole will render a seeming change, confusion, and/or contradiction in Cyprian's thought. That such a perception, which is based on a superficial reading of seeming inconsistencies in Cyprian's use of the term «*unitas*», is inaccurate cannot be emphasized enough. There are two reasons, or rather two seeming contradictions, that have already been addressed but deserve to be revisited here. The first contradiction concerns the apparent simultaneous divisibility and indivisibility of oneness/unity. The second contradiction concerns the two ways in which oneness/unity seems to be preserved, i.e. simultaneously «*in origine*» and by the fraternal brethren cherishing one another with «*tolerantia mutua*» and guarding the «*concordiae uinculum*» with patience.

Regarding the first apparent contradiction, Cyprian states in the twenty-third chapter of *De Unitate* that «oneness/unity is not able to be rent asunder». What does Cyprian mean, then, when stating as he does in *De dominica oratione* that one who rends asunder oneness/unity sins gravely, in *De zelo et livore* that the Church's oneness/unity is divided by grave sins, and in *De bono patientiae* that the same oneness/unity cannot be

preserved without mutual toleration and patience? Is Cyprian contradicting himself?

Either oneness/unity is not divisible or it is divisible, but the law of contradiction prohibits any co-existence of the two⁵³². Such a position would be irrational to say the least, and in order to resolve any possible misunderstanding Cyprian says much more. «Therefore, who is so wretched and treacherous, who so insane with the madness of discord, that either one believe the oneness/unity of God, the vestment of the Lord, Christ's Church able to be rent asunder or dare to rend it asunder»? Cyprian maintains that possessing Christ's tunic, i.e. the oneness/unity of the Church and, thus, being in the Church, while simultaneously rending her asunder is not only an inconsistency but a logical impossibility. Logically, one who rends asunder the Church neither can preserve oneness/unity. Those who rend assunder, or rather attempt to rend asunder the Church, are consequently separated from the Church and necessarily her origin not because they have rent either asunder, but because «they themselves have been rent asunder from the Church»⁵³³. Consequently, one's rending asunder, or more accurately one's attempt to rend assunder the Church's oneness/unity will succeed only in separating oneself from that very oneness/unity. Cyprian never refers to the action itself of rending asunder oneness/unity as preserved and experienced «*in origine*». Rather the Church's oneness/unity is experienced as rent asunder by those tree branches, streams, and children broken off, cut off, and rent assunder from their tenacious root, source, womb, and origin, i.e. Peter. As Cyprian insists, «they have abandoned us [i.e. the Church's oneness/unity preserved *in origine*], not we from them [i.e. the broken off schismatics]». Human free will means that anyone, by entertaining grave sins like jealousy and envy, can separate oneself from the Church's oneness/unity preserved *in origine*. Likewise anyone, by cherishing the brethren with mutual toleration and guarding the bond of concord with patience, can remain attached to the oneness/unity of the Church who, her one trunk grounded by a tenacious root, spreads her branches over the whole earth. Therein is the explanation for the second seeming contradiction to which we now turn.

Is the oneness/unity to which Cyprian refers throughout *De Unitate*, in which he maintains «*unitas*» to be preserved nowhere save «*in origine*», the same as that oneness/unity to which Cyprian refers in *De bono patientiae*, in which «*unitas*» is said to be preserved by the brethren cherishing one another with «mutual tolerance» and guarding the «bond of

⁵³² Either $u = u$ or $\sim u = \sim u$ but $u \neq \sim u$, where the variable «*u*» stands for indivisible oneness/unity and « $\sim u$ » stands for divisible oneness/unity.

⁵³³ Cf. *De Unitate* 12: «*ut ipsi ab ecclesia scissi sunt*» CCL III, 257.

concord» with patience? The oneness/unity about which Cyprian is speaking is one and the same in each of these cases. The way in which the Church, the simultaneously divine and human body of Christ, experiences her own oneness/unity, however, is two-fold.

God does not compromise man's free will. Each bishop has the free judgment of his will in the administration of the Church *in loco suo*⁵³⁴, for which he will be accountable to Christ alone⁵³⁵. Maintaining peace, charity, and oneness/unity among one another, subsequently, is far from being easy. Grave sins like jealousy and envy leading to schism exacerbate an already delicately maintained peace, charity, and oneness/unity, which fragile balance ultimately collapses if impatience and intolerance persist. Cyprian frequently cites Paul's exhortation of the brethren to endure one another making every effort to «preserve the oneness/unity of the Spirit in the conjunction of peace»⁵³⁶. Even God Himself patiently endures schisms and heresies while simultaneously accusing the treacherous and reproaching them for discord⁵³⁷.

The concord of oneness/unity (*unitatis concordiam*)⁵³⁸, or the fraternal charity, can be rent assunder due to human failure⁵³⁹. The bond, or principle, of that same concord (*concordiae vinculum*), however, which principle is the Church's oneness/unity, is preserved forever in the origin (*in origine*), i.e. Peter. This origin, Peter, is the principle, the bond, of the Church's oneness/unity⁵⁴⁰ and *de facto* cannot be rent assunder. If one does

⁵³⁴ Regarding the Church administered by one bishop «in his place», i.e. his diocese, cf. *Ep.* 68,5 (CCL III C, 468); M. MACCARONE, «*Sedes Apostolica – Vicarius Petri*», 276.

⁵³⁵ Cf. *Sent. episc. LXXXVII* in *PL* 3, 1054 A.

⁵³⁶ «*Seruare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis*». Cyprian quotes this passage from Paul in *De Unitate* 8 (CCL III, 255) and *De bono patientiae* 15 (CCL III A, 127).

⁵³⁷ Cf. *De Unitate* 12, (CCL III, 258).

⁵³⁸ Cf. *De Unitate* 21, (CCL III, 265); *Ep.* 55,7, (CCL III B, 263).

⁵³⁹ While divine «charity» is itself «firm» and «inseparable», which charity grounds human or «fraternal» charity, «Christian unanimity» is connected to such divine «charity» and, therefore, its redeemed but weakened human element leaves it susceptible to rupture. Cf. *Ep.* 69,5: «The Lordly sacrifices themselves declare Christian unanimity connected in itself by firm and inseparable love» («*unanimitatem christianam firma sibi atque inseparabili caritate conexam etiam ipsa dominica sacrificia declarant*», CCL III C, 476).

⁵⁴⁰ Oneness/unity is the bond («*vinculum*»), or principle, of concord. Regarding the notion that Peter is not only the «*origo*» of oneness/unity but the «*ratio*», the «principle of» or «reason for», such oneness/unity cf. not only *De Unitate* 4 (PT), but also *Ep.* 70,3: «...*una ecclesia a Christo domino nostro super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata*», (CCL III C, 511). Compare this ablative absolute as translated «...Church founded by Christ our Lord upon Peter in the origin and established plan of unity», in R.J. DEFERRARI, ed., *St. Cyprian: Letters...*, 261; or «the Church founded by Christ the Lord upon Peter, by a source and principle of unity», in COXE, A.C. – DONALDSON, J. –

not share in the oneness/unity of the Church, which necessarily includes the origin and principle of that oneness/unity, then neither does one preserve oneness/unity with anyone, much less oneself. «Indeed how can he, who does not agree with the body of the Church herself and with the universal fraternity, agree with anyone? How can two or three, whom one agrees to be separated from Christ and His Gospel, be gathered in Christ's name»⁵⁴¹?

In other words, oneness/unity itself is preserved in its origin and reason/principle. If one (A) preserves patiently and tolerantly the bond of concord with the origin and reason/principle (P) of the Church's

ROBERTS, A.C., ed., 376. Cyprian here seems to make explicit that Christ is the logical «ratio» for Peter's being the «ratio» of the Church's «unitas» as such oneness/unity comes from God. Cyprian seems to introduce implicitly an intimate identification between Christ and Peter. Consequently, Cyprian's application of the term «ratio» to Peter in this letter would seem to further verify the *PT* as authentically Cyprianic.

Even if by this ablative absolute Cyprian is calling Christ the origin and reason/principle of oneness/unity, he is by no means denying that Peter, upon whom Christ founded His Church, is the origin of that same oneness/unity. Cyprian will repeat only months later in *Ep. 73,7*: «Now the Lord gave that power first to Peter, upon whom he built the Church and whence he established and shows the origin of oneness/unity, with the result that what that man [i.e. Peter] has loosed will be loosed on earth» («*Nam Petro, primum Dominus, super quem aedificauit ecclesiam et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit ut id solueretur in terris quod ille soluisset*», *CCL III C*, 537). Nor does the assertion that Cyprian here intentionally identifies both Christ and Peter as the origin of the Church's oneness/unity seem to be mere coincidence, or a change leading to confusion and/or contradiction, or an interpretation foreign to Cyprian's thought injected violently or isegeted. If anything this explicit identification of Christ as the origin and principle of oneness/unity is contained necessarily, and at least implicitly, in Cyprian's declaration in *De Unitate* that such oneness/unity comes from the Triune God in Christ, symbolized by and carried by his tunic from the heavenly mysteries/sacraments cohering with God in heaven.

Cyprian has referred to Peter as the origin of the Church's oneness/unity too frequently throughout his tenure as bishop for anyone, including Cyprian himself, to deny rationally now either this principle in itself or Cyprian's consistent teaching on this principle. Moreover, Cyprian in *Ep. 68,5* (*CCL III C*, 468) tells Stephen that «the glorious honor of our predecessors, the blessed martyrs Cornelius and Lucius, is needing to be preserved. Since whose memory we honor, dearest brother, you, who have been made successor and vicar to them, all the more must honor and preserve by your gravity and authority. Cyprian states about three and a half years earlier in *Ep. 55,8* (*CCL III B*, 265) that Cornelius was made bishop of Rome when the place of his immediate predecessor, Fabian, which is one and the same with the place of Peter, and the position of the episcopal/priestly chair there were vacant. Cf. M. MACCARONE, «*Sedes Apostolica – Vicarius Petri*», 275-276.308-309.

⁵⁴¹ *De Unitate* 12: «*Quomodo autem potest ei cum aliquo conuenire, cui cum corpore ipsius ecclesiae et cum uniuersa fraternitate non conuenit? Quomodo possunt duo aut tres in nomine Christi colligi, quos constet a Christo et ab eius euangelio separari?*», *CCL III*, 258.

oneness/unity, then that necessarily means that one (A) likewise preserves the bond of concord with everyone else (B) who preserves patiently and tolerantly the bond of concord with the origin and reason/principle (P) of the Church's oneness/unity. The converse of this is equally valid and true⁵⁴². Then and only then can the concord of oneness/unity be preserved, i.e. oneness/unity experienced in the dynamic of the fraternity joined into the solid oneness/unity of the body by the glue/cement of concord⁵⁴³.

The oneness/unity of the Church preserved and enjoyed is one and the same for the origin of oneness/unity and the concord of oneness/unity. The manner in which that preservation and enjoyment is experienced existentially speaking is different. One may suppose the concord of oneness/unity to suffer more than the origin of oneness/unity in the event that patience and tolerance are tried and found wanting if not altogether lost. Cyprian quoting Jeremiah 2,13 observes: «They have abandoned me, the source of living water, and they have dug for themselves worn-out cisterns, which cannot carry water»⁵⁴⁴. Yet David certainly did not rejoice over the death of his rebellious son, Absalom. The prodigal son's father could not but weep with tears of joy upon his wayward son's return. The Good Shepherd seeks out the lost sheep in an effort to gather all the sheep into one fold, that the flock may be one with one shepherd, one God. Nevertheless, by their exercise of free will «they have abandoned us, not we from them, and since they have given birth to heresies and schisms...they have forsaken the head and origin of truth». Consequently, if not tragically, they will die. For this very reason Cyprian adamantly insists in the *TR* of *De Unitate* that «we bishops must hold firmly to and vindicate/claim oneness/unity in order that we prove/demonstrate as credible the episcopate itself one and undivided».

In conclusion absolutely no change, confusion, nor contradiction exists in Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity either within any single treatise, or among these treatises, or between them and *De Unitate* and the *Epistolae Cypriani*.

⁵⁴² $A \cdot P \supset A \cdot B^P = A \cdot B^P \supset A \cdot P$.

⁵⁴³ Cf. *Ep.* 52,4 in which Cyprian explains how those led astray by schisms of 251 «will be united» to the Church: «The mercy of God the Father and the indulgence of Christ our Lord and our patience really will unite the others to us» («*Ceteros uero nobis adunabit dei patris misericordia et Christi domini nostri indulgentia et nostra patientia*»), (CCL III B, 249).

⁵⁴⁴ Cf. *De Unitate* 11 (CCL III, 257).

PART FIVE

Conclusion

The Preface, Introduction, and the end of Part One of this thesis assert that only a philological analysis of the term «*unitas*» throughout classical Latinity can avoid potentially the endless cycle of contradictory scholarly opinions on Cyprian's thought on the subject. Such an analysis claims to be based not on *a priori* judgements and unchecked presumptions, but on a direct analysis of what actually is stated both by Cyprian and by the only other nineteen ancient Latin authors plus one Christian Church council to use the term prior to the *Pax Constantiniana*.

Twelve hallmarks of the ancient non-Christian Latin authors' conception of oneness/unity are evident: 1) oneness/unity is not plurality; 2) oneness/unity corresponds not to accidental quantity, i.e. number (*unus*), but rather to a substantial quality, i.e. one thing only (*unum*); 3) oneness/unity is uninterrupted continuity cohering in itself and not a composite of bodies united together with external aid; 4) oneness/unity requires that there be an origin (*origofons/radix*) from which are derived, to which are connected, and by which are sustained all things (*rivus/corpus/societas*), and a bond (*vinculum*) is salvific and necessary unto preserving oneness/unity, without which oneness/unity (of a *res publica*, *imperium*, or *tradux* for example) will be destroyed; 5) just as oneness/unity emerges out of a greater reality, everything that exists both derives out of oneness/unity and possesses oneness/unity; 6) tension within oneness/unity is an essential principle as together they animate the world; 7) oneness/unity separates that which is not within while simultaneously is that through which things join together; 8) oneness/unity's beauty is in its uniformity, which is enhanced with variations; 9) oneness/unity implies

identity of relation; 10) the presence or absence of oneness/unity affects future identity and integrity; 11) nature and man tend toward oneness/unity, without which they suffer; 12) oneness/unity requires much cultivation, attention, and time. Nowhere appear notions of division or separation existing or being able to exist within oneness/unity. Moreover, these same principles are maintained without exception by the later Christian authors, who either reiterate or paraphrase them, or (especially in Tertullian's case) enlist them in further theological (especially Trinitarian) elaborations.

Some phrases and sentences are different or even missing in one version of *De Unitate* compared with the other. Cyprian was careful not to contradict himself in editing the text. These changes neither introduce nor inject Cyprian's thought with any confusion or contradiction either in this treatise or in any of his other writings. Nor do there appear any changes, much less confusion or contradiction, in any of his writings during the baptismal controversy as compared with his thought as expressed prior to that period. Can any less be expected from the keen mind of the great upholder not just of oneness/unity but also of reason in the thought process of intelligent argumentation? Cyprian's thought is vindicated as entirely consistent, and continuity is a hallmark of his theory of oneness/unity.

Such a conclusion has been reached with Bévenot's *caveat* and Dunn's «warning» carefully in mind. This thesis has implemented an unprecedented approach in studying Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity. Rather than isolating «particular sentences or phrases from their context [and subsequently building] up a system from such phrases gathered from disparate contexts and [calling] it Cyprian's "thought"», this thesis has carefully, systematically, and thoroughly analyzed the use of the term «*unitas*» in the context of each of the 233 instances of the term in classical Latin literature prior to Constantine and specifically in the context of the 101 instances of the term in the entire *Corpus Cypriani*. A synthesis of Cyprian's thought on the Church's oneness/unity as determined by this study is rendered possible.

Oneness/unity and love have their origin in the Father in the Triune God. Jesus Christ, as God incarnate and the image of the Father on earth, hands down this oneness/unity and love to his Church in which oneness/unity and love endure inseparably together for all eternity. Christ establishes his one Church on this one, Peter, the origin and principle/reason of oneness/unity. Christ gives primacy and his keys to the first one, Peter, who is the origin of episcopal and sacerdotal oneness/unity. The honor and power of binding and loosing given to Peter is bestowed upon the other Apostles through Peter.

Each and every lawful bishop is a successor to the Apostles who stand in Christ's stead. The bishops by virtue of baptism are in the Church, which is the people united and joined to their respective bishop and not *vice versa*. The Church, consequently, is in the bishop. Each bishop through Peter holds equal honor and power of the episcopate in its totality in the one Church in the one place on the one chair where he is bishop. There is only one bishop on each chair in each respective place in one Church, for which one Church all the bishops are responsible.

The one bishop who finds himself on the one chair of Peter in the one place of Peter in one Church is the successor and vicar of all his predecessor bishops there, i.e. at Rome, the principle Church from which episcopal/sacerdotal oneness/unity originates and proceeds. This is because Mother Church's oneness/unity is preserved in her one origin, source, font, womb, and root, in that one Peter, whose successor and vicar is Rome's bishop in Christ's stead. Peter, to whom Christ gave primacy and his keys and from whom Christ established the origin and reason/principle of the Church's oneness/unity, consequently affords the one Church in Rome contained in her bishop a certain magnitude and capacity to preside, as well as divine protection from any access attempted by the evils of faithlessness and perfidy. Remaining in God's eternal love and oneness/unity in the Church necessarily means that one be joined and united to, i.e. in communion with, the one Catholic Church contained in her one bishop in Rome.

The baptized must remain joined to, united to, and in communion with their respective bishop. Bishops, whose communion with the bishop in Rome is a prerequisite, must remain joined to, united to, and in communion with each other as this is the divine plan handed down by Christ to the one Church of God from the love and oneness/unity shared by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The bishops and the Church contained in them in their respective places are joined to one another by the cement of mutual concord (with one another) and the bond of oneness/unity (with the one Church in Rome). Such communion, while reflecting God's state of being, is not always realized very easily for man.

Each bishop enjoys the free exercise of his judgment and the free judgment of his will – each will have to answer to God for his actions. This in no way legitimizes, however, any bishop or anyone else rupturing the mutual fraternal concord and separating oneself from oneness/unity. If disagreements arise the bishops must be vigilant that serious sins like jealousy, envy, and pride are vanquished by mutual tolerance and patience. Otherwise heresy, i.e. schism, will arise, which is precisely what the devil seeks. Mutual fraternal concord tempered by patience occurs when bishops

remain joined, united, and in communion with one another and with the bond of oneness/unity. This bond is the one Church, whose origin, principle/reason, and guarantee of authority is the one Church in Rome contained in her bishop. Such communion, such mutual concord, such fraternal charity requires man's response in love. Love is sometimes difficult, especially when pain is caused for the sake of another at the expense of oneself. This love is precisely that which Love himself incarnate has given to the Church. Such is the synthesis of Cyprian's theory of oneness/unity as determined in this thesis via the philological analysis of his use of the term «*unitas*» in its proper context. Moreover, such is far removed from Tertullian's ecclesiology that «the church [is] of the spirit through spiritual men, the church [is] not the number of bishops»⁵⁴⁵.

What happens when an unexpected contradiction to the essential nature of the Church arises from the Church's origin and principle, which is incapable error? In other words, what does one do when the very keystone, Peter, that grounds the integrity of the rest of the edifice, the Church, apparently alters the essential nature of that structure?

This is precisely what occurred during the baptismal controversy between Cyprian and Stephen. This debate, while vital to understanding Cyprian's sacramental theology, was not primarily instigated or antagonized by Cyprian's theory of the Church's oneness/unity. The debate resulted not from Rome's bishop illicitly usurping undue authority. The disagreement was not over the permanence or impermanence of sacramental grace within baptism or holy orders. Nor was there debate concerning whether or not the moral integrity of a lawful minister of the sacraments effected their validity and efficacy. While these last two issues would seem in their own right to be points of contention between Cyprian and Stephen, the baptismal controversy debated the issue concerning one's incorporation into the Church, whose origin and reason/principle is Rome's bishop as the successor of Peter in the one Church there.

The sacrament of baptism answers the what, how, and why of man's salvation as located uniquely in Christ. In other words, through its water (matter) and words (form) baptism is the means whereby the would-be disciple of Christ becomes a Christian and attains man's goal of salvation. Cyprian was concerned, however, with the questions of where and by whom such an ontologically transformative and eternally determinative event occurs.

⁵⁴⁵ «*sed ecclesia spiritus per spiritalem hominem, non ecclesia numerus episcoporum*» in TERTULLIANUS, «*De pudicitia*», XXI.17, in *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954, 1328.

Rome's bishop, Stephen, was stating apparently that entrance into the Church, i.e. the body of Christ, could occur through the hands of those outside the Church. Cyprian patiently and respectfully submitted a rational argument against Stephen's position. Both sides agreed with the Apostle Paul's instruction that there is only one Church, one Spirit, one faith, one baptism, one Christ, and one God who is Father of all. These all share in the same divine oneness/unity. Logically there cannot be a variety or plurality of oneness/unity by definition. How, then, can one, who is not in the one Church, give the one Spirit through the one Baptism? How can one give what one does not have? Cyprian argued that the one Church, which participates in Trinitarian oneness/unity, is the only human body divinely instituted that is capable of administering the saving grace of baptism through her legitimate ministers, viz. lawful bishops. The logic of Cyprian's argument is impeccable.

Cyprian's position was confronted, although the letter is lost, with an apparently irrational, or at least poorly argued and perhaps patronizing response from Stephen⁵⁴⁶. Cyprian was caused great pain and confusion precisely because his rational and logical argument was met apparently with a less than equitable response from him whom Cyprian defended to be in Christ's stead in the place of the origin and principle of the oneness/unity of the divinely protected Church, to which faithlessness and perfidy have no access. Paternal and fraternal dialogue respecting the dignity of a man, his service, and his office and a properly theological discourse would appear to have been less than appreciated in favor of a more immediate and seemingly easier paternalistic authoritarianism.

This issue, much more than for example the quartodeciman dispute, was exponentially, nay infinitely more important as «*salus extra ecclesiam non est*». The baptismal controversy would later be at the heart of the Donatist controversy, the first theological issue with which Constantine unwittingly would be confronted almost immediately after winning the entire Western Roman Empire on 28 October 312. Constantine determined a major obstacle to his goal of preserving oneness/unity within the Roman Empire to be an identity crisis within the Church herself. The disagreement that had begun with Cyprian and Stephen over fifty years earlier now had mushroomed into a much more encompassing debate. Is Cyprian's optimism that in the midst of grave disagreements bishops would, or even could continue to remain in the oneness/unity of the Church so long as they respect one another's free will? Can a particular tenet of faith be so essential to the Church's self-identity that her members' one-mindedness,

⁵⁴⁶ This inference is from asides made by Cyprian himself in *Ep.* 73 and 74 and from *Ep.* 75 from Firmilian, bishop of Cesarea, to Cyprian (cf. *CCL* III C, 580-604).

unanimity, and concord of agreement with the origin professing that creed are essential to remaining in her oneness/unity? While oneness/unity may be preserved in the origin, what responsibility beyond the passive and complacent assertion of such does the origin itself have for actively participating in and fostering that oneness/unity?

There is no textual evidence in the *Corpus Cypriani* to suggest that Cyprian ever changed his mind regarding the position and role of Rome's bishop. Nor can it be suggested that such a proponent not only of oneness/unity, which cannot be separated by a conflict of wills, but also of fraternal concord and unanimity, which is susceptible to such ruptures, would have entertained the idea of breaking concord and separating himself from the origin of the Church's oneness/unity, tantamount to rendering oneself an enemy and adversary of Christ and his Church.

It may be hypothesized quite simply that the one Church, metaphorically personified in Cyprian, experienced a fundamental crisis of her own faith in the context of the baptismal controversy. Faith in the ineffable God, who is immune from error or malevolence, is difficult enough for mere mortals, who are capable of erroneous judgments. Faith in the same God through a divinely established human institution preserved from error would appear even more miraculously supernatural. Cyprian and the Church experienced precisely and painfully the logical conclusion to and ramifications of his theory of oneness/unity when fully applied to the existential ecclesial reality.

The conclusion to Part One of this thesis suggests that the following statement of Bévenot would be either confirmed or questioned in this conclusion. He asserts that Cyprian had no «all-embracing preconceived system, and [this fact] did not preserve him from occasional inconsistencies». Bévenot's assessment of Cyprian's thought seems questionable in light of this thesis' research. The debate between Cyprian and the bishop of Rome was not instigated by any change, confusion, contradiction, or inconsistencies in Cyprian's thought. On the contrary, the unassailable logic, seamless continuity, and universally encompassing argument within Cyprian's theory of the Church's oneness/unity were precisely responsible for the ensuing fundamental disagreement between Cyprian and the bishop of Rome. Cyprian experienced the full impact of what such a system of thought, happily or not, inherently embraces.

Cyprian is rarely, if ever, associated with those ante-Nicene Fathers reknowned for their rather developed philosophy and theology. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, and even Cyprian's nemesis, Novatian, traditionally have overshadowed an equally important source of such thought in the early Church. Yet Cyprian's theology and ecclesiology

are grounded fundamentally in and by his philosophical and theological understanding of «*unitas*». Cyprian's broad and profoundly descriptive application to the Church of those traditional ante-Nicene descriptions of the persons and relations within the Trinity are unprecedented in the Fathers and remain unique to Cyprian centuries later⁵⁴⁷.

Bévenot employs the image of an international financial institution to describe Cyprian's vision of the Church. Such a metaphorical device seems advantageous to conclude this thesis. One nation's democratic government of the people, by the people, and for the people under God indeed may be constituted «*e pluribus unum*». According to Cyprian, God's one Church of the people united to their bishop, by the Church contained in each bishop joined in the communion of fraternal concord with his brother bishops, and for the purpose of the salvation of that people with their bishop, however, is constituted «*ex uno plures*».

⁵⁴⁷ In agreement is R.J. HALLIBURTON, 196. Clement of Alexandria and Origen employ similar devices within their ecclesiological thought, but not to the extent as does Cyprian.

APPENDIX I: ONENESS/UNITY ACCORDING TO THE ANCIENT NON-CHRISTIAN AUTHORS



APPENDIX II: LATIN CONCORDANCE OF «*Unitas*» FROM THE EARLY FIRST CENTURY BCE THROUGH THE EARLY FIRST CENTURY CE

unitas

- ab iis ipsis...optineri* (Lactantius, *Epitome* 2,4)
aliquando...fuit (Marcus Junianus Justinus, *Prologi hist. philipp. P. Trogi* 2,14)
est enim...ipsa (Tertullian, *De praescript. haer.* 42,12)
divisionem lucis...non capit (Cyprian, *De unitate* TC 5)
foliorum... (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 16,85,3,22)
haec... (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,25)
haec... (Seneca, *De clementia* 1,4,2,1)
hoc enim est... (dubium Quintilianus, *Declam. minores* 320,5,1)
indiscreta...facta est (pseudo Quintilianus, *Declam. XIX maiores* 13,2,266)
nec...corporis separatur (Cyprian, *De unitate* TC 5)
omnium...fiat (Scribonius Largus, *Compositiones* 75,41,22;)
quae...nisi haec esset in aere (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,6,6,59)
quam spiritus intentio et... (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,6,6,59)
quando... (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 3,6)
quasi non et... (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 3,8)
sacramenti... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 54,1)
scindi...non potest (Cyprian, *De unitate* 23)
solitas et... (Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos* 211,3)
solitas... (Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos* 211,7)
statim fiat... (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 17,118,3,98)
ubi consensus atque...erit (Seneca, *De vita beata* 7,8,6,4)
ubi facta...est (Celsus, *De medicina* 6,6)
ubi omnium... (Scribonius Largus, *Compositiones* 88,47,7)
unde...sacerdotalis exhorta est (Cyprian, *Ep.* 59,14)
unio et...et singularitas (Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos* 211,9)
...coloris (Columella, *De res rustica* 7,3,502,13)
...eius (Cyprian, *Ep.* 51,1)
...erat (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 7,56,2,20)
...est aera esse (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,2,1,55)
...fiat (Columella, *De res rustica* 12,22,888,13)
...facta sit (Celsus, *De medicina* 7,4)
...est sine comissura continuatio (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,2,2,55)
...ingenita (Arnobius, *Adv. nationes* 4,37)
...tamen servatur in origine (Cyprian, *De unitate* TC 5)
...vitae (Seneca, *Ep. Morales ad Lucillum* 66,35)

unitatis

abruptae...traducem (Tertullian, *De carne Christi* 20,34)
ad...vinculum (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,2,1)
ad...reverentibus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 51,1)
ante omnia...magister (Pseudo-Cyprian, *Sermo de centesima...*54,12)
caritatis ac pacis... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 54,4)
caritatis atque...vinculum (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,3,2)
caritatis atque...fide (Cyprian, *Ep.* 51,1)
catholicae...concordiam (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,7)
divinae...inimica (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73,10)
divinae...inimicus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 69,5)
divinae...et rationem et veritatem tenebat (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73,1)
ecclesiam catholicam...domicilium (Cyprian, *Ep.* 51,1)
et catholicae... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 45,1)
et...eius sacramentum (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,14,2)
hoc...sacramentum (Cyprian, *De Unitate TC* 7)
insistere...fide (Pseudo-Cyprian, *Sermo de centesima...*56,11)
confunderet... (Arnobius, *Adv. nationes* 5,23)
custos... (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 8,24)
missi sunt...spiritu (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,3,3)
nemo discidio...Christi ecclesiam scinderet (Cyprian, *Ep.* 59,5)
Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis divisionem praesumunt... (Tert., *Adv. Praxean* 3,6)
origine...et ratione fundata (Cyprian, *Ep.* 70,3)
proditores...existimus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73,11)
qui...oblitus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,2)
rationem divinae dispositionis atque... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73,20)
sacramentum... (Cyprian, *De Unitate TR* 4-5)
sacramentum...agnoscimus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73,11)
unde...originem instituit (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73,3)
...concordiam scindens (Cyprian, *De Unitate TC* 21)
...eiusdem originem (Cyprian, *De Unitate RT* 4-5)
...et ecclesiam (Lactantius, *Div. institutiones* 4,30,4)
...et fidei veritatem (Cyprian, *Ep.* 70,3)
...originem (Cyprian, *De Unitate PT* 4)
...sacramentum (Cyprian, *Ep.* 69,6)
...sacramentum expressum (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,11)
...sacramentum manifestavit (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,11)
...vinculo (Cyprian, *Ep.* 66,7)
vinculo... (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,3,3)

unitati

et...eorum (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* 1,7)
qui...eius inimicus est (Cyprian, *Ep.* 59,14)

unitatem

ad catholicae ecclesiae... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 45,1)
ad ecclesiae... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 71,3; Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,15)
ad ecclesiae catholicae... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 72,2)

ad quam... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 69,5)
ad substantiae... (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 25,9)
ad... (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 22,69)
ad...continendam (Tertullian, *De praescript. haer.* 5,11)
ad...excidere (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 37,195)
ad...magis spectat (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* 2, 376)
ad...providentiae omnes revolvuntur (Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 19,1)
baptismi... (Sent. *Epics.* LXXXVII 34,59)
catholicae ecclesiae... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 48,3; *Ep.* 54,4; *Ep.* 55,21; *Ep.* 55,24)
contra institutionis catholicae... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 46,1)
deserit... (Firmilian, *Ep.* 75,17)
dominus...docuit (Cyprian, *De unitate* 15)
domus...tenere (*Ep.* 69,4)
ecclesiae... (Cyprian, *De unitate* TR 4; *De unitate* 7; *Ep.* 52,1; *Ep.* 69,5; *Ep.* 74,8)
ecclesiae catholicae...tenere (Cyprian, *Ep.* 71,2)
ecclesiasticam... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,24)
esse autem... (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,6)
fidei...venientem (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,4)
habet autem... (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,4)
hanc concordiae... (Novatian, *De trinitate* 27,23)
hanc eandem nobis insinuans... (Cyprian, *De unitate* 8)
hanc...de divina firmitate venientem (Cyprian, *De unitate* 6)
hanc...qui non tenet (Cyprian, *De unitate* 6)
hanc...scindi in ecclesia (Cyprian, *De unitate* 6)
in singularis numeri... (Gellius, *Noctae atticae* 19,8)
in solidam corporis... (Cyprian, *De unitate* 23)
in... (Lactantius, *De ira dei* 88,11,4)
in...conroboretur (Frontinus, *De aquae urbis Romae* 123,2)
in...illa conpetant (Seneca, *Ep. Morales ad Lucilium* 84,8)
in...quamdam coeant (Celsus, *De medicina* 4,26)
in...semel fiat (Tertullian, *De exhort. cast.* 20,5)
in...venit (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 33,32)
inserendo...variare (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 35,3)
nec spiritus nec ecclesiae tenuerunt... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,29)
nec...sed diversitatem (Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos* 181,17)
nec...spiritus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,24)
nec...voluit tenere (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,24)
non tenet... (Cyprian, *De unitate* 10)
nullam...adsignificaret (Varro, *De lingua Latina* 8,2)
ob ipsam scilicet... (Lactantius, *Div. institutiones* 1,6)
pacem...optantes (Cornelius, *Ep.* 49,1)
per substantiae scilicet... (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 26,2)
per...corporis (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,6)
Petri... (Cyprian, *De unitate* PT 4)
Petrus ipse quoque demonstrans... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,11)
praetenderent... (Lactantius, *De opificio dei* 87,10,11)
probant... (Tertullian, *De praescript. haer.* 20,26)
quam...servat (Cyprian, *De unitate* 15)

quam...tenere firmiter (Cyprian, *De unitate* TR 4)
quasi...faciunt (Columella, *De res rustica* 11,3)
quasi...fecerint (Columella, *De res rustica* 12,24)
qui ecclesiae non tenet... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,8)
qui...tenens (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,2)
scinderet...dei (Cyprian, *De unitate* 8)
scismaticos... (Pontius the Deacon, *Vita Cypriani* 7,5)
servare... (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,24)
servare...spiritus (Cyprian, *De unitate* 8; *Ep.* 55,24; *Sent. Epics.* LXXXVII 5,19)
servasse...spiritus (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,25)
...animae (Tertullian, *De anima* 17,14)
...charismatum (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* 5,599)
...Christi (Cyprian, *Ep.* 69,8)
...corporum (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,23)
...de divina lege venientem (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,8)
...de divina auctoritate venientem (Cyprian, *Ep.* 69,5)
...dei rebellatur (Cyprian, *Ep.* 3,3)
...divinae potestatis (Lactantius, *Div. institutiones* 1,3)
...domini tenemus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 70,3)
...generis humani (Seneca, *De beneficiis* 4,18)
...ieiunationum (Tertullian, *De ieiunio adv. psychos* 29,291)
...ille portabat (Cyprian, *De unitate* 7)
...in trinitatem disponit (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeas* 2,29)
...manifestaret (Cyprian, *De unitate* TR 4)
...novi coloris (Tertullian, *De pudicitia* 20,38)
...personae sonat unum (Novatian, *De trinitate* 27,10)
...sibi vindicans (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 5,98)

unitate

a caritatis... (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,25)
a catholicae ecclesiae... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 68,1)
a dei... (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,3)
a qua...quisque discesserit (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,11)
ab...alvei (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 5,49)
ab...corporis deductae (Trogus, *Hist. Philip.* 33,3)
ab...divellunt (Tertullian, *De praescript. haer.* 5,11)
ab...divisus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,17)
ab ecclesiae...descisceret (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,24)
ab...dissipati essent (Cyprian, *Ep.* 69,6)
ab...ecclesiae catholicae (Cyprian, *Ep.* 69,1)
ab...profiscitur (Cyprian, *De unitate* TR, 4)
ab...quem dues constituit (Cyprian, *Ep.* 55,24)
aut triennium facta iam... (Columella, *De arboribus*, 9,998)
de...doceamus (Lactantius, *Div. institutiones* 4,29)
de...illarum (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,7)
de praedicationis... (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* 1,7)
disciplinae...et spei (Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39,4)
divina... (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,3)

dominica... (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,11)
ex... (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,6)
ex infirmi... (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones*, 3,30)
ex...patris (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 19,45)
ex...scilicet (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 14,76)
ex...substantiae (Tertullian, *Apologeticum*)
ex...trinitatis (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 12,14)
in...conroboretur (Frontinus, *De aquae urbis Romae*, 123,2)
in eadem...consistit (Cyprian, *Ep.* 74,4)
in...simplici (Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean* 12,1)
inceditis... (Arnobius, *Adv. nationes* 2,13)
pace atque... (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,6)
pro...deprecatur (Firmillian, *Ep.* 75,3)
pro...pugnamus (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73,11)
quoniam hebes...surda color (Pliny the Elder, *Nat. hist.* 37,76)
sed...sua cohaerentis (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones* 2,2)
sibi cohaerentis... (Cyprian, *De unitate* 14)
sine... (Seneca, *Nat. quaestiones*, 2,4)
sub...constarent (*Apologeticum*, 48,69)

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

AA. Vv.	<i>autori vari</i> /various authors
A.D.	<i>anno Domini</i>
Adv.	<i>Adversus</i>
B.C.	before Christ
BCE	before the common era
c.	<i>circa</i>
CCL	<i>Corpus Christianorum Series Latina</i>
CE	common era
Cf.(cf.)	<i>confer</i>
CLSA	Canon Law Society of America
Co.	Company
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
CUA	Catholic University of America
D.C.	District of Columbia (Washington)
<i>De Unitate</i>	<i>De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate</i>
Dn	Daniel
ed.	editor(s)
<i>EI</i>	<i>Enciclopedia Italiana</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistula(ae)</i>
et al.	<i>et alii</i>
ff.	following
flor.	<i>floruit</i>
Id.	<i>Ibidem</i>
i.e.	<i>id est</i>
Inc.	Incorporated
Jn	John
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
L&S	Lewis and Short
Ltd.	Limited
Mt	Matthew
<i>op. cit.</i>	<i>opus(-era) citatum(-a)</i>
O.S.B.	<i>Ordo Sancti Benedicti</i>
p.(pp.)	page(s)
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
<i>PLS</i>	<i>Patrologiae Latinae Supplementum</i>
Ps.	Psalms
<i>PT</i>	<i>Primatus Textus</i>
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique</i>
SCM	Student Christian Movement

<i>SEA</i>	<i>Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum</i>
<i>Sent. Episc.</i>	<i>Sententia Episcoporum</i>
<i>S.J.</i>	<i>Societas Jesu</i>
<i>SJTh</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>SP</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
<i>Spa./S.p.A.</i>	<i>Società per Azioni</i>
<i>SPCK</i>	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
<i>St./S.</i>	Saint
<i>TC</i>	<i>Textus Communis</i>
<i>TR</i>	<i>Textus Receptus</i>
tr.	translator
trans.	translation
U.S.A.	United States of America
v.	volume(s)
viz.	<i>videlicet</i>
§	paragraph
.	and
~	not
=	equals
≠	does not equal
⊃	[if...] then

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient Non-Christian Sources

- CELSUS, «*De Medicina*», in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Celsus: De Medicina I,II,III*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1948,1953.
- COLUMELLA, «*De re rustica*», in E.H. WARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Columella: De re rustica II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1968.
- FRONTINUS, «*De aquis urbis Romae*», in M. B. MCELWAIN, ed., *Loeb: Frontinus Stratagems and Aqueducts*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1980.
- GELLIUS, «*Noctes Atticae*», in T. E. PAGE – et al., ed., *Loeb: The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius III*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1952.
- MARCUS JUNIANUS JUSTINUS, «*Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*», in O. SEEL, *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi Accedunt Prologi in Pompeium Trogum*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1985.
- PLINIUS, «*Naturalis historia*», in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Pliny, «Naturalis historia», II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1947; T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Pliny, «Naturalis historia», IV,V,IX,X*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1950, 1952.
- QUINTILIANUS, «*Declamationes maiores*», in L. HAKANSON, ed., *Declamationes XIX Maiores Quintiliano Falso Ascriptae*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart 1982.
- _____, «*Declamationes minores*», in D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, ed., *M. Fabii Quintiliani Declamationes Minores*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart 1989.
- SCRIBONIUS LARGUS, «*Compositiones*» in S. SCONOCCHIA, ed., *Scribonii Largi Compositiones*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1983.
- SENECA, «*Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*» in E.H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca: Epistulae Morales II: Books LXVI-XCII*, V, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1970.
- _____, «*De Beneficiis*» in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca: Moral Essays III*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1958.

- SENECA, «*De clementia*» in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, «Naturales Quaestiones», I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge–London 1971.
- _____, «*De vita beata*», in T.E. PAGE – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca, Moral Essays II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1965.
- _____, «*Naturales quaestiones*», in E. H. WHARMINGTON – et. al., ed., *Loeb: Seneca: Naturales Quaestiones I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1971.
- VARRO, «*De lingua Latina*», in G. GOETZ – F. SCHOELL, ed., *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina Quae Supersunt*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig 1910.

Ancient Christian Sources

- ARNOBIUS, «*Adversus nations, VII*» in A. REIFFERSCHEID, ed., *CSEL: IV, Arnobii Adversus Nationes Libri VII*, C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam Accademiae Litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1875.
- CORNELIUS, «*Ep. 49*», in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL: III B Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,1*, Brepols 1996.
- CYPRIANUS, «*De bono patientiae*» in C. MORESCHINI, ed., *CCL III A*, Brepols Publishers, 1976.
- _____, «*De dominica oratione*» in C. MORESCHINI, ed., *CCL III A*, Brepols Publishers, 1976.
- _____, «*De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*» in M. BEVENÓT, ed., *CCL III*, Brepols Publishers, 1972.
- _____, «*De lapsis*» in M. BEVENÓT, ed., *CCL III*, Brepols Publishers, 1972.
- _____, «*De zelo et livore*» in M. SIMONETTI, ed., *CCL III A*, Brepols Publishers, 1976.
- _____, «*Ep. 3, 33, 45, 46, 48, 51, 52, 54, 55*» in G.F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL III B*, Brepols Publishers, 1994.
- _____, «*Ep. 59, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74*» in G.F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL III C*, Brepols Publishers, 1996.
- FIRMILIANUS, «*Ep. 75*», in G. F. DIERCKS, ed., *CCL: III C Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera Pars III,2*, Brepols 1996.
- HIERONYMUS, «*Ep. LXXXIV*» in J.P. MIGNE, ed., *PL 22*, Paris 1845.
- LACTANTIUS, «*De ira dei*», in S. BRANDT, ed., *CSEL: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia, XXVII*, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1893.
- _____, «*De opificio dei*», in S. BRANDT, ed., *CSEL: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia, XXVII*, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesariae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1893.

- _____, «*Divinae institutiones*», in S. BRANDT, ed., *CSEL: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XIX, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1890.
- _____, «*Epitome divinarum institutionum*», in S. BRANDT, ed., *CSEL: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, XIX, Bibliopola Accademiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis, Vienna 1890.
- MINUCIUS FELIX, «*Octavius*», in F. SOLINAS, ed., *Marco Minucio Felice: Ottavio*, Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, Milano 1992.
- NOVATIANUS «*De trinitate*», in G. F. DIERCKX, ed., *CCL: IV Novatiani Opera*, Brepols 1972.
- PONTIUS, «*Vita Caecilii Cypriani*», in G. HARTEL, ed., *CSEL: III.III.appendix S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani Opera Omnia Pars III*, C. Geroldi Filium Bibliopolam Accademiae, Vienna 1871.
- PSEUDO-CYPRIANUS, «*De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima*», in SEVENTH COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE, «*Sententiae episcoporum LXXXVII de haereticis baptizandis carthaginensis concilii sub Cypriano septimi*», in J.P. MIGNE, ed., *PL 3*, Paris 1844.
- TERTULLIANUS, «*Adversus Marcionem*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*Adversus Praxeum*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*Adversus Valentinianos*» in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*Apologeticum*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*De anima*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*De carne Christi*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*De exhortatione castitatis*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*De ieunio adversus psychicos*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*De praescriptione haereticorum*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: I Tertulliani Opera Pars I*, Brepols 1954.
- _____, «*De pudicitia*», in A. GERLO, ed., *CCL: II Tertulliani Opera Pars II*, Brepols 1954.

Later Sources

- AFANASSIEFF, N., «The Church Which Presides in Love», in AA. VV., *The Primacy of Peter*, The Faith Press, Great Britain 1973, 57-110.
- ARNALDI, F., «*Plinio il Vecchio*» in *EI XXVII*, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma 1935, 548-549.
- AUSTIN, R. G., «*Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius*», in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970, 907.
- BARNES, T. D., *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1971.
- BATIFFOL, P., *L'Eglise Naissante*, 1909; English trans., *Primitive Catholicism*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1911.
- BELTRAMI, A., «*Seneca, L. Anneo*» in *EI XXXI*, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma 1936, 372-375.
- BENSON, E.W., *Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work*, Macmillan and Co., Limited, London 1897.
- BÉVENOT, M., *Cyprian: «De Lapsis» and «De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate»*, Oxford University Press, London 1971.
- , «*Primatus Petro Datur: St. Cyprian on the Papacy*», in *JThS V* (1954) 19-35.
- , *St. Cyprian: The Lapsed, The Unity of the Catholic Church*, Newman Press, New York 1956.
- , *St. Cyprian's De Unitate: Chapter 4 in Light of the Manuscripts*, Burns Oates & Washbourn Ltd., England 1938.
- BIANCHI, E., «*Celso, Aulo Cornelio*» in *EI IX*, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma 1931, 675-676.
- BOBERTZ, C.A., «The Historical Context of Cyprian's *De Unitate*», in *JThS 41* (1990) 107-111.
- BURNS, J.P., *Cyprian the Bishop*, Routledge, London – New York 2002.
- CALDERINI, A., «*Columella, Lucio Giunio Moderato*» in *EI X*, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, Roma 1931, 905-906.
- CHAPMAN, J., *Studies on the Early Papacy*, Benziger Brothers, New York – Cincinnati – Chicago 1928.
- CLARKE, G.W., «*Dissertatio Biographica/Chronologica de Cypriani Vita ac Scriptis*», in G.F. DIERCKX, ed., *CCL III D*, Brepols Publishers, 1999, 691-709.
- CORSARO, F., «*Il Primato di Pietro e della Chiesa Romana nel “De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate” di Cipriano*», in *Pietro e Paolo: il Loro Rapporto con Roma nelle Testimonianze Antiche*, SEA, 74, Roma 2001, 445-456.

- COXE, A.C. – DONALDSON, J. – ROBERTS, A.C., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, V, «Cyprian», E. WALLIS, tr., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan 1978.
- CULLMAN, O., *Petrus*, Zwingli-Verlag, Zurich 1952; English trans. *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr*, SCM Press Ltd, London 1953.
- DANIELOU, J. – MARROU, H., *The Christian Centuries, Volume One: The First Six Hundred Years*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London 1964.
- DEFERRARI, R.J., tr. and ed., *St. Cyprian: Treatises*, in *The Fathers of the Church: a New Translation*, 36, Fathers of the Church, Inc., New York 1958.
- _____, *St. Cyprian: Letters (1-81)*, in *The Fathers of the Church: a New Translation*, 51, Fathers of the Church, Inc., New York 1964.
- DROBNER, H., *Lehrbuch der Patrologie*, Verlag Herder, Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1994; Italian trans., *Patrologia*, Edizioni Piemme Spa., Casale Monferrato (AL) 1998.
- DUNN, GEOFFREY D., «Cyprian and the Bishops of Rome: Questions of Papal Primacy in the Early Church» in *Early Christian Studies 11*, St. Paul's Publications, Strathfield 2007.
- van der EYNDE, D., «La Double Édition du "De Unitate" de S. Cyprien», in *RHE* 29 (1933) 5-24.
- FASHOLÉ-LUKE, E.W., «Christian Unity: St. Cyprian's and Ours», in *SJTh* 23 (1970) 312-322.
- FRACCARO, P., «Varrone, Marco Terenzio» in *EI XXXIV, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana*, Roma 1937, 1013-1015.
- FREND, W.H.C., *The Early Church*, SCM Press Ltd., London 1991³.
- _____, *The Rise of Christianity*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London 1984.
- HALL, STUART G., «The Versions of Cyprian, De Unitate, 4-5: Bévenot's Dating Revisited» in *JThS* 55, 1 (2004), 138-146.
- HALLIBURTON, R.J., «St. Cyprian's Doctrine of the Church» in *SP* 11 (1972) 192-198.
- HARNACK, A., *Dogmengeschichte*, Berlin c.1900; English trans., *History of Dogma: v. II&III*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York 1961.
- HENN, W., *The Honor of My Brothers*, The Crossroad Publishing Company, New York 2000.
- HUDLESTON, G.R., ed., *The Spiritual Letters of Abbot Chapman, O.S.B.*, Sheed and Ward, London – New York 1959.
- JALLAND, T.G., *The Church and the Papacy*, SPCK, London 1944.

- KELLY, J.N.D., *Early Christian Doctrines*, Continuum, London – New York 1977⁵.
- LEWIS, C. – SHORT, C. (LS), *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, London – New York 1984.
- LOI, V., ed., *Novaziano: La Trinità*, Società Editrice Internazionale, Torino 1975.
- LYNCH, J.E., «The Limits of *Communio* in the pre-Constantinian Church», in J.H. PROVOST, ed., *The Church as Communion*, CLSA, Washington, D.C. 1984, 159-190.
- MACCARRONE, M., «*Sedes Apostolic – Vicarius Petri*», in M. MACCARRONE, ed., *Il Primato del Vescovo di Roma nel Primo Millennio*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Città del Vaticano 1989, 275-362.
- MATTEI, P., POIRIER, M., SINISCALCO, P., *Cyprien de Carthage: L'Unité de l'Eglise (De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate): Texte Critique du CCL 3 (M. Bévenot)*, Les Editions du Cerf 29, Bd Latour – Maubourg, Paris, 2006.
- MCDONALD, A. H., «*Trogus, Pompeius*» in *The Offord Classical Dictionary*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970 1096-1097.
- MEYENDORFF, J., *Orthodoxie et Catholicité*, Paris 1965; English trans., *Orthodoxy and Catholicity*, Sheed and Ward, New York 1966.
- _____, *Rome, Moscow, Constantinople*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, U.S.A. 1996.
- MIGNE, J.P., ed., *Sancti Cypriani Tomus Unicus, PL 4*, Paris 1844.
- MORESCHINI, C., ed., «*Praefatio*» to *Sancti Cypriani De Bono Patientiae*, CCL III A, Brepols Publishers, 1976.
- _____, «*Praefatio*» to *Sancti Cypriani De Dominica Oratione*, CCL III A, Brepols Publishers, 1976.
- NICHOLS, A., *Rome and the Eastern Churches*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh 1992; North American Edition published by The Liturgical Press, Collegeville 1992.
- PHILIPS, G., *L'Église et Son Mystère au II^e Concile du Vatican*, Desclée, Paris 1967.
- QUASTEN, J., *Patrology II: the Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, The Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland 1953.
- ROSS, W. D., «*Scribonius Largus*» in *The Offord Classical Dictionary*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970, 965.
- SCHATZ, K., *Der Päpstliche Primat: Seine Geschichte von der Ursprungen bis zur Gegenwart*, Echter Verlag 1990; English transl., *Papal Primacy*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota 1996.
- SEEL, O., «*Praefatio*» in O. SEEL, ed., *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi Accedunt Prologi in Pompeium Trogum*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1985.

- SINISCALCO, P., «Tertullian», in A. di BERNARDINO, ed., *Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane*, Casa Editrice Mariett, S.p.A.; English trans., *Encyclopedia of the Early Church II*, James Clarke & Co. Ltd., Cambridge, England 1992, 818-820.
- USSANI, V., «Gellio, Aulo» in *El XVI, Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana*, Roma 1932, 485-486.
- VOLF, M., «Trinity, Unity, Primacy on the Trinitarian Nature of Unity and Its Implications for the Question of Primacy», in J.F. PUGLISI, ed., *Petrine Ministry and the Unity of the Church*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota 1999, 171-184.
- WALKER, G.S.M., *The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian*, John Knox Press, Richmond, Virginia 1969.
- WHITTICK, G. C., «Frontinus, Sextus Julius» in *The Offord Classical Dictionary*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970, 448.
- M. WINTERBOTTOM, «Declamationes Pseudo-Quintilianae», in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970, 317.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION

The *Corpus Cypriani* is quantitatively quite manageable: thirteen treatises and eighty-one letters totaling 1,019 pages of Latin text in the *CCL* series. Well over half of Cyprian's writings, and subsequently his thought, is contained in his letters, which are rather discursive and not in their nature systematic presentations. The complete *corpus* really must be studied, therefore, to obtain a proper *sensus Cypriani*. Perhaps the various interpretations of Cyprian's thought on the nature of the Church are the result of different approaches to studying his literary *corpus*. Strangely, in all of the research of manuscripts, philological analyses, textual comparisons, publications, and discussions over the past century, there has not appeared any systematic philological analysis of Cyprian's use of the term «*unitas*», even though Carthage's premier bishop employs the term 101 times in his writings, almost half of the 233 instances of the term from its first appearance in Varro in the first century BCE through the early fourth century CE dawn of the *Pax Constaniniana*. The present thesis attempts such a study in four parts.

The first part explores the history of debate surrounding the Cyprianic authenticity of the two versions of Cyprian's *De Unitate*, followed by a survey of subsequent scholarly interpretations of Cyprian's thought in light of the former. While permitting an examination that renders an accurate and thorough presentation representative of a variety of scholarly opinions on both the texts' Cyprianic authenticity and the interpretation of Cyprian's thought, the scope of this thesis prohibits an exhaustive study of either.

The second part presents in two chapters a philological analysis of every instance of the term «*unitas*» in all extant classical Latin literature removed from the Cyprianic context and Cyprian himself from the term's initial appearance in the first century BCE through the early fourth century CE. The first chapter presents the ten non-Christian authors' use of «*unitas*», who employ the term sixty-five times, and the second chapter does likewise with the four Christian authors not contemporary with Cyprian, in whose writings the term appears forty-three times with thirty-two occurrences in Tertullian alone. Each chapter concludes with a synthetic summary of the meaning of «*unitas*» as presented therein.

The third part studies every instance of the term «*unitas*» in the Cyprianic context, viz. the four Christian authors contemporary with Cyprian, the *Corpus Pseudo-Cypriani* (Pseudo-Cyprianic writings), and the Seventh Council of Carthage in 256CE, in which texts the term is found twenty-four times.

The fourth part explores in three chapters Cyprian's own use of the term «*unitas*»: 1) *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*; 2) the *Epistulae Cypriani* (Cyprian's letters); 3) the only other three of Cyprian's eleven treatises besides *De Unitate* in which he uses the term, viz. *De dominica oratione*, *De bono patientiae*, and *De zelo et livore*. Both the demonstration of continuity of meaning in the use of the term «*unitas*» throughout the four centuries surveyed in this thesis and a synthesis of Cyprian's theory of «*unitas*» is attempted in conclusion.

KURZFASSUNG

Das Korpus Cypriani ist quantitativ ziemlich handlich: 13 Abhandlungen und 81 Buchstaben, die 1.019 Seiten lateinischen Text in der CCL Reihe zusammenzählen. Gut wird überschuldhälfte der Schreiben des Cyprianus und nachher sein Gedanke, in seinen Briefen enthalten, die und nicht in ihren systematischen Darstellungen der Natur ziemlich abschweifend sind. Das komplette Korpus muß wirklich studiert werden folglich um ein korrektes *sensus Cypriani* zu erreichen. Möglicherweise sind die verschiedenen Deutungen des Gedankens des Cyprianus auf der Natur der Kirche das Resultat der unterschiedlichen Annäherungen zum Studieren seines literarischen Korpus. Merkwürdig in aller Forschung der Manuskripte, der philologische Analysen, der Textvergleiche, der Publikationen und des Diskussionen überschusses hat das letzte Jahrhundert, dort fast erschienen jede systematische philological Analyse des Gebrauches des Cyprianus von der Bezeichnung „*unitas*“, obwohl Bischoff Premier Karthagos die Bezeichnung 101 mal in seinen Schreiben einsetzt, Hälfte der 233 Fälle der Bezeichnung von seinem ersten Aussehen in Varro im ersten Jahrhundert BCE nicht durch die frühe vierte Jahrhundert CER-Dämmerung des Pax Constaniniana. Die anwesende Thesis versucht solch eine Studie in vier Teilen.

Das erste Teil erforscht die Geschichte der Debatte die Cyprianische Echtheit der zwei Versionen von *De Unitate* umgebend Cyprianus, gefolgt von einer übersicht der folgenden gelehrten Deutungen des Gedankens des Cyprianus im Licht des ehemaligen. Beim Ermöglichen einer Prüfung, die einen genauen und vollständigen Darstellung Repräsentanten einer Vielzahl der gelehrten Meinungen über die Texte Cyprianische Echtheit und die Deutung des Gedankens des Cyprian überträgt, verbietet der Bereich dieser Thesis eine vollständige Studie von irgendeinem.

Das zweite Teil stellt in zwei Kapiteln eine philologische Analyse jedes Falls der Bezeichnung „unitas“ in aller extant Literatur des klassischen Lateins dar, die vom Cyprianische Kontext und vom Cyprianus selbst vom Ausgangsaussehen der Bezeichnung im ersten Jahrhundert BCE durch das frühe vierte Jahrhundert CER entfernt wird. Das erste Kapitel stellt die 10 paganischen Autoren Gebrauch „der unitas“ dar, die die Bezeichnung 65 Zeiten einsetzen, und das zweite Kapitel tut ebenfalls mit den 4 christlichen Autoren, die mit Cyprianus nicht zeitgenössisch sind, in dessen Schreiben die Bezeichnung 43 Zeiten mit 32 Auftreten in Tertullianus alleine erscheint. Jedes Kapitel folgert mit einer synthetischen Zusammenfassung der Bedeutung von „unitas“, wie darin dargestellt.

Das dritte Teil studiert jeden Fall der Bezeichnung „unitas“ im Cyprianische Kontext, nämlich die 4 christlichen Autoren zeitgenössisch mit Cyprian, das Korpus Pseudo-Cypriani (Pseudo-Cyprianische Schreiben) und der 7. Rat von Karthago in 256CE, in dessen Texten die Bezeichnung 24 malen gefunden wird.

Das vierte Teil erforscht in eigenem Gebrauch des Kapitel 3 Cyprianus von der Bezeichnung „unitas“: 1) *De Ecclesiae catholicae unitate*; 2) das *Epistulae Cypriani* (Buchstaben des Cyprianus); 3) das einzige andere 3 von Abhandlungen des Cyprianus 11 außer *De Unitate*, in dem er die Bezeichnung verwendet, nämlich *De Dominica oratione*, *De Bono patientiae* und *De Zelo und livore*.

Beide Demonstration des Durchganges des Bedeutens im Gebrauch von der Bezeichnung „unitas“ während der vier Jahrhunderte, die in dieser Thesis und in einer Synthese der Theorie des Cyprianus von „unitas“ überblickt werden, wird als schlußfolgerung versucht.

CURRICULUM VITAE – LEBENSLAUF

Academic Development

- 2010 Universität Wien, Wien - Österreich
Philologische-Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät - Klassische Philologie
Dr. phil. (dissertation: “*Unitas in Latin Antiquity: the Contribution of Cyprian*”
Betreuer: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Kurt Smolak, Dr. phil.)
- 2003 Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Roma - Italia
Facoltà dei beni culturali e storia (studi interdisciplinari in archeologia, archivistica,
biblioteconomia, catalogazione, iconografia,
museografia, storia dell’arte)
Facoltà delle scienze patristiche (Pontificium Institutum Augustinianum, Roma - Italia)
Facoltà di teologia dogmatica
S.T.L. magna cum laude (tesina: “*Unitas*” in *Cyprian of Carthage: Change,
Confusion, Contradiction or Continuity*)
Moderator: Prof. Ord. Philip Renczes, Dr.phil.)
- 2001 Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Roma - Italia
Facoltà dei beni culturali e storia (studi interdisciplinari in archeologia, archivistica,
biblioteconomia, catalogazione, iconografia,
museografia, storia dell’arte)
Facoltà di teologia
S.T.B. magna cum laude
- 1997 Saint Charles Borromeo, Overbrook, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
Faculty of Undergraduate Studies and the Liberal Arts
Major: Philosophy
Minor: Classics (Major with further studies for the S.T.B.)
B.A. magna cum laude

In situ research and teaching applications

- 1998-2003 Ufficio Scavi, Fabbrica San Pietro, S.C.V. (Vatican City State)
Official guide of the archaeological excavations beneath the Basilica of Saint Peter on the Vatican (castellano, English, italiano, VIP, diplomat)
Private guide of the Vatican Museums and the Basilica of Saint Peter on the Vatican
- April 1999 Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Pontificium Institutum Orientalem, Roma, Italia
“The Holy Land” *in situ* Israel and Palestine (Nazareth, Jerusalem, Bethlahem, Galilee); Amman-Petra, Jordan (R. Mackowski, Ph.D., S.S.D., moderator)
- April 1998 Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, Pontificium Institutum Orientalem, Roma, Italia
“The New Testament Book of Revelation and the First Seven Ecumenical Councils” *in situ* Istanbul-Izmir, Turkey (R. Mackowski, Ph.D., S.S.D., moderator)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	9
PART ONE: <i>Status Quaestionis: History of Controversy</i>	11
1.1 The End of the Beginning.....	14
1.2 The Beginning.....	16
1.3 The Beginning of the End.....	18
1.4 Growing Consensus.....	19
1.5 Controversy Becomes History.....	20
1.6 Concord Brings Discord.....	21
1.7 Change, Confusion, Contradiction, or Continuity?.....	24
1.7.1 Problems Ignored?.....	24
1.7.2 Problems Inevitable?.....	28
1.7.3 Problems Inexistent?.....	32
1.7.4 Back to the Beginning.....	33
1.8 A New Beginning.....	34
1.9 Final Considerations.....	36
PART TWO: « <i>Unitas</i> » in the Latin Authors <i>Removed from the Cyprianic Context</i>	37
CHAPTER ONE: The Non-Christian Authors.....	37
2.1.1 Varro.....	37
2.1.2 Celsus.....	38
2.1.3 Scribonius.....	39
2.1.4 Columella.....	39
2.1.5 Seneca.....	41
2.1.6 Pliny the Elder.....	45
2.1.7 Frontinus.....	48
2.1.8 Quintillianus.....	48
2.1.9 Gellius.....	49
2.1.10 Marcus Junianus Justinus.....	50
2.1.11 Conclusion.....	51
CHAPTER TWO: The Christian Authors.....	55
2.2.1 Minucius Felix.....	55
2.2.2 Tertullian.....	56

2.2.3 Arnobius.....	69
2.2.4 Lactantius.....	71
2.2.5 Conclusion.....	74
PART THREE: « <i>Unitas</i> » in the Cyprianic Context.....	81
3.1 Novatian.....	81
3.2 Cornelius.....	83
3.3 Firmilian.....	84
3.4 Pontius the Deacon.....	93
3.5 Seventh Council of Carthage.....	93
3.6 Pseudo-Cyprianic Writings.....	94
3.7 Conclusion.....	95
PART FOUR: « <i>Unitas</i> » in Cyprian of Carthage.....	103
CHAPTER ONE: <i>De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate</i>	103
4.1.1 « <i>Unitas</i> » in the <i>Primatus Textus</i>	104
4.1.1.i « <i>Cathedra</i> » and « <i>Primatus</i> ».....	105
4.1.1.ii Summary.....	106
4.1.2 The <i>Textus Receptus</i>	106
4.1.2.i « <i>Exordium</i> ».....	108
4.1.2.ii Summary.....	109
4.1.3 « <i>Unitas</i> » in the <i>Textus Communis</i>	109
4.1.3.i The Oneness of the Church.....	110
4.1.3.ii The Unity of the Church.....	110
4.1.3.iii The Oneness/Unity of the Church is That of the Trinity.....	111
4.1.3.iv The Mystery of the Sacrament of Oneness/Unity...	111
4.1.3.v Oneness/Unity: Divisible or Indivisible?.....	113
4.1.3.vi Mystery and Sacrament in One House.....	115
4.1.3.vii Love and Oneness/Unity of the Church.....	116
4.1.3.viii Summary.....	117
4.1.4 Conclusion.....	118
CHAPTER TWO: Cyprian's Letters.....	122
4.2.1 The Epistolary Evidence Prior to the Baptismal Controversy	123
4.2.1.i <i>Epistula</i> 3.....	123
Summary.....	124
4.2.1.ii <i>Epistula</i> 45.....	124
Summary.....	125
4.2.1.iii <i>Epistula</i> 46.....	125
Summary.....	127

4.2.1.iv <i>Epistula 48</i>	127
Summary.....	128
4.2.1.v <i>Epistula 51</i>	129
Summary.....	129
4.2.1.vi <i>Epistula 52</i>	129
Summary.....	132
4.2.1.vii <i>Epistula 54</i>	132
Summary.....	133
4.2.1.viii <i>Epistula 55</i>	133
Summary.....	137
4.2.1.ix <i>Epistula 59</i>	137
Summary.....	139
4.2.1.x <i>Epistula 66</i>	139
Summary.....	140
4.2.2 Epistolary Evidence During the Baptismal Controversy.....	140
4.2.2.i <i>Epistula 68</i>	140
Summary.....	141
4.2.2.ii <i>Epistula 69</i>	141
Summary.....	143
4.2.2.iii <i>Epistula 70</i>	144
Summary.....	144
4.2.2.iv <i>Epistula 71</i>	145
Summary.....	147
4.2.2.v <i>Epistula 72</i>	147
Summary.....	148
4.2.2.vi <i>Epistula 73</i>	149
Summary.....	151
4.2.2.vii <i>Epistula 74</i>	152
Summary.....	155
4.2.3 Conclusion.....	156
CHAPTER THREE: <i>Three Treatises</i>	162
4.3.1 <i>De dominica oratione</i>	163
Summary.....	166
4.3.2 <i>De bono patientiae</i>	167
Summary.....	168
4.3.3 <i>De zelo et livore</i>	169
Summary.....	170
4.3.4 Conclusion.....	170
PART FIVE: Conclusion.....	175
APPENDIX I.....	183

APPENDIX II.....	185
ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS.....	191
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	193
BRIEF DESCRIPTION - KURZFASSUNG.....	201
CURRICULUM VITAE - LEBENSLAUF.....	205
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	207