The Pastors
of the 5th Century
The Pastors of the 5th Century

A Comparative Study of the Pastoral Works of St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles

Dariusz Kasprzak OFM Cap.

Kraków 2017
Missionary work of the Church solely involves showing God’s plan, that is Epiphany and fulfilling this mission in the world and in history, in which God fulfills the history of salvation.\(^1\) All Catholics should strive for Christian perfection\(^2\) through repentance and development of spiritual life according to the Gospel.\(^3\) As they head towards their meeting with God, they should partake in the redemptive mystery of Christ, to be “holy and unblemished as they appear before Him”.\(^4\) Evangelical lessons and spiritual life take place in a specific historical context. The clergymen and the faithful ask themselves a double question: how to teach the Gospel and how to develop the spirituality in yourself at the same time? The answer to this double question is of course very individual. It depends on our own personal way of experiencing faith. But it also depends on the historical times, in which the given person experiences his or her earthly life.

---


\(^2\) The Second Vatican Council, an edict on ecumenism 1,4: “All Catholics should strive for Christian perfection. Everyone depending on their status should make every effort for the Church to clear itself and become full of glory and flawless,” The Second Vatican Council, *Constitutions, edicts, declarations*, op. cit., p. 208.


The Pastors of the 5th Century. A Comparative Study…

The first half of the 5th century was typically a test of faith for the Western Church. On one hand the Church had reached organizational stability, rural parishes existed side by side with urban bishoprics and the preaching of the Gospel was done mostly during the Holy Mass on Sundays. The Church settled into the Western Roman Empire. On the other hand, more than a half of the citizens of Imperium Romanum remained pagan, a part of the faithful lived their faith superficially. Many of the conversions were done opportunistically, thus faith was often superficial and weak.

The 50's of the 5th century was a time of struggles for the Emperor’s throne, lack of political stability within the state itself and persistent invasions from the West were a moment of test for the faithful. All these had also led to the end of the relative organizational stability of the Church, while the faithful who were faced with consecutive wars and invasions had to make important lifetime decisions. For the pastors and the faithful of the Church the effectiveness of the teaching of the Gospel and living of the faith in times of political change proved vital. By formulating the topic of my dissertation Pastors of the fifth century. A comparative study of the pastoral works of St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles, I tried to analyze the manner by which two pastors who had both lived in the Western Roman Empire and who had preached the Gospel in the same times but varied social and Ecclesiastical conditions.

The former of the two preachers was a venerable bishop, while the latter was a convert from Lerins and a presbyter in Marseilles. Both represented different spiritualities within the same Christian spirit. They preached the same kind of faith but lived in completely different surroundings: Chrysologus spent his entire adult life as a bishop in the rather safe imperial Ravenna, while Salvian having abandoned his birth town in the

---

5 It is important to notice that the usual and legal term, describes the Catholic Church as the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic Church refers not so much to rituals but to the doctrinal and organizational unity with the Pope as the Bishop of Rome. The term “Roman Catholic Church” is also used in legal matters. The Church describes itself as the Roman Catholic Church as opposed to the Eastern Churches. Compare: M. Wójciewowski, katolicki Kościół, właśc. Kościół rzymskokatolicki, [in:] Religia. Encyklopedia PWN, t. 5, red. T. Gadacz, B. Milerski, Warszawa 2002, p. 408.
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South-Eastern Roman province of Gaul (either Germania I or II) moved to the Southern Gallic Province of Viennensis which was occupied by Burgundians and Alans. By analyzing the pastoral approaches one can identify two different pastoral models, shaped by external circumstances: 1. One which developed in conditions owing to rulers who favored local and internal peace, as well as, 2. In territory which was gradually occupied by new administrators, who were not necessarily liked and welcomed and who were not too friendly towards Catholic pastors.

Did the two mentioned pastors possess a similar vision of community, among whom they preached the Word of God? How did the manner by which the Bishop Chrysologus and presbyter Salvian preach the same Gospel differ? How did they perceive the community of the Church in the 5th century? What moral behavior did they encourage and what did they condemn? How did they perceive the faithful’s acquisition of material goods and how did they encourage personal conversions and personal asceticism?

The Pastoral issues undertaken by both 5th century pastors remain valid today, fortunately no longer times of wars or barbaric invasions. The problems, however, remain relevant in our times of laicism and rapid social and economic change in Europe of the 21st century. Thus the attempt to find an answer to the questions raised earlier in the works of these two pastors seems justified.

There are no books or publications complexly investigating the pastoral works of Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles. There are only some academic articles discussing chosen theological and pastoral aspects of the above mentioned authors.6

---

J. H. Baxter discusses the general themes of the homilies of St. Peter Chrysologus. A. Benelli deals with issues concerning the episcopate of Chrysologus while F. J. Dolger discusses in his article the importance of baptism and further progress of sacramental development of Christians as described by Chrysologus by use of military expressions by which the Bishop of Ravenna describes the lack of spiritual struggle and fasting. By discussing the theology of the mystery of Incarnation of God M. Herz notices that Chrysologus employs concepts of strict relation to *commercium* between God and man. F. Michalčík discusses the themes of virtues according to Chrysologus in the Neothomistic spirit of H. Noldin or A. Prumer. However, Michalčík’s interpretation of Chrysologus’ theology is nonexistent in the 5th century. A. Olivar and A. M. Argemí discuss Chrysologus, sermons on the Eucharist. A. Olivar also deals with the topic of preparing sermons and elements of improvisation during sermons and the duration of Chrysologus’ sermons. F. J. Peters defines Chrysologus as a homilist. Whereas, F. Sottocornola analyzes various topics of the liturgical year, on the basis of the existing Chrysologus’ sermons. Polish works include J. Wojtczak (a linguistic approach to the Church understood as *grex* (flock)). But following Blaise-Chirat’s interpretation, we...
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can understand the Latin *grex* as “herd” or the “herd of the faithful” – that is the “flock of the faithful.”

Certain works concerning Salvian of Marseilles are particularly worthy of attention, ones which discuss both the historical background, as well as, the pastoral aspect. These include J. Badewien and E. Maass which draw attention to social criticism in Salvian’s works. N. Brox considers the topic of reading the Gospel the concept of commonness according to Salvian of Marseilles. Important Polish works (from historical and philological point of view) include articles by: R. Kamienik, M. Żywczynski, G. Wcislo and Z. Wójtowicz.

---

The Pastors of the 5th Century. A Comparative Study…

The above mentioned works usually discuss one of the aspects of pastoral theme, either in a direct way or they just signal some theological and pastoral aspects in the works of early Christian writers. But they do not give a comprehensive view of pastoral issues from the point of view of Peter Chrysologus or Salvian of Marseilles and do not make a comparison between the two. However, the other works which I refer to, discuss given theological and historical issues concerning the two writers.

The source documents, which I discuss, are modern critical editions of St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles. In my work, I give my own translations of their texts, as well as, other patristic texts. Should the situation differ, I quote other translations.

In the works of Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles I came across historical, philological and theological issues. In order to understand the pastoral thought of the two authors I used a pluralistic approach, which is a paradigm of modern methodology of science. Depending on the topic analyzed, there is interdisciplinary research based on the principle

---


28 A. Grobler, *Metodologia nauk*, Kraków 2006, by describing pluralistic realism and its basis that science leads to truth, the writer describes science as ‘a patchwork of various fields, defined by local notions, fields which are linked to each other. The terms interpreted in one field are defined by terms derived from other fields. […] Further connections between fields are made due to hipotheses and findings from other fields.’ On the language of science see: *Pravda i racjonalność naukowa*, Kraków 1993; A. Grobler, *Prawda a względnosc*, Kraków 2000; A. Grobler, *Pomyśli na temat prawdy i sposobu uprawiania filozofii i w ogóle*, Kraków 2001.
of deducing as the best way of explaining. The contribution of various disciplines have preserved their originality due to their own aspect of research and own methods, yet the synthesis of pastoral thought of analysed authors has eventually taken the theological character, since human reality, even if researched into with the use of particular sciences methods, finally finds its conclusive explanation only in the mystery of the Revelation.

In the first part of the book concerning the historical background of the Church of the 5th century, I used the historical method typical of all historical studies. Having collected historical documents I interpreted the documents concerning the authors I was interested in. Having outlaid the historical context of the Western Church of the 5th century, I specified the question of the authenticity of the historical documents and I defined the credibility of the information of the early Christian writes, whom I discuss. At the systematic stage of the historical method I adopted the narrative historical synthesis and the synchronic comparative analysis methods, by reviewing and comparison of the two coeval personalities of Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles.

The historical interpretation of the texts of both authors has allowed me to define the syntactic structures (the mutual connections between different literary works, an analysis of the formal structure of these works, literary genre, linguistic forms and style) and the meaning and references (semantic dimension of the source text as a whole and the references to the reality portrayed) and to define the sense and subjective references (the pragmatic dimension of the source; its relation to the authors, different environments,

29 A. Grobler, *Metodologia nauk*, op. cit., when discussing the different types of sciences and their methodological differences in application to the choice between intentional and functional explanations, he points to inference as the best explanation rule. “Finally one can accept the fact that holism provides the most general methodological perspective but this does not mean that we should abandon individualism. Individual idealizations can be of importance. The choice between an intentional explanation and a functional explanation and between its individual and holistic versions should be subject to the inference to the best explanation rule”, there, p. 236.


historic situation) and to define the influence of the sources studied, both in patristic times and their modern interpretation and reception.\textsuperscript{32}

In the second part of the book which compares given pastoral issues concerning the two authors, I used the philological (lexical) method. I interpreted, translated and analyzed the texts of Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles. I treated those texts as historical texts, describing Roman society of the 5th century, giving a picture of the Church of the times and discussing issues concerning anthropological theology, the theory of ownership, as well as, ascetical theology. The use of philological method, allowed me to establish facts from the 5th century by giving words appearing in the original texts, the meaning which they had at the time they were written.\textsuperscript{33}

At the same time, by using the theological method, I was able to interpret the texts from historical and ecclesiastic point of view.\textsuperscript{34} By constantly referring to the written sources, I tried to discover the theological address of these texts and explain the meaning they had for the faithful of the 5th century and the faithful of today. As the Christian doctrine is of hierarchical nature,\textsuperscript{35} I tried to systematize the theological thought of the two authors according to the Truths of Faith criterion. While discussing the historical issues I had to foremost use a historical approach.

\textsuperscript{35} S. Pawłowski, \textit{Hierarchia prawd wiary}, [in:] \textit{Leksykon teologii fundamentalnej}, red. R. Rusecki et al., Lublin–Kraków 2002, p. 488–490. Taking \textit{Misterium Ecclesiae} (1973), as well as, Ecumenical Directory (1970 and 1993), Religious Directory (1971 and 1993), KKK (1992) and John Paul's II Encyclicals (\textit{Ut unum sint} 1995), S. Pawłowski says that the Magisterium of the Church differentiates two different Truths of Faith (first-rate and second-rate). The first-rate which are sometimes known as Primeval, concern order (Holy Trinity, Incarnation, the Kerygma of the death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, the truth about the history of salvation and the truth about the expatiation and eternal life). The second-rate ones, the so called derivatives, concern the means of salvation (ordinary means of salvation, the hierarchical structure of the Church, Apostolic succession, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome). The author stresses that the formal element of the religious truth (non-gradeable truth and “de rigeur”) is not the only one and therefore religious truths should be not only enumerated but appropriately “balanced” and brought to attention. This allows rapprochement between people and Ecumenical dialogue (p. 488–490).
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The 5th century authors, whose pastoral thought has been analyzed in this book, have come to accept the divine revelation as something given mankind. They listened to God’s word and to everything that helped explain revelation and they passed the dogmas of faith to other Christians. Thanks to this, the authors gave a testimony of their faith as they tried to explain the concept of revelation in that given place and time. By providing a systematization of the pastoral thought of both authors, I tried to describe and compare two phases of theology (the accepting and listening phase and the phase of active building of models for given time and place), both of which appear in the work of the two 5th century pastors and to reach theological conclusions.

The work consists of two parts: a historical one and a theological one. In the first part I discuss the historical background of the Western Church of the 5th century as the environment Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles lived in, no doubt influenced their work. I give an outline of the historical context of the Church in the 5th century in the Western Roman Empire in the first Chapter. To allow a better understanding of the theological thought in the writing of the two authors, I give an outline of their biography in Chapter Two. Chapters Two to Seven end in a summary of the topic.

36 Z. Hajduk, *Ogólna metodologia nauk*, op. cit., p. 144. The book discusses various historical synthesis. Apart from historical synthesis and philosophical synthesis, it also mentions the theology of history, that is the history in the light of Epiphany. By assuming that the history of mankind is a history of revelation of man by God (the so called *misterium salutis*) it is important to “point out the driving forces of history and its connection with God’s plan. History is a linear, constant and irreversible process (as opposed to the wheel of history, for example the myth of a reversible beginning). There are two immanent and transcendental factors in this proces. Epiphany is the basic source of knowledge for the theologian,” there.

37 B. J. F. Lonergan, *Metoda w teologii*, tłum. A. Bronk, Warszawa 1976, p. 147, defines Christian theology as “die Wendung zur Idee.” Within Christianity. It stresses what is important in Christian life. What is behind this diversification and development of Christian life is the development of theology. The development of theology can be divided into one that deals with the past and one that tries to deal with the future. Each one of these stages can be divided into four functional specializations. They each influence each other. Theology tries to satisfy the needs of Christian life, by updating itself and using the opportunities that history provides. Compare: J. Wicks, *Wprowadzenie do metody teologicznej*, op. cit., p. 35–37.
In the second part of the book I analyze and compare given pastoral issues concerning Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles. Chapter Three gives an outline of the Roman society of the 5th century, examined from the point of view of given clergymen (social differences seen as evil, the outcome of the differences). Chapter Four concentrates on how the Church was perceived in the 5th century. In Chapter Five, I analyze and compare the two authors view on sin and virtues of Christians of the 5th century. Chapter Six discusses the attitude to material goods (the right to ownership, wealth, the topic of alms). Finally, in Chapter Seven I discuss and compare the attitude of both authors to conversion and asceticism in the life of a Christian (a conversion of the mind, penance, monasticism, religious practices).

The pastoral solutions given by the two authors were yet another way of adjusting the Gospel to the Roman world and the Germanic Barbarians. The specific models suggested by Chrysologus and Salvian in the 5th century, the analysis of their way of thinking and fulfilling the evangelical mission can help the modern Christian to better fulfill his mission in the Church.
Part I: Historical background of the Church in the 5th century

At the end of the 4th century and throughout entire 5th century the Christianization of the Roman Empire took place mainly in cities. The majority of the population of the Western Roman Empire lived in villages and in the 5th century still remained pagan. Barbarian invasions in the 5th century caused temporary break off of administrative ties within the Western Churches and made preaching of the Gospel difficult in isolated Catholic Churches in Africa or Gaul. The wave of invasions did not disturb the life of the church to a great extent. The Church in the 5th century still preached the Gospel in the Imperium Romanum which was in decline, developed piety among the faithful and tried to eradicate pagan practices. St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles were clergyman who in their writings left an outline of pastoral teachings, characteristic of the 5th century. The objective of the two biographical entries and a general description of their teachings is to allow a better understanding of theological thought in their writing.
1. Historical context of the Church in the 5th century in the Western Roman Empire

Political events of the end of the 4th century were a forecast of the slow political downfall of the Western Roman Empire. The years 395 to 476 are traditionally considered in historiography the twilight of the Empire. The Western Roman army, made up mostly of regular Germanic soldiers, ineffectually defended the Western borders against subsequent Barbarian, Germanic or non Germanic invasions of the Huns or the Alans. Practically, a new era began – the rule of the Ostrogoths in Italy after the conquer of Ravenna (25th February 493) by the army of the Ostrogoths led by Theoderic the Great and killing Odoacer (the chief of the Scirii tribe, ruling Italy as rex). Thus this is the end of Imperium Romanum pars Occidentalis. Paradoxically the downfall of Western Empire brought the old imperial Church religious freedom. Gradually Catholicism had a privileged position (except in Britanny and Visigothic Spain until 587). The metropolitan structure of the Western Church and the primacial power of the Church of Rome was becoming stronger.

1.1. Outline of the most important political events

The 80’s and 90’s of the 4th century brought about political changes which were a forecast of a slow political downfall of the Western Roman Empire. Numerous wars between pretenders to throne and difficulties in keeping unity of Imperium Romanum resulting from this, the problem of the division of the country into its eastern and western part, the defeat at
Adrianopol (Hadrianopolis) (9th August 378 – the battle took place in the East but its results turned out terrible for the West), as well as, the foedus with the Visigoths on the 3rd October 382 (they were able to settle on the right bank of the Danube, mainly in Thrace, as the supporters of the Empire they were to receive tribute from the Romans in return for soldiers). Since Hadrianopolis the Germanic peoples attacking mainly the Western Empire, remained within its boundries and beginning with the end of the 5th century they ruled the majority of the Western provinces of Imperium Romanum. Not being able to defeat the Visagoths, Theodosius formed an alliance with them and tried to assimilate them within the boundries of the Empire, but that failed. The Western Empire fell and new Germanic countries were formed.

Gratian, a Roman Emperor (born in 359, died in 383) ruled the Western Roman Empire from 375 while another Emperor, Theodosius (born 347, died in 395)3 ruled in the East. Having succeeded to the throne in 379 Theodosius did not accept the title pontifex maximus. The Emperor Gratian also renounced the title. On the 28th of February 380 Theodosius issued an edict in Thessaloniki stating Catholicism in the Empire. This edict was also signed by Emperor Gratian and Valentinian II. As a result of this Gratian ordered (in 382) that the goddess Victoria be removed from the building of the Senat in Rome. He also deprived all vestals and pagan clergy their rights. Their income was meant for the cooperation of carriers and for the legislation of Theodosius.5

---

After the outbreak of Magnus Maximus' rebellion in Roman Britain, Gratian began his struggle with the usurper, but he lost the decisive Battle of Lutetia. He was then killed on the 25th August 383. Magnus Maximus resided in Trier and ruled Gaul and Spain for five years. As a ruler, he neglected the defence of Britain and weakened the borders with the Rhine.

As a result of Theodosius' war campaign, Maximus' army was defeated at the Save and the Emperor sentenced the usurper to death. Following Victor's death (Maximus' son), Theodosius, Valentinian II and Arcadius all formally became emperors, but it was Theodosius who actually ruled. In the years 388–391, Theodosius resided in Milan, whereas, Valentinian II in Vienne. Theodosius forbade all forms of pagan worship: this included killing innocent people to make an offering, visiting pagan temples and worshipping statues.

After Valentinian's death (15th May 392), magister militum Abrogast rebelled against rightful Emperor Theodosius and on August 22nd 392, he...
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placed Flavius Eugenius on the throne. Flavius Eugenius finally decided to back the pagan faction. Theodosius did not want to leave a large part of the Western Empire (that is Britanny, Gaul, Spain and Italy), in the hands of the Eugenius and Abrogast and in the summer of 394 launched an offensive attack on their army. The winning battle, the Battle of the Frigid River, took place on the 5th–6th September 394. Emperor Theodosius I died on 17th January 395. During his reign, he tried to strengthen Catholicism, he tried to consolidate the rule of the dynasty. He wanted to ensure political unity of the country after the Empire’s defeat at Adrianopol. However, the concept of Roman-Germanic society, living together as one empire had never been accepted by its citizens.

The years 395 to 476, bring about the twighlight of Imperium Romanum pars Occidentis. Due to a partition done by Theodosius in 395, the power was inherited by his two sons: Arcadius (395–408) in the East and Honorius (395–423) in the West. His reign was supported by his principal general, Stilicho (a Vandal by birth, married to Theodosius’ niece – Serena). The concept of unity of Imperium Romanum still existed. The East and the West were not separate countries, but were two parts of the same empire, with two emperors. Laws were introduced in the name of both emperors and applied in the entire Empire. But the split led to the formation of two independent countries (partes imperii).

Stilicho continued Theodosius’ politics, he was a guardian of the dynasty. But he was in conflict with Constantinopole over land in Illyria as the West was only granted the diocese of Pannonia, whereas, Dacia

---

and Thrace belonged to the East.\textsuperscript{13} In the East, after the rebellion of the Gothic Gainas, the army was transformed. Germanic Barbarians were not enlisted and conscription was based on local people and highlanders from Asia Minor. In the West of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century it was impossible to enroll local people and the Western Roman army was mainly made up of Barbarians. Since the times of Theodosius, the army was made up mostly of Germanic peoples: Visigoths, Saxons, the Alemanni and the Franks. At the beginning of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, the Roman army (\textit{limitanei} and \textit{comitantes}) consisted of 352 thousand soldiers in the East and about 248 thousand in the West. There were also a few divisions known as \textit{scho-laе}.\textsuperscript{14} Many Germanic leaders fought bravely for the Roman Empire and gained political influence.\textsuperscript{15}

Having prevented an uprising in Africa (397–398), Stilicho enjoyed peace and political stability on all boarders, especially with Gaul.\textsuperscript{16} The Visigoths, under Alaric I\textsuperscript{17} crossed the Alps in 401 and entered Italy. Emperor Honorius moved the capital from Milan to Ravenna in 402. After the Battle of Pollentia (6\textsuperscript{th} April, 402) and the Battle of Verdun (July–August 402 – the Visigoths lost), the Visigoths withdrew from Italy into Dalmatia and Pannonia.\textsuperscript{18} In 405, the Visigoths and the Ostrogoths entered the valley of the Po River but they were driven back by Roman troops.\textsuperscript{19}

Having forced the Rhine in 406, a new wave of Barbarians (the Vandals, the Suebi, the Burgundians, the Alemanni and the Alans) entered \textit{Imperium}

\textsuperscript{14} J. Vogt, \textit{Upadek Rzymu}, op. cit., p. 189–191; to read more about the Roman army in the West in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century see: M. Wilczyński, \textit{Germanie w służbie zachodniorzymskiej…}, op. cit., p. 30–45.
\textsuperscript{15} M. Wilczyński, \textit{Germanie w służbie zachodniorzymskiej…}, op. cit., p. 46–60.
\textsuperscript{17} M. Wilczyński, \textit{Germanie w służbie zachodniorzymskiej…}, op. cit., p. 115–161 (Alaric I, Alaricus, Alarichus).
Romanum and occupied Gaul, including Trier. Stilicho made a major mistake by continuing to try to connect Illyria to the West. This made the Western provinces of the Empire threatened by invasions. In 407, there was another usurpation in the West when Constantine declared himself Emperor and conquered Gaul, making Arelate the capital. Constans, Constantine’s older brother conquered Spain. In the situation of a clear weakening of the Western part of the Empire, Alaric together with his Visigoths occupied Eastern Alps and threatened to invade Italy if he does not get compensation. Thanks to Stilicho the demanded sum was collected. Stilicho persuaded the senat and the Roman aristocracy to pay the Goths the ransom. There was a rebellion of Roman troops in Tricinium (Italian Pavia) in the presence of Germanic tribes. This was probably provoked by Honorius. Stilicho then fled from Bologna to Ravenna where he was murdered on the 22nd August 408. There was no strong leader in the West and Emperor Honorius turned out to be helpless.20

In the Autumn of 408, Alaric’s Visigoths crossed the Alps and reached Rome. They demanded a tribute of 4 thousand pounds of gold in return for lifting the siege. Honorius delayed the payment and Alaric entered Rome again and this time demanded 5 thousand pounds of gold, 30 thousand silver and 4 thousand pieces of silk clothing, 3 thousand purple (dyed) skins, as well as, 3 thousand pounds of pepper. In 409 Alaric demanded both Nordic provinces and crop supply. When the government turned down the demand, the Goths entered Rome and demanded the senat to appoint a new emperor. Priscus Attalus became the new Emperor. He was a pagan who was baptized by Bishop Sigesar.21

Thanks to the intervention of troops from Constantinople, Constantine’s army withdrew. But the situation was inflamed again because of a conflict between Alaric and Attalus, who was finally deprived of power by the Visigoths. Alaric decided to attack Rome and captured it on 24th August 410 after a short siege.22 The Visigoths raged the city

---

for three days but spared human lives. The people found shelter in the churches. Even though the material loss was small, the occupation of Rome had ideological importance. The pagans blamed the Christians for the defeat. Having plundered Rome, the Visigoths kidnapped Honorius step sister – Galla Placidia and went to Rome, from there, they wanted to go to Africa.

Ataulf became the leader after Alaric’s death and the Visigoths entered Gaul under his leadership. They occupied the territory in both provinces of Aquitaine and Narbonensis I. In January 414, Ataulf married Galla Placidia and became a supporter of an agreement with Emperor Honorius. After the murder of Ataulf, the Gothic King Wallia made peace with Emperor Honorius and gave him Galla Placidia. Having defeated Constantine in 411, Honorius gave away his sister Galla Placidia to his magister utriusque militia – Constantius III (1st January 417). He saw his successor in him and that is why he upgraded him to Constantine III.

In the year 418, after Wallia’s death, Theodoric I became the King of the Visigoths and chose Toulouse and Burdigala (Bordeaux) as his place of residence. Emperor Honorius agreed that the Visigoths settle in Gaul as socii foederati. Thus they occupied Aquitania Secunda, Novempopulana and Narbonese with capital cities in Burdigala, Pikatvum (Poitiers) and...
Toulouse. After Constantius' death, Galla Placidia was expelled from the Western Empire on the orders of Honorius. She found shelter in Constantinopole but she did not get a warm welcome because of her views concerning the necessity for the Romans to reconcile with the Goths. However, when Honorius died on 15th August 423 after a twenty-eight-year reign, Theodosius II and his wife Eudocia decided to Valentinian's claim to the throne – Galla Placidia's son. Thanks to a military intervention from Constantinopole and a blockade of troops in Ravenna (by the Visigoths faithful to Placidia) the six-year-old Valentinian became king in Ravenna. He did not reign independently but remained under the care of his mother. Aetius remained the most important man in the Western Roman Empire until 454. He defeated Felix (murdered by Aetius’ men in 430), as well as, Bonifacius.

In May 429, 80 thousand Vandals (under the command of Genseric) crossed Spain (from Iulia Traducta) to Roman Africa and in May or June 430 the troops reached Hipo Regius. But the delayed expedition from Constantinopole did not win Roman Africa back from the Vandals. The troops were under the command of Flavius Ardabur Aspar who was rather militarily and politically passive.

Bonifacius returned to Ravenna and was granted the command of the army. He came into conflict with Aecius. Aetius was defeated and ran away with the Huns. When Bonifacius died in 433, Aecius entered Italy and gave the Huns the province of Valeria and Pannonia II. Empress Galla Placidia had to accept the new situation. Aecius became magister utriusque militia again in 434, married Bonifacius’ widow and thus inherited all the goods

---

33 M. Wilczyński, Zagraniczna i wewnętrzna polityka afrykańskiego państwa Wandalów, Kraków 1994, p. 27–49.
and the army. Aecius’ army were known as *buccellari*.

On the basis of a decree in Hippo Regius in 435, the Vandals (as *foederati*) received land in Mauritania and Numidia, in return for withdrawing from other African provinces. But Genseric broke this agreement and in the year 439, occupied Carthage and the wealthiest land of the province. He confiscated all the goods and propert belonging to the rich citizens and the Catholic clergy. He drove out the clergy, including Bishop Qoudvultdeus out of Africa. They managed to reach Italy, despite faulty ships. The next Roman treaty with the Vandals in 422, practically acknowledged the existence of the Vandal country in Africa.

In the meantime, the Franks gained Cologne and Trier, the Burgundians formed a country in the 20’s and 30’s in the middle Rhine region. The Visigoths occupied the area in South Gaul and Narbonne. The bagaude movement (a group of desperate peasant insurgents) was reborn. Thanks to the antagonism between the Germanic tribes themselves and the actions of Litorius (*magister militum Galliarum*) supported by the Huns, Aecius managed to calm the situation down in Gaul. He managed to stop the Franks and the Burgundians in the North of Gaul and settled the Alemanni near Basel and Lake Constance and the Alans near Venice. He signed an treaty with the Visgoths in 439, recognizing them as a country.

Roman Britain, which lacked Roman troops was attacked and divided (probably in the year 441) by the Saxons, the Angles and the Jutes, as well as, the Celtic Picts and Scots. In 449, the Huns attacked Gaul and in 451 they occupied *Mediomatricum* (Metz), Trier, *Civitas Remorum* (Reims) and

---


37 E. A. Thompson, *Romans and Barbarians…*, op. cit., p. 27–29.
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directed themselves towards the Loire. Under the command of Aecius, the Roman army was a coalition of the army of Gaul and Italy, the Aquitaine Visigoths and the Burgundians. On the 14th June 451, they fought a battle with the Huns on the plains near Treves known as *campus Mauriacus*. Due to Aecius’ lack of determination (he was afraid of strengthening the position of the Visigoths), the Huns were able to withdraw. Attila entered Italy in 452, destroyed Aquileia and came close to Rome. Thanks to the mediation of the Pope Leo I, Attila withdrew in return for a ransom. When Attila died suddenly in 453, the army of the Huns was defeated by the Gepids. The Germanic tribes, freed from the Huns, settled near the Danube. These included the Gepids, the Ostrogoths, the Heruli and the Scirri.

After Attila’s death, the Western Empire was able to enlist soldiers from those tribes, from which the leader of the Huns had forbidden earlier. The political situation of the Western Empire also improved after the assassination of the King of Visigoths – Thorismund. Their next King – Theoderic II (453–466) was pro-Roman and supported the Roman army in Spain and Italy.

Emperor Valentinian III wanted to carry out several reforms, including a reform of the legal profession but certain things ruined these plans. First of all, the tragic death of Aecius (he was hit by a sword by Valentinian during a quarrel and then put out of his misery by courtiers on

---

39 L. A. Tyszkiewicz, *Hunowie w Europie. Ich wpływ na Cesarstwo Wschodnie i Zachodnie oraz na ludy barbarzyńskie*, Wrocław 2004, p. 146–147. The book gives several possible reasons for Attila’s expedition to the West. This includes: cupidity, Emperor Marcian’s refusal to pay the Huns tribute, a “naturalness” of war and the spoils of war which made a regular income for the Huns (apart from breeding and agriculture on a limited scale) and finally the legendary issue of marriage to Galla Placidia’s daughter – Honoria. This could have persuaded Attila to plunder the West. P. Heather (*Upadek cesarstwa rzymskiego*, op. cit., p. 424–425) adds that when in the years 441–447 Attila’s army plundered the entire Balkans (apart from Peloponese, thanks to effective fortification), the Eastern Empire had to pay Attila a yearly tribute. The Huns robbed Constantinople of everything possible; the Huns could not remain idle and attacked the West as all lucrative targets were won.


21st September 454) followed by the murder of Valentinian by two *bucellari* – Optelas and Thraustelas (16th March 455). This put an end to the dynasty of Valentinian I, which lasted 91 years. All legitimism and dynastic succession was broken in the West. No other emperor which followed had the possibility to retain any form of succession.43

Valentinian’s murderers proclaimed the initiator of the plot, senator Petronius Maximus the next the next emperor. To make this legal, Petronius Maximus forced Valentinian’s widow Eudocia to marry him. He also forced his son Palladius to marry Valentinian’s older daughter Eudocia (she had been engaged to Genseric’s son – Huneric, prior to this). For the Vandals, this was an excuse to attack Rome, which they captured on 2nd June 455.44

Nobody defended the city and on May 31st, the fleeing crowd murdered Emperor Petronius Maximus. Pope Leo I managed to persuade Genseric to stop the fires and the bloodshed in the city. For two weeks, the Vandals robbed the city, loaded the spoils of war onto ships and took with them qualified craftsmen, a group of senators, as well as, Empress Eudocia and her daughters – Eudocia and Placidia. Huneric married Eudocia in 456 (after 16 years of marriage, around the year 472, she ran away from her husband and went to Jerusalem) and Eudocia and Placidia were freed thanks to the diplomatic tactics of Constantinopole.45 Rome which had been robbed by the Vandals, was poor and the French (mainly in the works of the 18th century) who described the events of the year 455, called it a thoughtless destruction of Rome and vandalism.46

The Roman army in Rome proclaimed Avitus (455–456) their new Emperor and the Visigoths who were still formally the allies of Rome, drove out the Suebii from Spain and conquered the majority of Southern Gaul. The Burgundians strengthened their position in Lyon and the Franks and the Alemanni conquered territory West of the Rhine. Avitus defended Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica but the Vandals practically occupied all of Africa. Ricimer

---
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(the son of an aristocrat from the royal family of the Suebii and a mother who was a Visigoth) was an effective general. He became *magister militum praesentalis*. He wanted to have an obedient emperor and thus he organized a plot against Avitus. In October 456 he defeated his army at Piacenza. The captured Emperor Avisus was ordained a Bishop of Piacenza. He soon ran away to his homeland Gaul and soon died in mysterious circumstances.

Ricimer ruled Italy, Raetia and Noricum. The Vandals ruled in Africa; in Spain – the Visigoths; in Gaul – the Visigoths, the Alemani, the Franks and the Burgundians and in a small area in Gaul – the Roman leader Aegidius; in Pannonia – the Ostrogoths and Marcellinus ruled in Dalmatia. The Emperor of the East – Leo I (457–474) tried to make Ricimer, the governor of the West. But the Roman army in Ravenna made Majorian (457–461) their leader. Aegidius from Gaul and Marcellinus from Dalmatia acknowledged his power; also the Germanic tribes in Gaul formally accepted the Roman command. Marcellinus tried to get Africa back but failed. The Vandals still ruled in Roman Africa, Balearic Islands, Sardinia and Corsica. On his way back from Gaul to Italy, Emperor Majorian was attacked and killed by Ricimer’s *bucellari* in Dalmatia on 2nd August 461.

After a few months without a former leader, Ricimer proclaimed Libius Severus (461–465) the Emperor. After the death of Libius Severus, in the years 465–467, he ruled the Western part of the Empire, on his own on behalf of Emperor Leo I (457–473). To put an end to the attacks of the Vandals in the East, Emperor Leo I decided to proclaim his own leader of the West. This was his own son-in-law, Anthemius (467–472). Ricimer married Anthemius daughter – Alypia. In 468, the Vandals destroyed the East Roman fleet and

---

Marcellinus (who was preparing an expedition against the Vandals) was murdered. After the death of the Eastern Emperor – Leo I (18th January 474), the new Emperor of the East – Zenon (474–475, 476–491) signed a peace treaty with Genseric in 474. The Vandals kept entire Roman Africa, new territorial gains such as Balearic Islands and Sicily. The East Roman Empire and the Vandals promised not to undertake hostile actions. Genseric promised to give Catholic religious freedom in his country and released prisoners of war.

In Gaul, Euric (466–485) murdered his own brother Theodoric II and became the King of the Visigoths. Eric tried to gain the entire area between River Somme and Loire. But he was defeated by Roman army led by Paulus and Roman allies – Salian Franks. With time, Euric managed to occupied the Eastern part of Aquitaine and a part of Gallia Narbonensis and the valley of Rhone. After the death of Paulus (year 470), Syagrius (the son of a Roman warlord – Aegidius) came to power in Gaul from Loire to Meuse. In 486/487 he was attacked by the King of the Franks – Clovis near Soissons. He was defeated and fled to Toulouse to the King of the Visigoths – Alaric. But Alaric gave him away to Clovis who ordered that he should be secretly killed in prison in Soissons.

After the victory of the Visigoths over the Roman army in Gaul (led by the Emperor’s son – Anthemius), Ricimer triggered a rebellion. He proclaimed Olybrius (Placidia’s husband) as the next Emperor in 472. The bucellari and the Burgundians (under Gundobad) captured Rome. Emperor Anthemius was killed by Gundobad on 11th July 472. Unexpectedly, in June 472 Ricimer and Olybrius died.

Italy was practically ruled by a Burgundian – Gundobad, under the nominal control of the Emperor of the East – Leo I. as a follower of Arianism and a person of Germanic origin, Gundobad could not become an Emperor of the West. For this reason, in March 473 he elevated the

55 M. Wilczyński, Germanie w służbie zachodniorzymskiej…, op. cit., p. 224–237 (Gundobad).
Part I: Historical background of the Church in the 5th century

current *comes domesticorum* – Glycerius (473–474). Emperor Leo I did not approve of this choice and proclaimed Julius Nepos (474–475), the ruler of Dalmatia (*magister militum Dalmatiae*, a relative of Empress of the East – Verina).57 Nepos occupied Rome in June 474 and forced Glycerius to surrender but allowed him to be Bishop of Salona (Dalmatia). Nepos made peace with Genseric (the Vandals) and Euric (the Visigoths) and acknowledged the territory they owned in Africa and Gaul. He also made peace with the King of the Burgundians – Chilperic. He changed the head of the Roman army. He dismissed Ekdycjusz (hated by the Visigoths) and appointed Orestes (trusted by the Eastern Empire). But Orestes58 rebelled against Emperor Julius Nepos and in August 475, he attacked Ravenna. Nepos fled to Dalmatia and Orestes appointed his own five-year-old son Romulus Augustulus (475–476)59 as the Emperor.

Romulus power was limited to Italy, excluding the islands and to Gallia Narbonensis. Syagrius probably acknowledged Romulus but had no contact with imperial Ravenna. The Alemanni occupied Raetia, the Ostrogoths and the Rugii occupied the province of Noricum. The former Western Emperor – Julius Nepos ruled Dalmatia. when the Roman soldiers (mainly the Heruli, Turcylingowie, Skirowie, Rugowie) did not receive their pay, they demanded one third of the territory of Italy. Orestes who represented the Roman land owners, did not agree. This led to a putsch which made Odoacer the King of Italy.60 Orestes withdrew with his troops to Placentia but he was seized and killed (28th August 476). Odoacer de-throned Romulus Augustulus (but spared his life, appointed a yearly


58 L. A. Tyszkiewicz, *Hunowie w Europie…*, op. cit., p. 76.


allowance of 600 pieces of gold and gave him property in Lucullanum, where Augustulus probably lived until the year 510). Odoacer asked Emperor Zeno to make him the patrician and the administrator on the Emperor’s behalf.61

After the death of Julius Nepos (the year 480), Emperor Zeno could formally make Odoacer the ruler of the West. Odoacer himself used the term rex.62 Odoacer carried out an agricultural reform in Italy and granted his soldiers some land confiscated from the land owners. The Roman senat was still active and the Church developed. In the year 488, the Ostrogoths led by Theoderic the Great,63 withdrew from the Balkan Peninsula and with the quiet acceptance of Emperor Leo, they entered Italy. The fighting between the Ostrogoths and Odoacer’s troops lasted from 488 to 493. After the capture of Ravenna, on the 25th February 493, it was decided that Odoacer and Theoderic would rule Italy together from Ravenna. But the ruler of the Goths broke this agreement and killed Odoacer himself.64

A new era begins in a legal sense in 488 and in a practical sense in the year 493 – the rule of the Ostrogoths in Italy. Thus this is the end of Imperium Romanum pars Occidentalis.65 The analysis of political events shows how small was the influence of Biblical teachings on the subsequent ruler and conquerors of the Western Empire in the 5th century.66

---

64 H. Wolfram, Historia Gotów, op. cit., p. 322–324. When being murdered Odoacer asks “Where is God?” and Theoderic answers: “These are the sins you committed on my people.”
65 M. Jaczynowska, Dzieje Imperium Romanum, op. cit., p. 491–496.
66 In 1776, Edward Gibbon formulated an idea that was typical of the Enlightenment era. He expressed his view on the indirect role Christianity and evangelization played in the downfall of Rome. Because this opinion stands in contradiction to opinions presented in “Pastors of the 5th Century – Peter Chrysologus and Salvian Marseilles” I decided to quote it as a contrast to E. Gibbon, Upadek Cesarstwa Rzymskiego na Zachodzie, tłum. I. Szymańska, Warszawa 2000, p. 381–382: “The clergy successfully propagated the concept of patience and the remains of the spirit of war buried in the cloisters of the monastery. A gross part of the state and private owned wealth was dedicated to the seemingly right concept of mercy and piety and the pay soldiers were entitled to was wasted on a multitude of useless women and men. Faith, zealousness, curiosity and other mundane passions such as meanness and ambition encouraged
The discussion on the reasons for the downfall of the Western Empire has been going on since ancient times. R. Remondon gave a synthesis of the opinion on the subject among ancient writers. For the writers of the 4th and 5th century, what heralded the downfall of the Empire were all violent events (external and internal wars, persecution), economic changes which were too difficult to bear for the citizens (for example the prices going up), an accumulation of defeats (Barbarian invasions, social poverty, epidemics). Ancient writers try to explain this in various ways. They name the following reasons: a. religious; the anger of pagan gods at Christian “lack of religiousness”, b. eschatological: the entire world is suffering decadence and is heading towards disaster (Cyprian of Carthage, *Ad Demetrianum* 3–11; Ambrose, *Expositio in Lucam* 10,10); c. political; the imperial power changes, the monarchy becomes a tyranny responsible for revolutions, the poverty of cities and the massacre of the high society (Julian, Themistius, Libanius, Synesius).

The opinions of the ancient writers can be divided into two: pessimistic one (the world and people are always degrading and drifting away from paganism stopped pagan god from spreading kindness) and an optimistic one (people continue developing, thus *Imperium Romanum* allowed effective evangelization and Christianity enabled proper moral and religious education). The attitude to Barbarians varied too, from positive (Themistius was in favour of an alliance with the Germanic tribes) to a negative one (the disasters of the Empire are due to the alliance with the Barbarians – Synesius).

---

theological discord. Differet religious parties, whose bloody and unrelating disputes were tearing the Church and even the state apart. The attention of the emperors shifted from these parties to councils. A new type of tyranny harassed the Roman world and the oppressed sects became secret enemies of their own country.” J. B. Bury (*History of Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1, New York 1923, p. 309) criticized Gibbon’s thesis, observing that “Christianity united and not divided […] there is no evidence that Christian teachings challenged the loyalty of people towards the Empire or weakened their willingness to protect its boundaries. Christians were as brave as the pagans.” (Polish translation: M. Cary, H. H. Scullard, *Dzieje Rzymu…*, op. cit., p. 432).

There are many opinions concerning the catastrophes which happened in the Empire. The most common one are: a. Stilicho’s betrayal, b. lack of faith of the Christians which made the Visigoths conquer Rome in 410 (pagan opinions; c. Imperium cannot disappear as it is the basis of the development and triumph of Christianity (Orosius); d. decadence of the Empire is not important, what is important is the City of God (Augustine of Hippo); e. the downfall of the Empire is God’s sentence, the Barbarian heretics (followers of Arianism) are God’s punishment for decadence (Salvian of Marseilles); f. the moral crisis of the citizens and the conversion to Christianity (pagan opinions from Athens and Alexandria from the 5th century); g. moral crisis and carelessness and lack of diligence made the Romans lose Imperium (Justynian).68

Analyzing the reasons of the downfall of the Western Roman Empire, from today’s perspective, one can say that there were many. These included external ones (war on two fronts; Persia – Barbarians; constant invasions of Barbarian tribes, beginning with the 3rd century; the invasion of the Huns at the turn of the 4th and 5th century; invasion of Germanic tribes in the years 376–380 and 405–408 at the same time as the Huns). There were also internal reasons (no universal form of education, general depression among people, weakness of the Roman economy – a system based on the work of slaves; a fight of the classes; concentration of power in the hands of the high society; no good system enabling a successful to the throne; no compulsory conscription; poor finances).69

One cannot doubt the historical fact that at the end of the 5th century (476–488) the Western Roman Empire fell.70 The Germanic tribes took

---

70 The date of the downfall of the empire is a matter of controversy among historians. Usually it is accepted that it was 476 (the return of the insignia to Constantinople) or 493 (the Kingdom of Ostrogoths was established). However, many historians accept other dates: (The First Council of Nicae; G. Ostrogorski), 755 (the Arab invasion of Abd al-Rahman on
Part I: Historical background of the Church in the 5th century

This did not happen rapidly: in the second half of the 5th century, most of the Western provinces of *Imperium Romanum* was in the hands of the Germanic and Iranian invaders, who even *ex post* demanded the status of allies, which made their presence legal.72

1.2. Barbarians in the Western Roman Empire of the 5th century

The invasions of Germanic tribes and the Huns and Alans at the end of the 4th century, the beginning of the 5th and throughout entire 5th century in the Western Roman territory, caused political problems in the Empire. The gradual Germanisation of the Western Roman army in the 5th century resulted in Barbarian allies replacing Roman army with an obvious result.73 The Germanic peoples were present not only in the Roman army but also in the imperial court in Ravenna.74 The military and political aspect of the


P. Heather (*Upadek cesarstwa*) having analysed the external reasons for the downfall of the Western Roman Empire, the author stressed the importance of the invasion of the Huns and the constant influx of Germanic tribes in the years 376–380 and 405–408. “The Roman Empire did not fall on its own but because its neighbours reacted in an unpredictable way to its wealth. One can draw the conclusion for future superpowers that Rome paid a high price for its insatiable aggression and imperialism”, ibidem, p. 528.


J. Kolendo, *Kontakty Rzymu z barbarzyńcami Europy środkowej i wschodniej*, [in:] *Starożytny Rzym we współczesnych badaniach. Państwo – Społeczeństwo – Gospodarka. Liber in memoriam Lodovici Piotrowicz*, red. J. Wolski, T. Kotula, A. Kunisz, Kraków 1994, p. 211–232. The author stresses the fact that the Roman army of the 4th century was becoming very much barbaric. Not only the border army (*limitanei*) but also the mobile army (*comitatenses*), as well as, gwardia cesarska was largely made up of Barbarians. This was due to the fact that the Romans did not want to serve in the army and the land owners refused to send their *coloni*. As a result, as of the beginning of the second half of the 4th century, the Roman army was entirely in the hands of the Barbarians, ibidem, p. 229.

presence of Germanic tribes, as well as, the Huns and the Alans seems to be reason for the downfall of the Western Roman Empire.

After the defeat of the Roman army at Adrianopole in 378, the Empire managed to control the situation by acknowledging the Visigoths and making them allies. After the death of Emperor Theodosius, anti-Germanic feelings in Constantinopole in the year 400 led to a slaughter of Germanic soldiers in the Eastern Roman army. This enabled the East to retain military and territorial integration but the Barbarian attack in the Western Empire, hastened the disintegration of political structures.75

At the end of the 4th century, various Germanic tribes crossed the Roman border on the Rhine and the Danube and entered different regions of the Western Empire.76 The entire 5th century was a streak of fighting of the Western Romans with the Barbarians. In 401, the Germanic tribes – the Vandals and the Iranian ones – the Alans entered Noricum and Raetia. Stilicho finally gave these tribes land in Noricum and in Vindelicia, in return for their service in the Roman army.77

Stilicho used the Alans and the Huns to fight the Visigoths in 402. As a result of the Battle of Pollentia, the Visigoths withdrew from Italy, into Dalmatia and Pannonia.78 In December 405, the Empire was attacked in the West by the Ostrogoths but were defeated by the Roman army at Fiesole.79 On the 31st December 406, the Western Empire was invaded by the Vandals, the Alans, the Alemanni and the Burgundians. This invasion flooded the Roman Gaul. Soon after, there was another invasion. This time the Burgundians and the Alemanni flooded the province of Germania I. in both cases, there was no army which could defy the invasion.80 When the Visigoths invaded again at the turn of 407 and 408, the

Romans were not able to fight successfully. They paid ransom and finally lost Rome on the 24th of August 410. Rome was also captured by the Vandals in 455, but at that time the city was no longer an administrative and political centre as the new capital of the Western Roman Empire was Ravenna (since 402).

The Visigoths attacked Gaul in 412. They fought the Roman army until 416 when they signed a treaty with the Romans. This ended the era of great Barbarian invasions of the Western part of the Empire. But they did not gain political freedom. Under the reign of king Theodoric, the Visigoths adopted a successful policy and around the year 426 they won power in the former Roman provinces of Aquitania II and Narbonensis. The new situation created an uncertain balance between the Western Roman Empire and the Barbarians which was disturbed by the invasion of the Vandals in Africa in the year 429.

Germanic tribes migrated to the territory of the Empire for various reasons: following a stage of fleeing ‘from the worse’, there was a stage of fleeing ‘from the better’ and occupying the territory of the Western Empire as a result. The Visigoths, the Vandals and the Burgundians settled with the permission of empire (foedus). With time, they freed themselves from

---
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the Romans and formed their own countries (the Visigoths, the Vandals) and in 436, the Burgundians nearly destroyed themselves.85

The Western Roman territory, occupied by Germanic tribes in the 5th century, were up till then inhabited by Roman population. Beginning with the end of the 5th century, the situation is such that the Romans live in Barbarian countries. Two different worlds – the Roman and the Barbarian, isolated up till now, begin to adjust, merge and coexist.86 The most important countries which were formed in the 5th century were the Visigoths, the Vandals, the Huns, the Ostrogoths and the Franks.

**The Visigoths** – for 89 years, from 418 to 507, they occupied territory in the South of Gaul, the Pyrenees and the large part of the Iberian Peninsula. After they were defeated by the Franks in 507, they left most of the territory of Gaul (except Septymania), occupied the territory of Spain, joined the territory of the Suebi and for the next 204 years, they became the masters of the Iberian Peninsula apart from the small mountainous area of the Basque territory. After the year 711, the Goths were conquered by the Arabs.87

**The Vandals** – they formed their own country in the territory of the former Roman Africa. This country existed for 105 years, from 429 to 534 when their army was destroyed by Byzantine army and Emperor Justinian founded the praetorian prefecture of Africa.88


86 J. Kolendo, Kontakty Rzymu z barbarzyńcami, op. cit., p. 231; J. Kolendo, I barbari del Nord, op. cit., p. 441; Ch. Lelong, Życie codzienne w Galii Merowingów, tłum. E. Bąkowska, Warszawa 1967, p. 7. The author notices that at the time of Germanic invasions the Gaul was becoming not only a country of Romanized Gauls, but also a mix of different peoples, races and civilizations. There were few Germanians in the Gaul in the 5th century. There are no more than 50 thousand Burgundians, around 100 thousand Franks in the entire population of 6–10 million. Only some Northern and Eastern parts were being settled by newcomers, the same.
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The Huns — a non-Germanic peoples (probably the descendants of the Xiung-nu people). In the first half of the 5th century, the Huns united under their own leadership, the Iranian tribes of the Alans, the Sarmatians, the Germanic Gepids, the Rugii, the Scirii and the Goths and thus became a threat to the entire Imperium Romanum. They did not found a stable enough country and in 453 the federation fell apart.\(^8^9\)

The Ostrogoths — their country existed from 456/457 to 473, they were in the Balkans between 473 and 488. After winning battles (under Theodoric), they gained Italy and their country existed from 490/493 till 552. In 552, the last king of the Goths — Teia was killed in Mons Lactarium. Thus their country existed for only 59 years, from 493 till 552.\(^9^0\)

The Franks — were united by Clovis who ruled in Gaul. The Franks conquered the Alemanni (496), the Thuringii (531) and the Burgundians (532) thus forming the strongest Germanic country built on the ruins of the Western Roman Empire. After the death of Charlemagne in 814, the country became weaker. The Treaty of Verdun (843) and the division of the country into three parts resulted in the formation of three new countries. The area was divided between the sons of Louis the Pious. Lothair I received the centre part (Italy, Burgundy, Frisia and Lorraine region); Louis the German (804–876) received the so called Eastern kingdom (the area which later became Germany). The Frankish Kingdom came to a definite end in 887. Thus the Frankish country lasted the longest, that is 401 years, from 486 to 887.\(^9^1\)

The Germanic peoples versus Christianity in the 4th and 5th century

Apart from the Frankish kingdom, the Germanic countries did not last too long. But the conversion of the Germanic peoples to Christianity proved to be successful and long lasting. The clash of the two worlds, the Roman

\(^8^9\) L. A. Tyszkiewicz, *Hunowie w Europie…*, op. cit., p. 16–18 (the probable genesis), 161–174 (the downfall of the Empire of the Huns).

\(^9^0\) H. Wolfram, *Historia Gotów*, op. cit., p. 326–408.
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and the Germanic took place between the 4th and 5th century and had religious and social consequences. J. Kolendo noticed that ‘when the Empire accepted Christianity, the Barbarians remained faithful to their pagan traditions’. This conflict became particularly bitter because the majority of the Germanic peoples were Arians.92

Beginning with the 4th century, there was a close link between the interests of the Church and the state in Imperium Romanum. The Empire fought simultaneously with the Germanic Barbarians, as well as, with paganism.93 For the Goths, Arianism was one way of spreading their identity and an opportunity for a Gothic translation of the Bible and spreading certain laws.94 Some Gothic traditions, such as Arianism and the Bible in Gothic, became mutual heritage of all Germanic tribes, but not for all as the Crimean Goths were not followers of Arianism.95

From the beginning of its existence, Christianity was strongest within Imperium Romanum.96 After Constantine’s (the Great) Edict which

---

95 M. Salamon, Ku nowej tożsamości. Plemiona germanińskie na Wschodzie w III–VI w., [in:] Wędrówka i etnogeneza…, op. cit., p. 158.
96 K. Holl, Die Missionsmethode der alten und die der mittelalterlichen Kirche, [in:] Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte, Bd. 1: Die Alte Kirche, Hrsg. H. Frohnes, U. W. Knorr, München 1974, p. 3–11. As far as development of Christianity is concerned, we know that beginning with the 3rd century, there was missionary work in Persia. Philip, Bardaisan’s pupil suggests that by the year 220, Christianity spread as far as to the Eastern provinces of the Persian Empire. This means that evangelization had begun in the previous century (compare Eusebius of Caesareaz, Praeparatio evangelica VI, 10: Sch 266, É. des Places, Paris 1980). Around the year 260, the Persian king Shapur imprisoned a group of Christians and took them from Syria to Mesopotamia and Persia. The Christian community in Persia in the second half of the 3rd century must have been rather strong if their members had polemicized with the Manichees. At the end of the 3rd century the capital of Persia – Seleucia also became the the capital of the Christian diocese. The first absolutely certain bishop of Seleucia was a Syrian – Papa bar-Aggai. Compare: J. Zeiller, L’espansione cristiana dalla fine del II secolo all’inizio del IV secolo, [in:] Storia della Chiesa, vol. 2: Dalla fine del II secolo alla pace costantina (313), a cura di J. Lebreton, J. Zeiller, Milano 1995, p. 195–224. The evangelization of Georgia and Armenia dates back to the 3rd century and the Christian mission in India. To read more about missionary work of the Church in the first centuries
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decreed tolerance, the Church chose to spread Christianity within the Empire. Evangelizing rarely took place outside the Roman borders in the 4th century. The only exceptions being – the Iberians in Caucasia, the Axumites in Ethiopia and the Goths.97 But the Goths accepted Christianity thanks to the Arian evangelization. Imperium Romanum gave members of Germanic tribes the opportunity to convert to Christianity when they joined the Roman army – through contact with Christian soldiers or merchants.98

The first significant evangelization of the Goths took place thanks to an Arian bishop – Ulfilas.99 No evangelization took place among Goths before Arianism. “The Goths came across Arianism during Christianization. Arianism was the only knowledge they had of God and Christ”.100 The Visigoths passed Christianity onto (in Arian form) to the Ostrogoths.101 Gradually, the Arian form of Christianity became popular among the Gepids, the Vandals, the Suebi, the Burgundians, the Lombards, the Rugii, the Heruli, the Alemanni and between the 5th and the 7th century – the Thuringii. However, the majority of Germanic tribes attacking the Western Roman Empire at the turn of the 4th and 5th century, remained pagan.102

98 E. A. Thompson, Il cristianesimo e i barbari del Nord, [in:] Il conflitto tra paganesimo e cristianesimo nel secolo IV, a cura di A. Momigliano, Torino 1975, p. 67–73. In his book M. Wilczyński (Germanie w służbie zachodniorzymskiej…, op. cit.) notices that a large number of Arians among Western Roman officers and foederati of Germanic origin, is rather surprising as Arianism was one of the characteristics of their ethnic identity, p. 82.
100 M. Wilczyński, Germanie w służbie zachodniorzymskiej…, op. cit., p. 83.
The Catholic Church undertook its own steps to evangelize the Goths.\textsuperscript{103} The few people who did this were bishops – Nicetas of Remesiana and Victricius of Rouen,\textsuperscript{104} as well as, Bishop Amantius in Pannonia.\textsuperscript{105} It is interesting that none of the Christian Emperors of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} century took into consideration the social aspect of converting Germanic tribes into Christianity – by tempering the aspects of war.\textsuperscript{106}

Most of the Catholic writers in the West, with their pax romana, provided protection against the Barbarians in the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{107} This was no surprise as the Germanic peoples attacking the West in 406, entered Gaul stealing and destroying private property but also the property belonging to the Church. “The Bishops of Northern Gaul were forced to flee and the abandoned residences in Cologne, Mainz, Worms, Speyer and Strasbourg, remained empty for the next hundred years. Probably, there was no bishopric in the Balkans at the time”.\textsuperscript{108} Latin writers and Fathers of the Church never accepted the Barbarians, they could never become part of Romania and in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century, they were treated as worse. The Arianism they believed in, was a synonym of paganism.\textsuperscript{109} On the other hand, the Arianism accepted by Germanic peoples did not encourage a better relationship with followers of Catholicism (especially honestiores).


\textsuperscript{106} E. A. Thompson, \textit{Il cristianesimo e i barbari del Nord}, op. cit., p. 75.


and Germanic leaders, except for the Franks did not seek better relations between religions, but allowed a coexistence.110

Together with constant invasions and the settlement of Germanic tribes in the Western Roman Empire, the attitude of Catholic writers towards the Barbarians began to change. They were ignored by St. Ambrose and for St. Jerome, the Barbarian invasions and the downfall of Rome in 410 meant the end of the world. St. Augustine saw the possibility of converting the Barbarians to Christianity but encouraged the faithful to take care of the supernatural and God’s world.111

Saint Peter Chrysologus presented a similar attitude in the 5th century. As the Bishop of Ravenna, in his works he emphasized the importance of God’s grace, whereas, the topic of Barbarian invasions was practically nonexistent in his sermons.112 But for Salvian of Marseilles, the Germanic Barbarian was important from the point of view of a moral and social discussion. Salvian knew that people of a certain class (humiliores) saw the Barbarians as liberators.113

Salvian was more fond of the morality of the Germanic tribes than that of the Romans in his De Gubernatione Dei. In his opinion God punished the Romans for their sins and rewarded the Germanic tribes for their moral stance.114 He idealized the Germanic tribes and juxtaposed them with the

114 M. Ianenelli, La caduta d’un Impero nel capolavoro di Salviano, Napoli 1948, p. 33–43, 148–152; G. Wcisło, Stosunek Salwiana do barbarzyńców, op. cit., p. 159–169; G. Wcisło (ibidem, p. 168) notices that while in the Gaul, Salvian did not feel any hostility towards the Germanic peoples. He noticed their religiousness, high moral standards and faithfulness to their own tradition. Even if he did not like them, he respected them. From a theological point of view, he was convinced that God blesses the Barbarians as they are his tool in punishing the Romans who live in sin.
moral decay present among the Romans. In his view, the Barbarians were a tool in the hands of the Divine Providence, the invasions were punishment for injustice, social evil and bad behavior. The Barbarians were not only a Roman enemy but also a tool in God’s hands. Salvian perceived the Barbarian tribes as the descendants of the Romans, who through their simplicity and purity of morals were to revive the old Romans.115

But Salvian’s opinion of the Barbarians as the new, virtuous Romans was rather unusual in the 5th century Church because the stability of Imperium Romanum and the dedication of the Catholic Church to the Empire were the basis of the ideological and political beliefs of the time. Only, with the beginning of the second half of the 5th century, do Catholic writers begin to view the Barbarian invasions as Providence. People such as Salvian of Marseilles, view this situation as a just punishment for the sins of the Romans and a God’s summoning to undertake new missionary work.116

These theological opinions gave birth to ideological and theological changes in the missionary work of the Church in relation to the Barbarians. But the real change of attitude towards the Germanic tribes took place in the 6th century. Beginning with the second wave of Barbarian invasions, that is the year 406, the real conversion to Christianity in its Arian form, began to take place.117 When the Visigoths (under the leadership
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of Ataulf) settled near Barcelona, they were already followers of Arianism and they propagated Arianism. Arianism was no doubt the preferred form of religiousness among Germanic and Iranian tribes, settling in the Western Roman Empire in the 5th century. The Visigoths in the South of Gaul and Spain, the Suebi and the Vandals in Galicia were followers of Arianism, just like the Iranian Alans in Lusitania and the Vandals in Bettica. With time, the Germanic tribes begin to convert to Catholicism. The Burgundians did this soon after the year 500, the Visigoths in 587 and the Lombards between 671 and 688. The Saxons and the Frisians remained pagan the longest and were Christianized at the end of 8th century, during the reign of Charles the Great.

The Barbarian invasions brought with them plunder and violence and led to the downfall of the Western Roman Empire. By invading and settling the new land, the Germanic tribes made the corrupted Roman tax
system fail in the 5th century. For this reason, the poorer citizens saw the invaders as saviours from the Roman tax system. The Germanic tribes of the 4th and 5th century were usually pagan, but gradually they were converging to Christianity,\(^{120}\) usually from Arianism to Catholicism. In Salvian's opinion, the Germanic tribes were to revive the Romans and bring back moral integrity. This was not an apocalyptic vision of the end of the world but wishful thinking of reviving virtuous Romans.\(^{121}\) This was best achieved through the Franks. The formula *pro impero Romano* was condemned in Sacramentaries in Gaul. This was clearly a sign of new times.\(^{122}\) The gradual

\(^{120}\) J. Vogt, *Upadek Rzymu*, op. cit., p. 226–231; M. Maęczyńska, *Wędrówki ludów*, op. cit., p. 38–39. The author draws attention to the fact that the process of Christianization of Germanic tribes can be noticed in archeological sources. The custom of equipping the dead dies. New church graveyards appear; the dead are equipped with Christian symbols (in case of men – gold crosses made of thin metal placed on the chest or a veil covering the face in case of women). Metal or wooden capsules appear for storing blessed items, as well as, ornaments and tools decorated with a cross or Christ's monogram. Under the influence of Christianity, the Germanic tribes begin to bury the dead with the head facing West instead of South or North as was the case up till then. L. Leciejewicz (*Nowa postać świata*, op. cit., p. 61) adds that the Germanic peoples buried their dead without burning them.

\(^{121}\) Salvian's theology is more ecclesiastic than that of his almost contemporary John Cassian (around 360–435). C. Leonardi, *Alle origini della cristianità medievale. Giovanni Cassiano e Salviano di Marsiglia*, “Studi Medievali” 18/2 (1977), p. 491–608 notices that Salvian studies the Bible and addresses all bishops and the entire Christian community and not just the monks. For this reason, it is Salvian, not John Cassian who sees the possibility of a positive relationship between the Church and Germanic peoples after the downfall of the concept of the imperial Byzantine Church. In the Western Church, the concept of foretelling salvation and perfection for everybody remains essential. Prophecy is juxtaposed with mystical experience. Whereas, in Cassian’s monasticism the evangelization of people remaining outside of the Church (for example 5th century Barbarians) is negated. In Cassian’s opinion, such an opening up could lead to the decay of the Church. Such model of Christianity is in danger of the predominance of the institutional over the mystical level. Thus when discussing the Germanic issues, Salvian sees the need for external actions of the Church and forces it to abandon monastic isolation. If the West like the Eastern Church did not see the Church solely made up of monks, but of peoples than it owes that to Salvian’s prophecies. As the restorer of Western monasticism, Benedict will have to realize the separate standard. For this reason, Gregory the Great referred to the Augustine heritage when discussing the dilemma of the bishop-monk. He resigned from monastic stability and decided to send missionaries to England when – in his Commentary to Ezekiel – he presented the prophetic charisma as an own quality of a bishop. The most important character of such stature is Columbanus who became a missionary and would prophesy towards all authority, the Church authority in Rome included, ibidem, p. 607.

\(^{122}\) R. Kamienik, *Kościół i hierarchia kościelna...,* op. cit., p. 175, 177.
assimilation of Barbarians in the Western Roman Empire, finally resulted in their Romanization and Christianization.\textsuperscript{123}

1.3. The Socio-economic Situation

At the turn of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} century, there was a decline in population in the provinces of the Western Roman Empire. This was due to the political situation in the region.\textsuperscript{124} The total population of the late Roman Empire was 50 million and the average life expectancy was between 30 to 45 years for adults and 15 for ill children. Due to frequent childbirth, women’s life expectancy was five years shorter than men’s.\textsuperscript{125}

Social conditions in the late Roman Empire were very much the same as earlier during the times of Diocletian and Constantine the Great.\textsuperscript{126} Diocletian introduced absolute power of the emperor and used the title \textit{dominus ac deus} (‘lord and god’), \textit{princeps} (‘the first citizen’). Modern day historians use the name of the dominate to describe this stage of Roman system.\textsuperscript{127} The formation of Germanic countries in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century increased the importance of social force but did not change the basis of the late Roman Empire social system. Society was no longer divided into two main groups (\textit{honestiores} and \textit{humilores}), but three: \textit{potior dignitas},

\textsuperscript{123} P. Courcelle, \textit{Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques}, op. cit., p. 252–258.
\textsuperscript{124} The demographic situation at the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} century was different in the East than in the West of the Roman Empire. A. Cameron (\textit{Późne cesarstwo rzymskie}) notices that beginning with the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and throughout the 5\textsuperscript{th} century there was a notable increase in population. One must remember though that the political situation in the West in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century was different and did not encourage population growth, p. 136.
\textsuperscript{125} A. Demandt, \textit{Die Spätantike…}, op. cit., p. 276.
\textsuperscript{126} J. M. Carrié, \textit{Le riforme economiche da Aureliano a Costantino}, [in:] \textit{Storia di Roma}, vol. 3\textsuperscript{e}, op. cit., p. 283–322. The author stresses the fact that the financial situation of the Empire at the beginning of 4\textsuperscript{th} century (lack of noble metals, as well as, high cost of public spending) did not allow Diocletian and later Constantine the Great to chose their own monetary policy. Because of inflation, they decided to ‘pilot’ the monetary policy, but it was a secondary issue to economics. Their monetary policy was adapter to the changing situation of the economy. For this reason, the economy was not based only on monetarism and the coin apart from the tax system and price control system was only one element of their financial policy, ibidem, p. 320–321.
\textsuperscript{127} A. Demandt, \textit{Die Spätantike…}, op. cit., p. 212–231.
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decuriones and plebei (CTh 13,5,5, an act from 326), or: possessors, curiales, plebei (CTh 9,31,1, an edict from 409).128

The Roman economy of the end of the 4th and entire 5th century was based on agriculture.129 The most important members of potior dignitas (possessors) that is senators, owned the majority of the land. At the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries there was a concentration of estates and most were owned by senators.130 Such concentration of goods in private hands was dangerous as at the same time the political and economic power of the government was becoming smaller.131

The most characteristic feature of the late Roman Empire was slavery. During Docletian’s times, the price of an adult man between the age of 16 and 40 was 30 thousand denarii communes (dc), the equivalent of the price for a camel (ED 30,7). The price for a woman of the same age was 25 thousand dc, an equivalent of the price of a man, aged 40 to 60. The price of a woman aged 40–60 was 20 dc. The price of a child (boy or girl) between 8 to 15 years of age was 15dc, whereas the price of a woman over 60 was about 10dc.132

131 A. Cameron, Późne cesarstwo rzymskie, op. cit., p. 139–140.
132 A. Demandt, Die Spätantike…, op. cit., p. 291. Demandt notices that the prices of slaves changed during the Germanic invasions. In the time of Justinian the Great (AD 530) the number of men slaves (former soldiers) became smaller (CJ VII 7, 5). The price of a slave under ten was 10 solidi. An ordinary slave or woman slave cost 20 solidi. An educated slave cost 30 solidi. An uneducated eunuch, a boy under 10 cost 30 solidi. An uneducated eunuch over the age of 10 cost 50 solidi (for example, a qualified notary, a scribe – 50 solidi; a doctor – 60 solidi; a competent craftsman – 70 solidi), ibidem. Compare: W. L. Westermann, The slave system of Greek and Roman antiquity, Philadelphia 1955.
Slaves were used in agriculture. Owning slaves, except for Italy, never became a norm. Slavery was not common in rural areas of the late Roman Empire (except for Italy, Spain and Asia Minor, including its islands). But the entire late Roman economy was based on the exploitation of the coloni, farmers leasing land, forced to pay poll tax (capitatio), as well as glebis inhaerent, servus terrae, inserviant terries and those deprived of freedom and ownership (colonus adscripticus) – in theory they were free people but in reality they were treated like slaves. The coloni suspected of the wish to escape, were handcuffed like slaves (CTh 5,17,1; an edict from 332). They were assigned to given area of land and inherited together with new land owner (CTh 13,10,3’ an edict from 357). They were not allowed to join the army, the clergy and were not allowed to marry outside their status. They were forced to inherit their job and an act from the year 419 allowed the slave to be sent back to the estate, even 30 years after the escape, no matter whether the rightful owner was still alive or not (CTh 5,18,1).

The financial system of the Empire of the 4th and 5th century was based on gold money (solidus aureus, about 5.45 g) and copper money (follis). In the year 346, follis was withdrawn and replaced by maiorimus and centenionalis. In the first half of the 5th century, the Roamn Empire decided not to issue coins of varied value. There was one bronze one (10–13 mm and weighing about 1g) known as nummus or minimus. The silver coins, lost some of their value, but they were still in use. There was a smaller number of mints. Only some of them survived until the times of Honorius (395–423). These included mints in Lugdunum (Lyon), Sisak and Aquileia. The mint in Trevir stopped working around mid 5th century but the one in

---

133 A. Cameron, Późne cesarstwo rzymskie, op. cit., p. 141–142.
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Arles was still in use. The mints in Milan, Ravenna and Rome continued their work even after the fall of the Western Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{137}

The tax system in the Western Roman Empire was controlled by the decurions. By the end of the 4th century the situation improved slightly and the taxes were collected \textit{iugatio et capitatio}.\textsuperscript{138} One of the most characteristic features of the Western Roman economy was the fact that the Barbarians were paid yearly sums in gold as yearly subsidy or one-time tribute.\textsuperscript{139}

\textit{Patrocinium},\textsuperscript{140} slavery, attachment of the \textit{coloni} to land, delivering free food to the inhabitants of Rome and Constantinople was what made up late Roman Empire. This stopped its development on a larger scale.\textsuperscript{141} The


\textsuperscript{138} The tax system known as \textit{capitatio-iugatio} was introduced in the year 287 by Emperor Diocletian. \textit{Capitatio} (from Latin \textit{caput}, \textit{capitis} – head), that is poll tax paid by everyone from the age of 14 to 65. The sum was different for everyone. The basis for the calculation was \textit{caput}, which defined the value of one colonus. Depending on the value of the work of the people farming the land, \textit{caput} was consisted of more heads (\textit{capitatio humana}). Cattle owners paid tax depending on the number of animals (\textit{capitatio animalium}). Poor commoners paid yearly (\textit{capitatio plebeia}). Some people such as widows and children were exempt from tax. \textit{Iugatio} (from \textit{inuerum}, \textit{inur} – an agrarian unit) was land tax. Land tax depended on the value of land. Its basis was \textit{inum}, that is the area which could farmed by one man and his horse. Taxes were collected by Diocletian’s representatives, the so called \textit{ordo decurionum}, who were located all over the Empire. During Diocletian’s reforms, the yearly tax usually did not exceed 10\% of a citizen’s income. In the late Empire, land tax (\textit{capitatio terrena}) and income tax (\textit{negotiatorum collatio}) from people earning money who joined trade unions was a burden for the people especially due to abuse from the state officials. To read more see: E. Stein, \textit{Histoire du Bas – Empire}, vol. 1: \textit{De l’État Romain à l’État Byzantin} (284–476) (orig. \textit{Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches}, Bd. 1: \textit{Vom römischen zum byzantinischen Staate} (284–476 n. Chr.), Wien 1928), ed. J.-R. Palanque, Amsterdam 1968, p. 73–76; A. H. M. Jones, \textit{Capitatio and Iugatio}, “Journal of Roman Studies” 47 (1957) 1/2, p. 88–94; W. A. Goffart, \textit{Caput and Colonate. Towards a history of late Roman taxation}, Toronto–Buffalo 1974 (Phoenix Supplementary, vol. 12); U. Hildesheim, \textit{Personalspektke der frühbyzantinischen Steuerordnung. Die Personalveranlagung und ihre Einbindung in das System der capitatio – iugatio}, Pfaffenweiler 1988.

\textsuperscript{139} A. Cameron, \textit{Późne cesarstwo rzymskie}, op. cit., p. 137–138.


\textsuperscript{141} A. Cameron, \textit{Późne cesarstwo rzymskie}, op. cit., p. 144–145; the author adds that public institutions in Rome gave away cereal, bread, olive oil and pork. Most cereal produced in Africa and Egypt was confiscated because of this. It was treated as part of the land tax. Pork was confiscated in other Italian cities.
system based on oppression and oppressive taxes made Roman citizens flee to the Barbarians, who did not have an oppressive tax system but only feudal dependency on the Germanic ruler.\textsuperscript{142}

The Barbarians of the 5th century were not as oppressive in terms of tax. What is more, when the Germanic peoples accepted Christianity, the early \textit{mos maiorum} (separating the Romans from the non-Romans) was overcome as the Germanic peoples had one religion and ethics. The collapse of Imperial power in the West in the 5th century was inevitable. The acts and orders they tried to issue were unrealistic but this did not change the social structure, instead the protofeudal dependency became common. This was replaced by the rule of Germanic kings.\textsuperscript{143}

The administrative regions of the Western Roman Empire in which Peter Chrysologus (\textit{Flaminia}) and Salvian of Marseilles (\textit{Germania I et II, Viennensis}) lived, were part of two different prefectures of the West: \textit{Flaminia} (the capital city in Ravenna) was part of IX diocese of Italy, the so called \textit{Italia Annonaria} (paying crop tax, \textit{annona}) which in turn was part of the prefecture of Illyria, Italy and Africa (in the years 286–402, its capital was Milan and from 402 to 476 – Ravenna).\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{142} J. Gagé, \textit{Les classe sociales}, op. cit., p. 432–439; G. Alfoldy, \textit{Historia społeczna starożytne- go Rzymu}, op. cit., p. 280. The author notices that at the beginning of the 5th century, Orosius lamented that the poor Roman flee to the German peoples. During the times of Salvian of Marseilles (\textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 21) this became common. Both the poor and the well educated people fled to the Germanic peoples. This resulted in a paradox where the people who could potentially stop the surge of Barbarians, chose the lesser of the two evils by staying with the Barbarians. The Western Roman Empire in the 5th century was forced to tolerate Germanic settlement within its territory. This undermined its existence. As a result of Roman people fleeing, large areas of land were not cultivated.


\textsuperscript{144} As a result of administrative division of \textit{Imperium Romanum} done by Diocletian, there was \textit{Dioecesis Italicae} which was divided into two vicariates: the Northern one (\textit{regio annonaria}) with the capital in Milan and the central Southern one (\textit{regiones suburbicariae}) with Rome as the capital. The \textit{Dioecesis Italicae Annonariae} eventually became the \textit{regio annonaria} in the 4th century. It consisted of five provinces: \textit{Aemilia et Liguria, Alpes Cottiae, Raetia, Venetia et Histria, Flaminia et Picenum Annonarium}. Whereas, \textit{Dioecesis Italicae Suburbicariae} consisted of nine provinces: \textit{Tuscia et Umbria, Flaminia et Picenum, Campania, Samnium, Apulia et Calabria, Lucania et Bruttii, Sicilia, Sardinia and Corsica}. The last data concerniong the administrative division of the Western Roman Empire is to
During the late Roman Empire the province of Flaminia et Picenum encompassed today’s province of Romagna and the delta of the Po river.\textsuperscript{145} In the year 364, the territory of this province included Central Apennine Mountains by the Adriatic Sea and the coast from Ravenna to today’s Termoli (Molise). The province stretched from North to South – from Cesna to Sangro river, boarding with Regio IV – Sannium. This region extended towards the East to include Umbria and the territory of the ancient Sabini, Euganei, Marsi, Paeligni and Frentani. With time, all of these territories became part of Valeria district.\textsuperscript{146}

The Imperial Constitution of the 9th November 399 (CIL, VI, 2715)\textsuperscript{147} shows another administrative transformation – the division of the former province into the northern part (Flaminia), southern part (Picenum) and...
southern-central part (Valeria). At the beginning of the 4th century, Ravenna was part of Aemilia et Liguria and between 354 and 395, it became the capital of Flaminia et Picenum province, which in 357 was still part of the Roma Suburbicaria diocese and between 395 and 398 again became part of Dioecesis Annonaria as a province called Aemilia. After 398 Ravenna was already the capital of Flaminia and finally became a province known as Flaminia et Picenum Annonarium.

At the beginning of the 4th century, Ravenna was a provincial city, halfway between Rome and Milan. But at the end of the 4th century, Ravenna was already a competition for Milan (the capital of Italia Annonaria) and finally took over the role of capital city. It became the capital of Dioecesis Annonaria on the 6th of December 402, when Emperor Honorius promulgated the first edict from Ravenna. At the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 5th century (at least until the year 430), the territory of provincia Flaminia was ruled by consularis. But the city and the port of Ravenna was ruled by prefectus classis Ravennatinum.

---

148 A. Giardina, *La formazione dell’Italia provinciale*, [in:] *Storia di Roma*, vol. 3*, op. cit., p. 51–68; G. A. Cecconi, *Governo imperiale*, op. cit., p. 204; E. Migliaro (*A proposito di CTh IX, 30, 1–5*, p. 475–476) notices that the so called Northern part – Flaminia Annonaria, was generally equivalent to the areas along Via Flaminia: consisting of the traditional Umbria, as well as, the coast of Northern March and Romagna. The Southern part was located along Via Emilia, which is now part of the Italian province of Romagna. But the Southern and Central part or the suburban part was located in the historic Picenum and the new district of Valeria. Emperor Arcadius and Emperor Honorius issued edicts to adjust the geographical and political division to the territorial division which came to be during the Reign of earlier emperors. The constitution of the above mentioned emperors (399) was meant for the administration of Valeria vel Picenum (Suburbicarium). The division of the region could have taken place because originally the territory of Flaminia et Picenum stretched from the Northern diocese of Italia Annonaria to the Central/Southern Roma Suburbicaria making administration difficult.

149 F. Rebecchi, *Le città dell’Italia annonaria*, [in:] *Storia di Roma*, vol. 3*, op. cit., p. 212–213. As a result of a new division in the year 402, Northern March (that is the former ager Gallicus) became part of the province of Flaminia et Picenum Annonarium, ibidem.


There were six stages of development of ancient Ravenna: *Ancient* (with an almost square structure which had a wall which was destroyed during imperial times to allow new buildings to be built) and five so called regions (*regions*), which developed on the base of the original city. The Golden Gate (*Porta Aurea*) in the South Eastern part of the city was the most characteristic building in Ravenna.\(^{153}\)

Ravenna developed towards the North. This allowed the formation of so called *regions* II and III. The architecture of 4th century Ravenna was Christian. Saint Apollinaris, the first Bishop of Ravenna ordered the temple of Apollo near the Golden Gate to be destroyed. But the local city forum can still be traced in the place of S. Maria *in Fori*.\(^{154}\) The 5th century city of Ravenna reproduces the configuration of Constantinopole.\(^{155}\)

In Ancient times Ravenna had two ports. The first one, the so called old port (built in the Northern Eastern part of the city) was also called *portus Coriandri*. We can assume that later on it was all covered in sand. It is no surprise that new gardens and orchards were founded. In the Southern East part of the city, there was another port called *Portus Classis* or *Novus Portus*. It was connected to Ravenna by *via Popilia*. The new port was build during the reign of Augustus (29 BC – 14 AD). He decided to build a canal (*Fosa Augustea*) connecting the city with the Adriatic Sea. According to Pliny the Older, the port could accommodate up to 250 ships and ten

\(^{153}\) F. Rebecchi, Ravenna, *ultima capitale di Occidente*, [in:] *Storia di Roma*, vol. 3**, op. cit., p. 125–128. The antique city gate of Ravenna was rebuilt and decorated around 42. This was probably done in honour of Emperor Claudian, on his return from Brittany (upon embarking on his expedition, the Emperor boarded a ship in the port of Ravenna and was welcomed by a new gate in 44). The name *Porta Aurea* probably comes from the 5th century and it refers to *Chryse Porta* in Constantinopole (commemorating the victory of Theodosius II in 423 over John, an usurper to the throne of the Western Roman Empire, ibidem.


\(^{155}\) A. Carile, *Ravenna e Costantinopoli*, Porphyra (Rivista online a cura dell’Associazione Culturale Bisanzio) 3/8, Novembre 2006, L’sarcato 554–751, 5–11; http://www.porphyr.a.it/Porphyra8.pdf. The author notices that the topography of Ravenna between the 5th and the 6th century was very much based on the urban model of Constantinopole as the New Rome. It is for this reason that the buildings of 5th century Ravenna resemble important places in Constantinopole: *Miliarium aureum* (*Milion*), *Porta Aurea* (*Chryse Porta*), *Lauretum* (*Daphne*), *chiesa di S. Salvatore ad Calchi* (*Chalké*), *palatium ad Lauretum* (*Blacherne*), *ad scubitum* (*Excoubita*). The architectural centres of Ravenna resembled public places of the East in the spirit of early Byzantine triumphalism and cosmocentism, ibidem, 6.
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thousand sailors controlling the Eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea (the Roman sea base for the Western part of the Mediterranean Sea was port Misenum, today the city of Miseno).156

The bay surrounding Ravenna enabled better use of the port. Today, it is difficult to estimate the size of the port canal as the bay still meanders around Ravenna and now it would be able to accommodate hundreds of ships.157

It is very telling that the clerk who was in charge of the fleet and the port (prefectus classis) also took over the role of the city administrator (cura- tor civitatis). Once Portus Classis was built, which was also the main basis of the Roman fleet, Ravenna became the most important port in the region.158

Salvian of Marseilles came from provinces (Germania I or Germania II from 313 till about 420) which belonged to XIII Dioecesis Galliae, which were in turn part of Praefectus praetorio Galliarum (with the capital in Augusta Trevorum from 318–406 and then Arelate from 407). During those times XIV Dioecesis Septem provinciarum belonged to the province of Gaul, which in turn was part of the province of Viennensis. Salvian of Marseilles was active in the province of Viennensis. The administrative division was changed around 418/420 and Septem Provinciarum was set up, incorporating all Gallic, Spanish and British provinces.159 One can only speak about

159 During the time of Diocletian, Gaul was divided into two diocese: Dioecesis Galliae et Dioecesis Viennensis. The first one, Dioecesis Galliae, was made up of eight provinces in the year 297: Belgica Prima, Belgica Secunda, Germania Prima, Germania Secunda, Maxima Sequanorum, Lugdunensis Prima, Lugdunensis Secunda, Alpes Graiae et Poeninae. Two more were added in 385: Lugdunensis Tertia et Lugdunensis Senonia. During the time of Diocletian Dioecesis Viennensis was made up of five diocese and around the year 381, changed its name to Dioecesis Septem provinciarum, as at that time it was made up of seven provinces (Vienne nensis, Narbonensis Prima, Narbonensis Secunda, Novempopulana, Aquitanica Prima, Aquitanica
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the administration of Northern Roman territories of Gaul beginning with the first half of the 5th century\textsuperscript{160} as beginning with the fifties they are gradually being taken over by the Franks.\textsuperscript{161}

The Roman province of Germania I consisted of what today we call the French Alsace and the German Rhine region. Augusta Treverorum was

\textit{Secunda, Alpi Maritimi}. During tetrarchy, governors (\textit{praesides}) were in charge of the these provinces, who in turn came under were subordinate to the so called ‘vicarius’. \textit{Vicarius Galliarum} in Augusta Treverorum (Trier), and \textit{vicarius Vienensis} in Colonia Julia Vienna (Vienne, 30 km from Lyon). Later, \textit{Praefectura Galliarum} came into being, which was made up of the diocese of Roman Britain and the diocese of Spain, with a capital in Trier. Based on: \textit{Notitia Dignitatis Occidentalis} 3 (http://www.pvv.ntnu.no/~halsteis/occ001.htm). We know that around the year 420 \textit{Dioecesis Vienensis} was liquidated and 17 provinces were grouped into one diocese, known in name only as \textit{Dioecesis Septem Provinciarum} (capital: Arelate/Arles) constituting the entire Gaul prefecture (\textit{Vienensis, Lugudunensis primae, Germania Primaet, Germania Secunda, Belgica Prima, Belgica Secunda, Alpi Maritimae, Alpi Poenitae et Graiae, Maxima Sequanorum, Aquitania Prima, Aquitania Secunda, Novem Populi, Narbonensis Prima, Narbonensis Secunda, Lugudunensis Secunda, Lugudunensis Tertia, Lugudunensis Senonia}). The new provinces which came into being around the year 420 were: \textit{Lugudunensis Tertia} and \textit{Lugudunensis Quarta} (Senonia). To read more about the division in Gaul see: P. M. Duval, \textit{La Gaule jusqu’au milieu du Ve siècle} I, 2, Paris 1971, p. 517–519; G. Ch. Picard, \textit{La romanisation des campagnes gauloises}, [in:] \textit{La Gallia Romana. Atti del Colloquio. Promosso dall’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei in collaborazione con l’École Française de Rome}, Roma 1973, p. 139–150; A. L. F. Rivet, \textit{The Notitia galliarum: some questions}, [in:] \textit{Aspects of the Notitia Dignitatum. Paper presented to the conference in Oxford, December 13 to 15, 1974}, eds. R. Goodburn, P. Bartholomew, Oxford 1976, p. 119–142 (British Archaeological Reports – Suppl., ser. 15); J. Harries, \textit{Church and state in the Notitia galliarum}, “Journal of Roman Studies” 68 (1978), p. 26–43; D. Zolotetki, \textit{Administracja cywilna i wojskowa oraz jej reprezentanci w Galii u schy- laniu panowania rzymskiego} (435–486), UJ Wydzial Historyczny, Instytut Historii, Zakład Historii Bizancjum, msr, Kraków 2005, p. 48–52.

\textsuperscript{160} Ibidem, “In the first half of the 5th century, the Gaulian imperial administration was as follows. Gaul was one diocese under one vicarius. At the same time it was the central part of Pretorium prefecture spreading to the dioceses of Spain and Britannia. Both the prefect of Gaul, as well as, his deputy, vicarius Septem Provinciarum resided in Arlate. The subordinate provinces of Gaul were administered by the so called \textit{praesides or consulares}. The latter were introduced during the times of Constantine the Great. They were of higher rank but at the beginning of the 5th century, their rank was identical to \textit{praesides} and had the same rank as \textit{viri clarissimi}. The vicarious as their superior hd the title of \textit{vir spectabilis}. The most honourable rank of \textit{vir illustris} was granted to the most important dignitaries of the Empire such as \textit{praefectus praetorio Galliarum}. This rank entitled the holder to have a seat in the privy council and be a member of the Roman Senate. This made not only the military officials, formally not dependant but also the kings and Barbarian chiefs remaining totally outside official control, respect the prefect of Gaul.”

\textsuperscript{161} E. Ewig, \textit{Die Merowinger und das Frankenreich}, Stuttgart 2006\textsuperscript{5}, p. 10–17.
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the most important city.\textsuperscript{162} The settlement named \textit{Augusta Treverorum}\textsuperscript{163} was founded in the year 16 BC. Because of its fertile soil it provided supplies for many of its \textit{castra}. It consisted of 72 hectares.\textsuperscript{164}

In the year 275, Trevir was invaded and plundered by the Franks.\textsuperscript{165} The city was rebuilt during the reign of Constantinus Chlorus, who made the city his seat in the years 293–306. The urbanization process began in the beginning of the 4th century. The city occupied an area of 285 hectares. Trevir had 300 thousand inhabitants and was the biggest city North of the Alps. The city was developed during the times of Constabntine the Great (306–337). Many monumental buildings were erected, including fortifications, an amphitheatre which could accommodate 20 thousand people, Porta Nigra, Porta Alba, a stone bridge and imperial baths.\textsuperscript{166}

Beginning with the year 313, Trevir was the seat of \textit{vicarious Galliarum} of Dioecesis Galliarum. Emperor Constantine II ruled from Trevir between the years 328–340. In the year 367, during the reign of Valentinian I, Trevir became the seat of emperors. This was so until the death of Theodosius I in 395. For several years (383–388), the city was the capital of Emperor Magnus Maximus.\textsuperscript{167} In the year 407, soon after the invasion of the Vandals, the Alans and the Suebi, the Gaul prefecture was transferred to Arles.\textsuperscript{168} The city was conquered by the Franks four times in the 5th cen-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{162} To read more about Trier itself from archeological point of view in pre-Roman and Roman Times see materials published by Rheinisches Landesmuseum Trier: \textit{Trier. Augustustadt der Treverer. Stadt und Land In vor- und frühromischer Zeit}, Mainz am Rhein 1984; \textit{Trier. Kaiserresidenz und Bischofsitz. Die Stadt in spätantiker und frühchristlicher Zeit}, Mainz am Rhein 1984.
\item \textsuperscript{165} A. Demandt, \textit{Die Spätantike…}, op. cit., p. 40.
\item \textsuperscript{168} D. Zoloteński, \textit{Administracja cywilna i wojskowa}, op. cit., p. 49; compare the same, n. 33, 49.
\end{itemize}
A huge army of the Huns won the city in the year 451\textsuperscript{169} and finally in the year 455 the city was conquered by the Franks.\textsuperscript{170}

The province Germania II was located between the rivers Rhine and Moselle from the North East and the province Belgica II from the West. Its capital was Colonia Agippina (today: Cologne).\textsuperscript{171} The Roman settlement founded in the year 15 BC was called Ara Ubiorum or Oppidum Ubiorum. The Ubii were a Germanic tribe, cooperating with the Romans. Aggripina (who was to become Emperor Claudius wife) was born in Ara Ubiorum. In the year 50, Emperor Claudius named the city Colonia Claudia Ara Ubiorum Agrippinensis (CCAA).\textsuperscript{172} The city was also the seat of the Roman army and the castrum of the Rhine fleet (Classis Germanica Pia Fedelis). The city, which already had a Forum, a theatre and capitolium, grew bigger with time and was octagon shaped.\textsuperscript{173}

Around the year 85, Cologne became the capital of the province. It consisted of 96 hectares and at the turn of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, had

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{169} P. Haether, *Upadek cesarstwa rzymskiego*, op. cit., p. 391–340, states that the army of the Huns, which set off in the spring of 451, probably followed the path of the Germanic invasion in 406. What Jordanes, the chronicler found surprising was the fact that the army was made up of half million people. Having left the Great Hungarian Plain, the army continued to move along the Danube and crossed the Rhine near Koblenz. The army then continued to go West and probably on the 7\textsuperscript{th} of April 451, the city of Metz surrendered, followed by Trier.
\item \textsuperscript{170} K. Polek, *Frankowie a ziemie*, op. cit., p. 41, compare footnote number 142 (about the topography of Trier in the second half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century); M. Wilczyński (*Germanie w służbie zachodniorzymskiej*..., op. cit., p. 165–166) rightly notices that Abrogast from Trier was a wealthy Franconian man, who around the year 477 was a ‘comes’, but the city itself was already under the rule of the Franks and no longer under the influence of Odoacer. […] It is difficult to establish if Abrogast had the military rank of comes rei militaris, or if he was simply a clerk in the city, ibidem.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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a population of 15 thousand people in the city itself and another 5 thousand on the outskirts.\(^{174}\) In the 3\(^{rd}\) century, the city became more urbanized. Many buildings come from this era, including *Romer-Turm*, *Principia* and *Divitia*.\(^{175}\) as well as, *Prætorium*. In the 4\(^{th}\) century, *Prætorium* became the residence of the governor of the province (*legatus Augusti pro praetore*). The army units stationed in Cologne in the 4\(^{th}\) century were not too numerous. After Constantine’s reform of the *castrum*, they were up to one thousand people.\(^{176}\) *Castrum* was connected to the city by a bridge built in the year 310.\(^{177}\) There were Roman troops in Cologne throughout the entire 4\(^{th}\) century and withdrew around 406/407. However, archeologists found traces of Roman presence in the first years of the 5\(^{th}\) century in the castle (*Castrum Divitensium*).\(^{178}\) In 461, the Ripuarian Franks, who lived by the Rhine up till then, seized Mainz and Cologne, the land around Moselle.\(^{179}\)

In the first half of the 5\(^{th}\) century, the Roman province of Vienennsis (with the capital of Arles and the cities of Massilia and Vienne) stretched to the valley of Rhone.\(^{180}\) The first settlement, later known as Arles was

---
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founded in the 6th century BC by the Greeks. In the 30’s of the 6th century, this territory was conquered by the Salluvi Celts, who named it Theline. Julius Caesar (in his *Bellum Civile I*, 36,4), defined the Celtic name as the 'place by the lake' (Latin are-late). In the year 46 BC, Arles became a Roman colony for veterans (*Legio VI Ferrata – Colonia Iulia Paterna Arelatensium Sextanorum*). In the 6th century it was one of the places in which Emperor Constantine resided. Beginning with 407, up until the fall of the Western Roman Empire – it was the capital of Gaul and the place of trade.

**Marseilles.** The original settlement was founded by the Greeks around the year 6000 BC. Already then, it was known as a wine export centre. During the times of the sailor Pytheas of Massalia (around 380-around 310 BC), there were around 40 thousand inhabitants and the city was around 50 hectares. It had public tanks, a theatre, a market (agora) and numerous temples. Marseilles was conquered by Julius Caesar in 49 BC. Its name was Latinized to Massalia. It was an important war and trade port. During Roman times, the city retained its autonomous status (*civitas foederata*). After the downfall of the Western Roman Empire, it was

---


Part I: Historical background of the Church in the 5th century

first conquered by the Visigoths (after the year 475) and then by the Franks (the year 539).185

1.4. The Situation of the Western Church in the 5th Century (Christianization, the Local Church in Southern Italy and Gaul, Heresy)

The political and socio-economic events which took place in the 4th and 5th century in the Western Roman Empire had an important aspect on the Church and pastoral work of the Catholic Church. Christianity did not halt the political or social changes. Because of mass superficial conversions of the Roman people of the 4th century only and despite stressing the importance of faith and church it was impossible to improve the moral standards of those in power or the citizens of the Imperium.186 Gradually, Christianization mainly took place in the Roman cities but the majority of the population of the Empire lived in the country and in the 5th century still remained pagan.187 The Barbarian invasions of the 5th century caused administrative turmoil between the Western Churches and made Catholic pastoral work difficult in the isolated Catholic Churches of Africa and Gaul.188

On the other hand, the wave of invasions did not hinder the life of the Church, which in the 5th century, still taught the Gospel ‘within and no longer’ ‘Imperium Romanum’. The Church encouraged piety and fought pagan practices.189 What was important for the preaching of the 5th century Church was its dedication to Sunday teaching which was supposed to be fairly simple, without theological subtleties. The most prominent

clergymen of this type in the 5th century were such Italian bishops as: Leo I, Maximus of Turin or St. Peter Chrysologus.190 In Gaul the teaching of the Gospel also took place on Sunday but what was emphasized was the homiletic, not the doctrinal meaning of sermons according to *bono disciplinae, lectio profetica aut evangelica, arcta et angusta* and *verba otiose*. Those who delivered such sermons included: St. Honoratus, St. Cictricius and St. Eucherius of Lyon. Dogmatic sermons and sermons for feast days were delivered by St. Faustus of Riez, as well as, St. Valerianus. Both type of sermons were maximally 20 minutes long.191

Parish structure begin to develop in the 5th century, now not only in the cities but in villages too.192 In the North of Italy there was something in between a diocese and a parish, the so called *pieve*.193 The downfall of the Western Roman Empire paradoxically brought the old imperial Church religious freedom.194 In the West, Catholicism gradually became privileged (except for Brittany and Spain until 587). The metropolitan structure of the Western Church195 became stonger and so did the Church authorities


192 V. Bo, *Storia della parrocchia*, vol. 1: *I secoli delle origini (sec. IV–V)*, Roma 19902, p. 41–46. The author states that the real development of parishes only began in the 4th century, when the slow proces of Christianization of Roman countryside began (*vici, pagi, villae, fundi*). Church documents which testify this include: The Council of Elvira (AD. 306), kan. 77: If a deacon (*si qui diaconus regens plebem*) baptizes someone without the presence of a bishop or a presbyter, the bishop shoud complement it with his blessing. Should the baptized person die earlier, he should be excused because of his faith ŹMT 37, *Dokumenty synodów od 50 do 381 r.*, red. A. Baron, H. Pietras, Kraków 2006, p. 61, 61*. The Council of Arles (AD 314), kan. 21: On the subject of presbyters and deacons who often leave the place where they were ordained and move to other places, it has been established that they should serve in those places. Should they wish to move elsewhere, they will be made redundant: ŹMT 37, *Dokumenty synodów od 50 do 381 r.*, op. cit., p. 73, 73*.


of Rome. Because of Barbarian invasions in 406, the contact between the bishop of Rome and bishops in North-Eastern Gaul was practically broken and the contact with Gallic provinces in the South-East made difficult. The functioning of Church administration slightly improved in the second half of the 5th century when the Kingdom of the Visigoths, the Kingdom of Burgundy and the Kingdom of Franks were founded in the areas formally belonging to the Western Roman Empire.

The Church of the second half of the 4th century no longer used Greek and the liturgy and the sermons were delivered in Latin. In the 5th century, the Catholic Church in Italy had two church metropoli: Rome for Italia Suburbicaria and Milan for Italia Annunaria till 402 and later Aquileia (Grado). In Flaminia, where St. Peter Chrysologus was, the administrative division of VIII Flaminia ed Aemilia reflected the

---

196 W. H. C. Frend, *The rise of christianity*, Philadelphia 1985, p. 791–792. The British historian writes that in the 5th century, papal power stretched to all Western Churches. This was particularly so during the pontificate of the following: Pope Innocent I (401–417), Pope Boniface I (418–422), Pope Celestine I (422–432) as well as, pope Sixtus III (432–440). Those popes were new type of administrators who served the Church and not the Empire. Thanks to them, papacy was able to fill the gap in the West because of the weakening power of imperial authority. A further centralization of papal authority and development of the idea of common jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome took place during the pontificate of Leo the Great and Gelasius I, ibidem, p. 727–728. H. Chadwick (*Kościół w epoce wcześniego chrześcijaństwa*, tłum. A. Wypustek, Warszawa 2004) notices that after Pope Leo and Pope Gregory popes became responsible for guarding apostolic faith and claimed the right to exercise their power over other churches. The churches of the East, aware of their ancient traditions, usually were in communion with Rome but did not see its jurisdiction as something desired for or possible, 245; compare: K. Baus, E. Ewig, *Die Reichskirche* II/1, op. cit., p. 254–278; K. Schatz, *Prymat papieski od początków do współczesności*, tłum. E. Musial, J. Zakrzewski, Kraków 2004, p. 53–103.
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administrative complexities of the state system. The following churches belonged to the church province of Flaminia: Ariminum (Rimini), Ficuclae (Cervia), Caesena (Cesena), Forum Popilii (Forlimpopoli) and Ravenna which came under the direct authority of the Pope.201 The following churches of Aemilia were under the church jurisdiction of the diocese of Milan: Forum Livii (Forli), Faventia (Faenza), Forum Cornelii (Imola), Claternae, Claterna (Quaderna?), Bononia (Bologna), Mutina (Modena), Regium Lepidum (Reggio d’Emilia), Colonia Iulia Augusta Parmensis (Parma), Brixellum (Brescello), Vicohabentia (Voghenza), Placenta (Piacenza), Montefeltro and Comacchio.202 In the 5th century, affiliation to a given church jurisdiction was nominal only for churches in Flaminia et Aemilia as the archbishop of Ravenna, Peter Chrysologus was also responsible for Aemilia.

Salvian of Marseilles worked in an area where in the 5th century Christianity harmonized with the institutions of the time. The cities were also bishoprics (Buergidalca – Bordeaux, Bituriges – Bourges, Massilia – Marseille, Cemenelum – Cimiez).203 Church metropolises were founded in cities which were the capitals of Roman provinces. And thus the provinces which became Catholic metropolises included Vienne and later Arelate204


204 G. Bardy, Il papato da s. Innocento a s. Leone Magno, [in:] Storia della Chiesa, vol. 4, op. cit., p. 310–311. The author draws our attention to the fact that Pope Zosimus was deceived by Bishop Patroclus. It was under his influence that, the Pope wrote a letter to the bishops of Gaul telling that all bishops should (under the threat of excommunication) submit to the authority of Patroclus of Arles. He was entitled to ordinate not only the new bishops of the province of Vennensis, but also both provinces of Narbonensis. The bishops of Narbo, Marseilles and Vienne (Hilary of Narbonne who was first to submit to Zosimus’ decision, Proculus of Marseilles and Simplician of Vienne) protested against diminishing the role of these metropolises, asking Pope Zosimus for help. Proculus and Simplician were summoned to appear before the Pope’s tribunal and Proculus was even deprived of his office by Zosimus’ decree. However, this decision was never binding as on the 26th of December 418, Pope Zosimus died. It was not until Pope Boniface, who resolved the difficult jurisdictional situation of Gaul by not confirming the privileges of Bishop of Arles. In his letter to Bishop
in Vienensis, Moguntiacum in Germania Prima, Colonia in Germania Secunda. However, the bishop centre was not necessarily located in the city centre of a given city. In the 5th century, the majority of bishops came from aristocratic families, many of them were considered saints.

The Germanic invasions in the North-Eastern part of Gaul, in Lugdunensis Secunda and Begica Secunda and the migration of Germanic and Celtic peoples caused havoc in the Church in the 5th century. The life of Church community in Gaul was weakened but never broken. Archeological findings confirm the continuity of Christianity in the following places: Argentoratum (Strasburg), Treveris (Trier) and Moguntiacum (Mainz). The churches, the cemeteries were being visited. Although the cities became smaller, they survived and thus the Roman oasis and people who were able to keep Christian tradition alive. The fact that Christian tradition survived is proof that evangelization was strong in the 4th century.


207 H. F. Muller, L’époque mérovingienne, New York 1945, p. 83, gives the statistics for Gaul of the 5th century; of all 175 saints, 123 of them were bishops; compare: F. E. Consolino, Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica. Studi sulla figura del Vescovo nei secoli IV–VI, Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi. Collana di Studi e Testi – Koinonia IV, Napoli 1979, p. 23–37.
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The development of Christianity was visible in cities\textsuperscript{210} but the countryside of Gaul remained generally pagan.\textsuperscript{211} Among the bishops, who began evangelization in the 5th century, were Victricius of Rouen and Simplicius of Augustodunum (Autun).\textsuperscript{212}

The work of St. Severinus of Noricum (410–482) was rather peculiar. As a monk, not as a presbyter, he developed religious life (strengthening faith, piety, mercy and encouraging monastic life) and on the other he kept discipline, had control of the police and acted as a mediator between local people and Germanic chiefs.\textsuperscript{213} St. Severinus was responsible for Noricum, whereas in other areas there were the following bishops: St. Anian in 
\textit{Aurelianum} (Orlean), St. Lupus in \textit{Tricasses} (Troyes), St. German in \textit{Autissiodorum} (Auxerre) or St. Leo in Rome.\textsuperscript{214}

As far as monasticism is concerned, one new form of consecrated life appeared in the 5th century – a monastic community, concentrated around


\textsuperscript{214} J. Daniélou, H. I. Marrou, \textit{Historia Kościola}, t. 1, op. cit., p. 307–308.
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the bishop such as Paulinus of Nola\textsuperscript{215} or Augustine of Hippo.\textsuperscript{216} Other forms of monastic asceticism were largely influenced by Egyptian Cenobitic monasticism (the monasticism of Saint Honoratus, John Cassian).\textsuperscript{217} But the Spanish monasticism in the form heterodoxic priscillianism, propagating strict asceticism and theological dualism, did not develop because of invasions of the Suebi and the Vandals in Spain.\textsuperscript{218} The development of monasticism in the West, caused negative reactions against its monastic ideals with their ‘monastic pneumatism’, especially with their negation of the ‘strict rules’ of the Bishops of the Church, they seemed to be a threat to the institution of marriage.\textsuperscript{219}


\textsuperscript{218} G. M. Colombás, \textit{Il monachesimo delle origini}, vol. 1: \textit{Uomini, fatti, usi e istituzioni}, trad. S. Dell’Aira, Milano 1990, p. 296–301; what is more, the word ‘monk’ had a bad connotation in Spain because of priscillianism. The term \textit{monachus} appears for the first time in Spanish church papers during a synod in Zaragoza in the year 380. Caesaraugusta/Saragossa (4th October 380) 12 bishops; \textit{Przeciw pryscylianom}, nr 6: “A clergyman who wilfully wants to be a monk, risks excommunication.” He also added that should a clergyman out of impudence or excessive vanity wilfully abandon service and should want to become a monk instead of a clergyman (\textit{in monacho videri voluerit esse quam clericum}), thinking that in this way he would better abide law, he should be expelled from Church. He should not be accepted back unless he asks many Times and makes up for his mistakes. All the bishops said: Let this be’: Polish translation: A. Caba, [in:] \textit{Acta Synodalia ab anno 50 ad annum 381–381. Synodi collectiones legum}, t. 1, red. A. Baron, H. Pietras, Kraków 2006, p. 294, 294*.

\textsuperscript{219} G. M. Colombás, \textit{Il monachesimo delle origini}, op. cit., p. 333–340. The author comments the tension between bishops and monks and says that such situations were rare and were not permanent. John Cassian’s radical theses are very much the same as the theses of the reformers of the 16th century. Both renewal movements shared the following concepts: a return to the roots, the intention of rebuilding an authentic and primal Christianity, a return to a simple intretation of God’s word – to stress the difference beween man’s action
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The Western Church did not like the Eastern church fall into the trap of theological disputes and ecclesiastic dilemma in view of controversies concerning Nestorianism and monophysitism. The Popes of the 5th century accepted the doctrinal solutions developed by the Fathers at the Council of Ephesus (431) and the Council of Chalcedon (451).\textsuperscript{220} However, the Popes of the 5th century did not accept canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon, granting the Bishop of Constantinopole the second position in the Church.\textsuperscript{221}

The Pelagian issue was a theological problem in the Western Church, the moralistic preaching of the ideal of perfection, based on sacrifice, deprived of mysticism and grace and leading to a certain puritanism, slightly resembling neo-Judaism which emphasizes the obedience to God’s law.\textsuperscript{222}

---

\textsuperscript{220} B. Sesboüé, \textit{Władza w Kościele. Autorytet, prawda i wolność}, tłum. P. Rak, Kraków 2003. The author comes to a conclusion that beginning with the First Council of Nicae (325) the era of ecumenical councils begins. They are a privileged form of magisterium as a way of regulating the teaching of faith in the face of various heresies. Together with the councils but still autonomically, the bishops of Rome intervene. Whereas, the relations between the Pope and the Council is differently interpreted in the East and the West, as opposed to the concept of the regulation of faith which is interpreted in the same way and exercised by both the Council and the Pope. Usually three terms are used in this context: faith, teaching, definition, 28; Notice the comment by: K. Schatz, \textit{Sobory powszechne. Punkty zwrotne w historii Kościoła}, tłum. J. Zakrzewski, Kraków 2001, p. 66, that the four ecumenical councils (Nicae 325, Constantinopole 381, Ephesus 431 and Chalcedon 451) were the highest and infallible authority of real faith. There was no clear view of the ‘infallibility of the councils’: when the councils are ecumenical, how do we distinguish between real and false ones. The Church teaching was based on the principle of ‘paradosis’ that is the teaching of faith and accepting it in the spirit of faith as described in 1 Cor 11:23 or 1 Cor 15:3, there 66.

\textsuperscript{221} Ibidem. “The opposition of Rome against canon 28 was to turn out to be a total failure just because imperial authority was behind Constantinopole and also because both Alexandria and Antakya, weakened by monophysitism could not counterbalance Constantinopole. During times of tension, Rome repeatedly protested against the ecclesiastical rank of Constantinopole and reminded of the undeniable and supposedly eternal order: Rome, Alexandria, Antakya. This was so during times of Nicholas I (858–867) and finally during the times of Leo IX (1049–1054). This, however, could not change reality. When the relations between Rome and Constantinopole improved, Rome abandoned its protest and at least silently agreed with Constantinopole’s role”, 61.

\textsuperscript{222} J. Daniélou, H. I. Marrou, \textit{Historia Kościoła}, t. 1, op. cit., p. 299; Julian of Eclanum, Pelagian’s most talented student organized the Pelagian beliefs and gave them a Christian-Stoic tinge. To read more about the subject see: J. N. D. Kelly, \textit{Początki doktryny chrześcijańskiej},
Pelagianism adopted an approach of striving towards holiness resembling the perfection of a wise man than holiness based on the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{223}

The African Councils in Carthage and in Mila in the summer of 416, condemning Pelagianism as well as, further condemnation by the African Ecumenical Coucil, its total rejection by imperial authorities and the following Popes: Pope Zosimus, Pope Boniface and Pope Celestine, as well as a condemnation by the Council of Ephesus in 431, all of these did not solve the issue of the relation of grace versus free will.\textsuperscript{224} Many Western monks (for example John Cassian, some monks from Lerins – Faustus of Riez, Honoratus of Marseilles and Gennadius of Masillia) rejected the very strict view of Saint Augustine (mainly Augustine predestination, the mystery of selection and the importance of final persistence).\textsuperscript{225} For this reason, in the year 496, Pope Gelasius demanded Bishop Honoratus and Gennadius of Masillia to define religious beliefs. The anti-predestination attitude of the inhabitants of Province was questioned in the year 519 in Constantinople by monks (Scythian Monks) and by African bishops in Sardinia, faithful to the ideas of St. Augustine. It was not until the year 529, that the Council of Orange (led by St. Caesarius of Arles – a former monk from Lerins, who knew both the works of Faustus of Riez, as well as, those of Saint Augustine

\textsuperscript{223} J. Daniélou, H. I. Marrou, Historia Kościoła, t. 1, op. cit. “When Pelagius agrees to reintroduce the term (grace), which is so important for Christian tradition, he does it, giving it completely new and special meaning. For him the first and most important grace is nature, especially its most important attribute that God had given – freedom and free will. Thanks to nature, man can make best use of it, can practice virtues, strive for perfection and avoid sin, \textit{impeccantia}. This means drifting away, especially from St. Paul. Did that not mean mutilating the teaching of the Church, to an extent that made it difficult to recognize? Was this not a weakening of the mystery of the cross? Pelagius showed Christ not so much as the Saviour but as an author of a learning, an example to follow. Pelagius’ doctrine was engrossed in a religious and Christian context: the notion of creation and definite end play an important role; he emphasizes the judgement and the promised rewards. But the holiness, the way he perceives it, is very much the ideal of a stoic wise man?,” 299.

\textsuperscript{224} Ch. Pietri, Roma Christiana, vol. 2, op. cit., p. 933–954.

of Hippo) slightly improved the tense situation in the South of Gaul. The Council rejected the Pelagian statements of Faustus of Riez and accepted more moderate and balanced opinions of Augustianism.²²⁶

2. Selected Clergymen of the 5th Century.
St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles

Both St. Peter Chrysologus, as well as, Salvian of Marseilles were clergymen who in their writing, gave an outline of pastoral teaching, characteristic of Western Church in the 5th century. They did not practice systematic theology, instead their aim was to shape Christians according to biblical, pastoral and ascetic theology. The historical moment they lived in, inevitably shaped their works. In the following chapter an outline of their biography and a general description of the works of both clergyman will be presented to give a better understanding of the theological thought in their works. Unfortunately, we lack extensive source materials which would allow a detailed description of Peter Chrysologus or Salvian of Marseilles. In many cases this is a highly probable historical assumption. The hypothetical nature of historical reconstruction gives us a better understanding of the fact that we can only try to come closer to the truth concerning a given person.

2.1. The figure of a Bishop. St. Peter Chrysologus

St. Peter Chrysologus, known as Golden-haired, was the best known Bishop of late – Roman Ravenna. His nickname was given to St. Peter of Ravenna rather late, only in the 9th century. His collections of sermons and a letter to Eutyches survive to this day. There are two different traditions of St. Peter Chrysologus manuscripts: pre-Felician tradition (the so called Severian) and the Felician tradition. Different editions of texts have been drawn up on the basis of these two traditions ever since the 16th century.
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2.1.1. The biography of St. Peter Chrysologus

I will describe the figure of St. Peter Chrysologus on the basis of his sermons and later chronicles. Having discussed the issues of historical credibility of chronicles concerning Chrysologus I will then describe the most important events from the life of the Bishop of 5th century Ravenna: his background, education, baptism, priesthood and finally issues concerning his date and place of death.

2.1.1.1. Biographical Sources

The most important ancient source of information concerning St. Peter Chrysologus is no doubt his collection of sermons.1 There are biographical references in them and, however, rare they provide the only and reliable source of information about their author.2 He himself was not well known to his contemporaries and it seems that he did not have a substantial impact outside the Church metropolis of Ravenna. There is no mention of him either in Hieronimus' *De viris illustribus* nor Gennedy of Marseilles, neither Isidore of Seville nor Ildephonsus of Toledo make any note.3

The second source of information concerning St. Peter known as Chrysologus, is the *Pontificate of the Church of Ravenna* written by Andreas Agnellus, a Church historian also known as Agnellus Ravennatis (born 801, died around 850).4 This is a late source, written at the beginning of the 9th century, almost 400 years after the death of Chrysologus. It includes

---

1 *Opere di san Pietro Crisologo*, op. cit. I am using this version of the Latin text as it contains an integral text of the critical edition of the works of Peter Chrysologus issued in *Corpus Christianorum* vol. 24, 24A, 24B, and it is a clearer edition.
data concerning the Bishops of Ravenna and it was composed like the Roman Liber Pontificalis. It was Agnellus Ravennatis who first gave Peter the nickname Crisologus meaning golden-haired (literally: ‘word made of gold’).

Unfortunately, except for the nickname, the Pontificate by Agnellus of Ravenna does not contain too much information concerning St. Peter. The author of Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis wrongly identified the Bishop Peter I (that is Chrysologus) with the successor of Bishop John – Bishop Peter II (born 494, died in 519). Other mistakes Agnellus made included anachronisms, confusing facts concerning the life of St. Peter Chrysologus and other Bishops of Ravenna bearing the name Peter but living in the 5th and 6th centuries. He also made up legends concerning Chrysologus’ activities.

Due to numerous mistakes of the early Mediaeval chronicler, Agnellus’ text (Liber pontificalis) can only be considered reliable in relation to building activities of the Empress Galia Placidia and Chrysolo-
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gus.\textsuperscript{11} It is not reliable when it comes to detailed facts concerning the life of Chrysologus. Modern historiography accepts Agnellus’ accounts of St. Peter Chrysologus as legendry. This includes the story of the 9th century chronicler about the miraculous election of Peter Chrysologus as the Bishop of Ravenna by Pope Sixtus III (432–440) and the story of his burial in the tomb of the holy martyr Cassian of Imola.\textsuperscript{12} While studying the contents of Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis one should notice that it conveys the tradition of the local church, where Chrysologus was Bishop therefore this is the place where the hagiographic biography of Chrysologus as the holy Bishop was formed.\textsuperscript{13}

What is interesting, is the fact that the nickname Chrysologus was unknown to Bishop Felix of Ravenna who was the first to publish the sermons of St. Peter Chrysologus.\textsuperscript{14} Being the first editor of his sermons, he praised Chrysologus often but did not give him a nickname that would fit him as well as the later term Chrysologus.\textsuperscript{15}

The name Chrysologus has far fetched echoes of the nickname Chry sostom (given to the most famous Christian preacher of the East – St. John (died in 407)). The term Chrysologus used in the 9th century by Agnellus to describe the 5th century Bishop of Ravenna – St. Peter was solely his initiative. He mentioned it in his Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis, which became common rather late (in the 9th century) and only in the Emilia region.\textsuperscript{16} It


\textsuperscript{11} We know that Peter Chrysologus built the Basilica of St Peter in Classe near Ravenna. The work was continued by Chrysologus’ successor Bishop Neon. However, it was destroyed by an earthquake in the 8th century. Some researchers suppose that Chrysologus erected the Basilica of the Apostles (Basilica Apostolorum), later known as San Pietro Maggiore, which was finally changed into the Basilica of St Francis. Dante Alighieri is buried there. More about the building activity of Chrysologus see: Agnellus Ravennatis, Liber pontificalis, MGH, ed. O. Holder-Egger, p. 289–296, 318, 376–378; F. W. Deichmann, Ravenna Hauptstadt des spätantiken Abendlandes, vol. 2/2, p. 308–310, 350–351.


\textsuperscript{13} R. Benericetti, \textit{Il Cristo nei sermoni}, op. cit., p. 54.


\textsuperscript{15} R. Benericetti, \textit{Il Cristo nei sermoni}, op. cit., p. 65.
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was not until the Renaissance that St. Peter of Ravenna was referred to as Chrysologus, when Liber pontificalis by Agnellus became better known.\(^\text{17}\)

In his lifetime Chrysologus was called Peter.\(^\text{18}\) This is interesting as he was probably one of the first Western bishops, who just like the Pope Athanasius (399–402) would accept Christian names.\(^\text{19}\)

After his death, he was given pseudonyms such as Severian\(^\text{20}\) or Chrysologus.\(^\text{21}\) As history has shown, the latter one has proved more adequate in

\(^{17}\) R. Benericetti, *Il Cristo nei sermoni*, op. cit., p. 66.

\(^{18}\) It seems that in *Sermo 175* Chrysologus refers to himself as ‘Peter’ – *Sermo 175*: “Hic uero, qui nobis hodie natus est, semper retia tetendit in mare; nemo ergo miretur, si piscatorem Petrus gestiuit habere collegam”, OSPC 3, text A. Olivar, a cura di G. Banterle et al., Milano–Roma 1997, p. 308. According to R. Benericetti, OSPC 3, n. 6, p. 309, this would be the only place in his collection of sermons when Chrysologus referred to himself as Peter. To read more about this topic see A. Olivar, *San Pedro Crisologo*, [in:] *Año Cristiano*, vol. 4, a cura di L. De Echevarría, Madrid 1959, p. 535–538. *Sermo 175* was delivered by Chrysologus on the 1st November 431 when Chrysologus ordained Marcelin the Bishop of Voghenza. We can deduce from *Sermo 175* that the diocese of Ravenna was elevated by papal decree (*beati Petri*), as well as, an imperial decree (*principis christiani*) to the rank of an archdiocese. To read more about this see: A. Olivar, *La consagración del obispo Marcelino de Voghenza*, “Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia” 22 (1968), p. 87–93. R. Benericetti, *Il Cristo nei sermoni*, notices that the name Peter is certified by the Bishop Felix of Ravenna (p. 708–724), the first editor of the sermons of Chrysologus. In the prologue he uses the name Peter and consistently refers to him as the author.


\(^{20}\) Beginning with the 6th century some of the sermons by Peter Chrysologus were given the name of Severiano. R. Benericetti, *Il Cristo nei sermoni*, op. cit., p. 65, proves that ascribing the sermons to Severiano took place only outside Ravenna. The first publisher, who published the Sermons by Chrysologus – the Bishop Felix (beginning of the 8th century) had no doubt that its author was Bishop Peter, who lived in the 5th century. The Felix of Ravenna perhaps knew the dual term Peter–Severiano as he had placed it in the headline of *Sermo 149*. However, A. Olivar, *Los sermons*, op. cit., p. 116–122, proves that *Sermo 119* (*CXLIIX De natiuitate Christi. Spurius*) which is to be found in Chrysologus’ collection is not authentic, as the real author is Bishop Severian of Gabala (died around 408/430), an opponent of St. John Chrysostom. In A. Olivar’s opinion this explanation is very likely as in the Middle Ages the two names – Peter and Severian were mixed up when the manuscripts were being rewritten. This was not the only instance of such thing happening. Other researchers tried to explain the duality of the names in a different manner. In the opinion of G. Lucchesi, *Stato attuale degli studi*, op. cit., p. 70–71, the name Severian might have been Peter’s second name, whereas, F. Sottocornola, *L’anno liturgico nei sermoni di Pietro Crisologo. Ricerca storico-critica sulla liturgia di Ravenna antica*, Cesena 1973, n. 77, 53, considered the name Severian to be a pseudonym used by Peter (Chrysologus).

\(^{21}\) R. Benericetti, *Il Cristo nei sermoni*, op. cit., p. 65–66, notices that Bishop Felix of Ravenna (708–724), did not know the term ‘Crisologo’. In the prologue to the first edition,
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case of Peter of Ravenna. In 1729 Pope Benedict XIII proclaimed St. Peter Chrysologus a Doctor of the Church.22

2.1.1.2. Date and place of birth
Peter Chrysologus was the 18th Bishop of Ravenna (Roman province of Flaminia).23 He was probably born around the year 380.24 This is a historical calculation based on the assumption that he must have been at least 40 years old when he became the Bishop of Ravenna, which was between 425 and 431.25 Unfortunately we have no information concerning his parents or potential siblings.

Researchers do not agree upon the place of birth of St. Peter Chrysologus. Some, like F. Lanzoni26 claim (on the basis of Agnellus Ravennatius’
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notes\textsuperscript{27} and excerpts from \textit{Sermo 165}\textsuperscript{28} by Chrysologus) that he was born in Forum Cornelli (today known as Imola, 35 km East of Ravenna).\textsuperscript{29} It is not known, however, in which town Bishop Cornelius was bishop in, that is why we cannot be certain if Imola was the birth place of Chrysologus.\textsuperscript{30} What is more, if Chrysologus wanted to stress that \textit{Forum Cornelli} was his homeland, he would have written directly of his affection for this town as his place of birth and not only because of the resemblance of its name to Bishop Cornelius.\textsuperscript{31}

Other scholars (mainly G. Lucchesi\textsuperscript{32} and A. Benelli),\textsuperscript{33} skip the doubtful historical note by Agnellus (\textit{Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis})\textsuperscript{34} and consider that the place of birth of the future saint was Ravenna or its close vicinity (Classe near Ravenna). R. Benericetti takes an indirect stand and


\textsuperscript{28} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 165: “sed Corneliensi ecclesiae inseruire peculiarius ipsius nominis amore convellor. Cornelius namque memoriae beatissimae, uita clarus, cunctis uirtutum titulis ubique fulgens, operum magnitudine notus uniuersis, pater mihi fuit”, OSPC 3, 252.

\textsuperscript{29} R. Benericetti, \textit{Il Cristo nei sermoni}, op. cit., p. 54.

\textsuperscript{30} Bishop Cornelius, named by Chrysologus as the consecrating bishop, unfortunately is not mentioned neither in the pontifical of Agnellus of Ravenna nor in the Italian episcopal letters. This is significant as modern historical criticism sees this entire list of bishops given by Agnellus as complete and authentic. To defend the theory that Chrysologus came from Ravenna, G. Lucchesi, \textit{Stato attuale degli studi}, op. cit., p. 51–80 made the assumption that there are several defects list of bishops by Agnellus.

\textsuperscript{31} R. Benericetti, \textit{Il Cristo nei sermoni}, op. cit., p. 55.


\textsuperscript{33} A. Benelli (\textit{Note sulla vita e l’episcopato…}, op. cit., p. 72–73) shares a similar view (though not as strongly) as G. Lucchesi on Ravenna being the possible birthplace of Chrysologus. A. Benelli claims that Chrysologus was probably born near Ravenna, in a town called Classe. This would explain the reason for the building of the basilica called Petriana (in honour of the builder), equipped with a source of baptismal water.

\textsuperscript{34} R. Benericetti, \textit{Il Cristo nei sermoni}, op. cit., p. 55 points that Peter II came from Imola (495–519) and he died (on July 31st 519) while visiting the grave of the martyr Cassian of Imola. The Medieval chronicler probably was also mistaken as to the place of death of Peter I (Chrysologus) and Peter II.
accepts Imola as a probable place of birth, leaving the question open for further research.35

2.1.1.3. Education, baptism and priesthood
We do not have too many detailed, historically certain facts concerning events from Chrysologus’ later life. His sermons still remain the basic source of information concerning him. One can draw conclusions concerning the type of learning expressed by its author, his pastoral ways of leading the faithful into salvation and conclusions concerning Chrysologus himself. What is more, the sermons are often a source of specific historical data concerning the preacher, as well as, the environment in which he lived and carried out his pastoral work.

The current sources do not contain any certain information concerning his family or education. In his sermons he used literary Latin and this suggests he must have studied rhetoric as he used its methods in his sermons. He was also acquainted with classical literature.36 However, he did not refer to the ideas of various pagan and Christian authors in his sermons. Therefore, as R. Benericetti suggests the thoughts of other authors constitute an assonance and prove that he used the same spiritual and doctrinal sources of the 5th century.37

In Chrysologus’ sermons we observe frequent references to the concepts and terms typical for lawyers. This suggests that Chrysologus might have served some legal post in the city of Ravenna or in the imperial magistracy before becoming a Bishop.38 This would not have been unusual as many bishops had gone through legislative careers earlier, usually as lawyers. One

35 C. Truzzi, *Introduzione. Cap. 2. Notizie biografiche*, [in:] OSPC 1, Milano–Roma 1996, p. 21. This researcher claims that Chrysologus had the habit of playing with words and using complicated arguments in regards to names. The statement *ipsius nominis amore* (Sermo 165) is not enough to consider Imola as the place Chrysologus came from OSPC 3, n. 3, 252. Compare to the sermons delivered during the priestly vows: Sermo 130, Sermo 130 bis; Sermo 136.


mustn’t forget that in the 5th century being a bishop was connected with serving public duties which had legal consequences both in clerical and civil matters. The bishop himself had to be acquainted with imperial law.39

Peter Chrysologus Sermo 165 (made public during the ordination of Bishop Proietti of Imola) contains many important biographical details of Peter later known as Chrysologus, especially concerning his spiritual development.40 Unfortunately, we have no historical data concerning the much praised Bishop Cornelius to whom Chrysologus was much indebted in matters of faith and priesthood. The expression ipse me per evangelium genuit (born through the Gospel) can be considered an allusion to baptism and receiving religious instruction (in the 5th century probably during youth).41

Therefore Peter was probably baptized by the Bishop Cornelius in Ravenna, then trained and introduced into ecclesiastical office, perhaps a deacon (ipse pius piissime nutriuit, ipse sanctus sancta instituit servitute, ipse pontifex sacris obtulit). The term sacris consacrauit altaribus (I was consecrated to sacred altars) suggests service to the deacon and not holy orders themselves.42

He was ordained as Bishop between the year 425 and 430.43 On the basis of his sermons we know that he referred to himself as archbishop and


40 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 165: “Omnibus quidem ecclesiis uenerationem me debe-re, debere me fidelissimam profiteor servitute, sed Corneliensi ecclesiae inseruire pecul-liarius ipsius nominis amore compellor. Cornelius namque memoriae beatissimae, uita clari-rus, cunctis inuiratum titulis ubique fulgens, operum magnitudine notus uniuesirs, pater mihi fuit, ipse me per euangelium genuit, ipse pius piissime nutriuit, ipse sanctus sancta instituit servitute, ipse pontifex sacris obtulit et consecrauit altaribus; et ideo mihi carum, colendum, mirabile Corneli nomen. Amor ergo cognominis me compellit Corneliensi ecclesiae desideriiis desiderantem occurrere, et Proiectum uenerabilem uirum amabiliu pontificem consecrare\", OSPC 3, 252.


42 R. Benericetti, Il Cristo nei sermoni, op. cit., p. 56.

43 R. Benericetti, Il Cristo nei sermoni, op. cit., p. 61–62. Chrysolog was the right age to be ordained a bishop. Between the years 435 and 430, he was about 40–45. J. Gaudemet, L’Église dans l’Empire Romain (IVe–Ve siècles), op. cit., p. 125, states that the first Western synodical texts defining the proper age for each of the ministerial orders were the reso-
had the rights of an archbishop to ordain bishops for various regions of the church.\textsuperscript{44} The new political situation made this possible as in 402 the imperial court moved from Milan to Ravenna which made the administrative role of the bishopric of Ravenna bigger.\textsuperscript{45} Earlier (before Chrysologus became Bishop) the diocese of Ravenna was a local suffragan diocese of

\textsuperscript{44} There are four sermons delivered by Chrysologus during the ordaining of various suffragans in Ravenna: Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 130: OSPC 3, 40–42 (this sermon was delivered during the ordaining of an unknown bishop suffragan); Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 165: OSPC 3, 252 (a sermon delivered by Chrysologus during the ordaining of the first bishop of Imola), Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 175: OSPC 3, 306–308 (a sermon delivered by Chrysologus during the ordaining of the first bishop of Voghenza). To read more on this subject see: F. Lanzoni, \textit{I sermoni 107 e 130 di s. Pier Crisologo}, \textit{Rivista di Scienze Storiche} 6 (1909), p. 944–962; A. Olivar, \textit{Los sermones}, op. cit., p. 197–200; ibidem, \textit{La consagración del obispo Marcelino de Voghenza}, p. 87–93.
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Rome. Beginning with 404 it started to gain control over some cities of the province of Flaminia (which had earlier been dependent on the diocese of Milan). The fact that as the ordinand of Ravenna, Chrysologus consecrated new bishops, proves that the diocese of Ravenna began to take on the role of an archdiocese. The formal founders of diocese of Ravenna were probably both Emperor Valentinian III (425–455), as well as, Pope Celestine I (422 – 27th July 432).

One of the first Bishops consecrated by Chrysologus was Marcelin from the town of Voghenzy (today known as Ferrary). The Bishop of Milan was probably against the consecration of auxiliary bishops by the Bishop of Ravenna. The Church metropolis of Milan lost some influence, giving more power to the bishopric of Ravenna and causing a new and rather unpleasant situation. Chrysologus did not relate to this directly but by using his authority to consecrate bishops in Ravenna he sent the signal that he does not share their concern of losing their administrative Church power. Because of the presence of the imperial court in Ravenna, as a clergyman Chrysologus would often deliver his sermons in the presence of Galla Placidia and her sons.

Peter Chrysologus was probably the first known archbishop of Ravenna who used the power of an archbishop and was supported by both the Pope and the Emperor of the West of the time. Peter Chrysologus never used the term *episcopus* or *archiepiscopus* but used the terms *doctor*, *sacerdos*, *antistes*, *pontifex*, *pastor*, *rector*. The first Bishop of Ravenna to use the ti-
tle archbishop was Archbishop Maximianus of Ravenna of the first half of the 6th century (546–557).\textsuperscript{53}

In his letter in 449 the monk Eutyches referred to Peter Chrysologus as the Bishop of the Ravenna which further testifies the importance of the bishopric. The monk had earlier been condemned by the local synod in Constantinople. Unfortunately Eutyches’ letter went missing but we have Peter Chrysologus’ reply.\textsuperscript{54} It was probably sent from Ravenna between June and August 449.\textsuperscript{55} His letter is proof of a certain ‘lack of understanding’ of Monophysite churches. Paradoxically, Chrysologus encouraged Eutyches to abandon the concept of Origen and Nestorius and their speculation concerning Christ. Chrysologus stressed that he cannot fully relate to theological issues stated by Eutyches as he lacks the documents of the opposing party (that is Archbishop Flavian of Constantinople). What is more, as the Bishop of Ravenna he had no intention of undertaking any steps to resolve the Eutyches’ theological controversy. He advised Eutyches to wait for a decisive opinion of the Bishop of Rome: ‘my dear brother, first of all we encourage you to obediently follow what was written by the blessed Pope of Rome, as the blessed Peter who lives and rules in Rome, grants faith to those who seek.’ We cannot therefore, because of our love peace and faith, deal with legal matters without unanimity with the Bishop of Rome.\textsuperscript{56}

St. Peter Chrysologus did not have full metropolitan power and Ravenna did not become a Church metropolis in full meaning of the word in the 5th century. The Bishop of Ravenna had to attend the local synods and always had to appeal to Rome metropolis. Chrysologus consecrated

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Epistola Petri episcopi Ravennensis ad Eutychem presbyterum scripta}: OSPC 3, 340–342.
\item According to F. Lanzoni, \textit{Le diocesi d’Italia}, vol. 2, op. cit., p. 752, a letter from Chrysologus to Eutyches, sent between June and August 449.
\item \textit{Epistola Petri episcopi Ravennensis ad Eutychem presbyterum scripta}, n. 31–37: “In omnibus autem hortamur te, frater honorabilis, ut his quae a beatissimo papa Romanae civitatis scripta sunt, oboedienser addendas, quoniam beatus Petrus, qui in propria sede et vivit et praesidet, praestat quaerentibus fidei veritatem. Nos enim pro studio pacis et fidei extra consensum Romae civitatis episcopi causas audire non possimus”: OSPC 3, 342.
\end{itemize}
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suffragan bishops and administered the Church unit he had been granted, but always in accordance with the Bishop of Rome. Also in terms of area, the archdiocese of Ravenna was a small Church unit of up to ten dioceses. This gave St. Peter Chrysologus limited church power.\textsuperscript{57}

One other certain piece of information concerning St. Peter Chrysologus (apart from the already above mentioned ‘Letter to Eutyches’) is a note describing the arrival of Bishop German of Autessiodurum (currently Auxerre) in 446.\textsuperscript{58} He visited Ravenna in connection to the secession of Armorica, the North-West region of Gaul. Unfortunately he soon fell ill and died. The modest possessions German owned had been divided between Galla Placidia, who took the reliquary of the late German and Peter Chrysologus who inherited hair shirt of the late Bishop from Auxerre.\textsuperscript{59}

2.1.1.4. Death

St. Peter Chrysologus definitely died after Aelia Galla Placidia, therefore after the 27\textsuperscript{th} November 450.\textsuperscript{60} We do not know the exact date\textsuperscript{61} but most probably before 458 when Neon, Chrysologus’ successor\textsuperscript{62} was responsible for Ravenna. We suppose that it was the 3\textsuperscript{rd} December 450.\textsuperscript{63} The date

\textsuperscript{57} F. Lanzoni, Le diocesi d’Italia dalle origini, vol. 2, op. cit., p. 750.

\textsuperscript{58} The 31\textsuperscript{st} of July 446 is usually accepted as the date of death of Bishop Germanus of Auxerre. To read more see: R. W. Mathisen, The last Year of saint Germanus of Auxerre, “Analecta Bollandiana” 99 (1981), p. 151–159. Whereas, R. Scharf, Germanus von Auxerre – Chronologie seiner vitæ, Francia 18/1 (1991), p. 1–19, claims that Germanus of Auxerre died a year earlier, that is on 31\textsuperscript{st} of July 445.


\textsuperscript{60} D. Kasprzak, Galla Placidia…, op. cit., p. 216.

\textsuperscript{61} Based on a short note by Agnellus from Ravenna, Liber pontificalis: “Fuit enim Valentinianus temporibus. Cum vero coeisset Valentinianus imperare, in ipso introitu imperii eius, beatus iste Petrus vita expoliatus astra petivit”: MGH, ed. O. Holder-Egger, 290, thus the closest date of death of Chrysologus would probably be December 3\textsuperscript{rd} 450.

\textsuperscript{62} Bishop Neon of Ravenna received a letter from Pope Leo the Great (Epistula CLXVI): “Leo episcopus Neoni episcopo Ravennati salutem […] Data nono kalendas Novembris, consulatu Majoriani Augusti,” that is on the 24\textsuperscript{th} of October 458: PL 54, 1191A–1196B.

\textsuperscript{63} R. Benericetti, Il Pontificale, op. cit., p. 138.
of 31\textsuperscript{st} July 451 is less probable,\textsuperscript{64} just like the 31\textsuperscript{st} July between the years 452 and 457.\textsuperscript{65}

Peter Chrysologus was probably buried in Imola\textsuperscript{66} although some point to Ravenna as the place of burial.\textsuperscript{67} The worship of relics belonging to St. Peter Chrysologus that takes place in Imola would speak in favour of that place.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{64} Considering 31\textsuperscript{st} July as the date of death of Chrysologus was probably due to a mistake made by Agnellus of Ravenna, who confused the figure of Peter I (Chrysologus) with Peter II (494–519). The Bishop Peter II ordered a mosaïque made in the chapel of St. Andrew’s, which was outside the diocese. It was also Peter II who had the figure of the martyr Cassian of Imola made on the church vault in Milan. Peter II, not Peter Chrysologus (as Agnellus claims) died on 31\textsuperscript{st} July 519, outside the diocese while in Imola awaiting \textit{dies natalis sancti Cassiani} (13\textsuperscript{th} August). To read more about this read: G. Lucchesi, \textit{Note interno a s. Pier Crisologo}, op. cit., p. 97–99; ibidem, \textit{Ancora sulla questione crisologhiana}, p. 97–107; G. Scimè, \textit{Giudei e cristiani nei sermoni di san Pietro Crisologo}, SEA 89, Roma 2003, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{65} G. Lucchesi, \textit{Ancora sulla questione crisologhiana}, op. cit., p. 102.


\textsuperscript{67} This view is supported mostly by G. Lucchesi, \textit{Stato attuale degli studi}, op. cit., p. 78–80; G. Lucchesi, \textit{Ancora sulla questione crisologhiana}, op. cit., p. 102.

\textsuperscript{68} D. L. Baldisserri, \textit{San Pier Crisologo}, op. cit., p. 98–112, noticed that the first \textit{recognitio} of the relics of Peter Chrysologus (that is the canonical opening of the coffin and the identification and the securing the mortal remains of the saint) took place in Imola in 946 during the renovation of San Cassino. A marble plate with ‘Petrus’ written on it and the epigraph ‘Sancti Petri Ravennatis episcopi corpus’ was found. In 1174 Bishop Henry decided to place another marble plate with the words: ‘Beatissimi Crisologi Petri Ravennatis corpus hic est locatum ab Henrico episcofo MCLXXIV’. In 1200 Bishop Adalbert decided to inhume the relics of Peter Chrysologus and other saints in a special chapel ‘Anno Domini millesimo duecentesimo indictione tertia. Hic inclusa laic cent sanctorum corpora multorum. Hic beati Ravennatis sub ara requiescunt Petri membran beata’. The plates were there until the ceremonal \textit{recognitio} of the mortal remains of Chrysologus in 1698. Bishop Carlo Alidosi received permission from the Pope Clement VI for indulgence during a church fair during the Day of St. John Casian and St. Peter Chrysologus (papal bull – 19\textsuperscript{th} January 1342) The second \textit{recognitio} of the relics of Chrysologus took place on the 29\textsuperscript{th} August 1497. Bishop Simon Bonadies ordered the relics to be closed in a lead case which was placed in a marble sarcophagus, ibidem, p. 98–99. The third \textit{recognitio} took place in 1698 when a new chapel dedicated to Chrysologus was built in the Cathedral of Imola. His mortal remains were transferred there. Ibidem, p. 103–104.
2.1.2. Literary work – *Sermones*

The sermons of St. Peter Chrysologus survived to this day in the form of two manuscripts: pre-Felician tradition (the so called Severian) and Felician tradition. The pre-Felician tradition is earlier (6th/7th century) but has fewer sermons and is less credible as to the authorship. The second Felician one is a later one dating back to the beginning of the 8th century and richer in number of codes but none of them dates back earlier than the 11th century. All editions of the text were based on both traditions of the 16th century. Currently, the most important one is the edition published by Alessandro Olivara (CChSL 24–24A–24B; OSPC 1–3). The sermons of Peter Chrysologus were a clerical explanation of Biblical periscopes read during Liturgical Year. The Bishop of Ravenna had planned out the topics of the sermons according to the *explanation – enarratio* schema. In his explanation of the meaning of the Biblical text, he turned from the literal meaning of the given quote to its figurative and practical sense.

2.1.2.1. The texts

The only texts Peter Chrysologus left behind are a collection of sermons. There are two traditions of manuscripts: pre-Felician tradition (the so called Severian) and Felician tradition.69

**The pre-Felician Tradition**, sometimes also called Severian70 came into being before Archbishop Felix’ tradition. The sermons were provided

---


70 Beginning with the 6th century, Chrysologus’ sermons were wrongly assigned to Severian of Gabala. R. Benicletti, *Il Cristo nei sermoni*, op. cit., n. 43, p. 75, notices that one of the first people to make such a mistake was Gregory the Great (590–604), who quoted Chrysologus’ *Sermon* 64 as Severian’s one. Compare Gregory the Great, *Epistula* X, 21, verse 94–99: “Quamuis hoc in loco Seuerianus Gabilli aliud loquitur, dicens quia hoc mulieribus Dominus quasi per increpationem dixerit, quod mortuum Lazarum ubi posuerint requisuit, acsi aperte Euae culpam memorans mulieribus dicaret: ego uirum in paradiso posui, quem uos posuistis in sepulcro”, OGM VI/3 (VIII–X), ed. V. Recchia, Roma 1998, p. 570.
with the name Severin. These manuscripts contain the oldest texts (sermons) by Chrysologus, in their purest form. The Milan Code is the most important one (Ambrosianus C. 77 sup.). It was written in the second half of the 6th/7th century in Verona but assigned to the library in Bobbio. Unfortunately it is not complete. Of the 88 sermons listed in the index, it contains only 35 complete sermons and two excerpts. There is also another pre-Felician manuscript from Bobbio: Codex Vaticanus Latino 5758 from the 6th/7th century. Some sermons by Chrysologus in this manuscript are ascribed to St. Augustine of Hippo. Some pre-Felician manuscripts (the so called Severian) was well known to Benedictine monks, including: St. Gregory the Great (born around 540, died 12th March 604), the manuscripts from Monte Cassino Monastery before 8th century and Paul the Deacon (born around 720, died around 799).71

The Felician tradition. Its name comes from the Archbishop Felix of Ravenna (708–724), who gathered all sermons by Chrysologus (in the archive of Ravenna), provided them with an index and had written a forward, pointing to the Bishop of Ravenna (Chrysologus) as its author. This collection of 176 sermons was often copied by copyists. The Felician tradition is richer in number, but none were written earlier than the 11th century. We can divide the Felician tradition of manuscripts (Sermones) into three main groups. The first one, the most accurate one, closest to the original one. Not many copies exist, the most important one being Codex Vaticanus Latinus 4952, written in Ravenna in the 11th century. Other editors, basically used this text. The second group, the so called franca (very numerous texts, mainly from the 12th century) and a third one called franca derivate (codes from England and northern France, from before the 13th century).72

The authenticity of the text. Of all 176 sermons making up Collectio Feliciana Sermones by Chrysologus, 8 sermons are not authentic: 53, 107, 119, 129, 135, 149, 159. Sermo 119 was written by Severian of Gabala.73 It is acknowledged that 15 sermons in the Felician tradition were not written

72 A. Olivar, Los sermones, op. cit., p. 45–100; R. Benericetti, Introduzione, OSPC 1, p. 39.
by Chrysologus but due to their style, content and tradition, they were included in the current edition. These include the following sermons: 7 bis, 62 bis, 72 bis, 72 ter, 85 bis, 85 ter, 99 bis, 130 bis, 140 bis, 140 ter, 148 bis, 155 bis, 177, 178 and 179. The Letter to Eutyches (written after June 449) is also considered to be a text by Chrysologus. Researchers have divided views as to the authorship of the so called Rotulus of Ravenna.

2.1.2.3. Text editions
The first editor of Chrysologus' works was Agapito Vincentino who printed the first edition of the works of Peter Chrysologus in Bologna in 1534. The next important editions of his texts included: Domenico Mita, Martina del Castillo, as well as, Sebastiano Paoli. Sebastiano Paoli’s edition was reprinted by J. P. Migne. A modern version of the text, by far the most

---

78 Dominicus Mita, *D. Petri Chrysologi Forocorneliensis Ravennatum archiepiscopi, Homiliae sacrate, sive sermones aurei, recogniti, emendati ac maxima parte (variiis lectionibus, scholiis et observationibus) illustrati*, Bononiae 1643.
79 Martini Del Castillo, *Divi Petri Chrysologi Archiepiscopi Ravennatis Sermones aurei ad exemplar Seraphicae Cesenae Bibliothecae correcti*, Lugdunum 1676.
80 Sebastiano Paoli, *Sancti Petri Chrysologi Opera omnia ad codices manuscriptos recensita a P. Sebastiano Paoli, Clerico Regulari Congregationis Matris Dei Lucensis, Venetiis 1750.
81 Sancti Petri Chrysologi Archiepiscopi Ravennatis Opera omnia. Recusa ad caditgatisimm recensionem Sebastiani Pauli, qui praefatus est, notasque adject in quibus manuscriptorum codicum collationes, selectiona quaedam ex observationibus dominici mitae, voariate lectiones latini latiniti, necnon castigatones meurrisi comprehendidur sequuntur Sanctorum Valeriani et Nicetae, Cemeliensis et Aquileiensis Episcoporum scripta universa juxta Jacobi Sirmondi, Braidae atque eminintissimi Cardinalis Maii elucubrationes accurantissime expressa et emendata. Editio ante
critical in terms of putting the two manuscripts together, classifying and thorough analysis was prepared by Alessandro Olivar.\textsuperscript{82}

2.1.2.4. Translations
Of all modern translations\textsuperscript{83} of Peter Chrysologus’ works there is a German translation,\textsuperscript{84} three Italian translations: by A. Pasini,\textsuperscript{85} M. Spinele\textsuperscript{86} and G. Banterle,\textsuperscript{87} Catalanian\textsuperscript{88} and English ones.\textsuperscript{89}

There are Polish translations of selected sermons only. They were translated into Polish from PL. Collected Feliciana and that is why the text differs from the critical edition by A. Olivar in CChSL or OSPC.

2.1.2.5. Literary value
The nickname Chrysologus comes from Agnellus Ravennatius. It seems to be a rhetorical emphasis derived from a flowery style of early Mediaeval episcopal offices. However, this title can be justified. Chrysologus has literary education and style which was rare in early Mediaeval times thus the title given to the 5\textsuperscript{th} century Bishop does not seem offensive, especially if we compare him to mediocre 9\textsuperscript{th} century preachers.\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{82} Petrus Chrysologus, *Sermonum collectio a Felice…*, op. cit.; the text in CCHSL is almost identical to OSPC, that is: *Opere di san Pietro Crisologo*, op. cit.


\textsuperscript{86} *San Pier Crisologo, Omelie per la vita quotidiana*, trad., introduzione e note a cura di M. Spinelli, Roma 1978 (Collana di testi patristici, 12).


\textsuperscript{90} G. Del Tòn, *De sancti Petri Crisologi eloquentia*, “Latinitas” 6 (1958), p. 177–189.
Of all 183 sermons by Chrysologus (published in the critical edition by A. Olivar), 150 refer to Biblical texts, typically used by the Church in the given liturgical season and coming mainly from the New Testament (130 texts concerning the Gospel, 12 discussing the texts of St. Paul, 6 on the Psalms, 1 sermon on the Acts of the Apostles). What is interesting is that not even one sermon by Chrysologus is entirely based on the New Testament. The preacher refers to the Old Testament but uses it to explain the New Testament. This is usually a precise Christological interpretation. The subsequent 14 sermons are religious lessons meant for catechumen. They are on the subject of the Symbol of faith and on the subject of the prayer ‘Our Father’. Another four sermons were delivered during the consecration of Bishops. The remaining ones were liturgical tributes to the saints of the Church. The calendar of saints (based on Chrysologus’ sermons) was written later, probably by copyists, who had organized and rewritten the sermons according to the liturgical calendar before Collectio Feliciana.

Chrysologus’ sermons were a pastoral explanation of the Biblical periscopes read throughout the entire liturgical year in order to strengthen faith and provide tips for Christians. It is assumed that a sermon should be short, around a quarter of an hour. If the preacher had not managed to finish the topic of his sermon, he continued it during the next one.

93 F. Sottocornolla, L’anno liturgico, op. cit., p. 157–161, suggests the following order of Chrysologus’ sermons: 1–14 (Lent sermons), 15–39 (sermons which are not clearly assigned), 41–43 (Lent sermons), 44–55 (sermons which are not clearly assigned), 56–72 (sermons for the end of Lent, except for sermons 63–64, on the raising of Lazarus); 73–85 (Easter sermons), 86–92 (sermons before Christmas), 93–126 (sermons which are not assigned), 127–139 (heterogenous sermons) 140–160 (sermons for Epiphany and Christmas), 161–176 (heterogenous sermons).
94 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 132, 6: “Quod qui plenius nosse desiderat, apostoli de corpore Christi loquentis perlegat instituta, quia nos illa percurrere sermonis breuitas amica non patitur”, OSPC 3, 58.
95 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 112: “Date ergo ueniam, fratres, si intra punctum temporis et horae ipsius uix momentum obscura lucidare”, OSPC 2, 344; To read more about the timing of a perfect sermon according to Peter Chrysologus see: A. Olivar, La duración de la predicación antigua, “Liturgia” 3 (1966), p. 143–184.
96 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 36, 1: “Cum archisynagogi uel emoruose mulier conexa sibi et producta narratio a consueta sermonis nostris breuitate discederet, maluimus dimidiare
In the opinion of A. Olivar, the sermons had been written down by stenographers during the sermon itself, then corrected by Chrysologus and rewritten by a copyist.97

In his sermons Peter Chrysologus commented the evangelical periscopes. He used the Latin translation, the so called *Vetus Itala*, as the Vulgate was introduced into the Church in Ravenna during the times of Bishop Maximinus (546 – around 556).98 He used a short introduction, indicating the topic of the sermon, then he explained verse after verse.99 Having explained the literal sense (*historia*) of the given Biblical text, he went on to comment on the allegorical meaning (*misterium*, *intelligentia spiritualis*, *sacramentum*). Sometimes he made accurate pastoral comments or made lengthy comments. Often he would present a typological egegisis but did not use the term *typus* often.100 To encourage his listeners to change their ways, and to give them as Christians specific recommendations, he explained the moral sense of a given periscope. In his sermons he was not *explicite* on the ideas of classical philosophy. What is more, he was prejudiced against them and they were never the basis of his pastoral egegisis. Some philosophical concepts were present in his sermons, as *opinion communis* used in the preaching tradition.101

Chrysologus would often ask himself the question about the appropriate style of a preacher. In one of his most meaningful texts on the subject, he came to a conclusion that the sermons should be simple.102 But

---

102 Peter Chrysologus *Sermo* 43, 3–7: “Populis populariter est loquentium; communio compellanda est sermonem communi; omnibus necessaria dicenda sunt more omnium.”
the requirement for simplicity and humbleness of the speaker was very much part of what was typical of an ancient orator or preacher. This had been advised for centuries by pagan rhetors. What is more, using a simple language was part of the art of ancient rhetors. It was a type of game. By advising to speak straightforwardly, in practice this did not mean resigning from the art of eloquence. Both, ancient school, as well as public life, where the orator was expected to express beautifully, in a flowery and eloquent manner, prepared well for the art of eloquence.¹⁰³

The Bishop of Ravenna was a typical representative of this style of an ancient speaker – an eloquent orator. But he never sacrificed the content for the art of speaking. He used special effects but the evangelical meaning never lost its importance. When planning his sermons, everything concerning disposizione was limited to the bare minimum.¹⁰⁴

Those sermons were first of all theological commentary on Biblical stories. The subject matter was planned according to explanation – enarratio schema. Chrysologus used the means of expressions the pagan grammaticus had used in his classical texts to relate to the Bible. By using this classical method, he tried to explain the literal sense of a given quote. He then went on to explain the figurative sense. The next step of such a carefully constructed sermon were practical conclusions drawn from the literal and figurative sense. They would relate to the lives of the listeners.¹⁰⁵

Naturalis lingua cara simplicibus, doctis dulcis; docens loquatur omnibus profutura. Ergo hodie imperito uerbo ueniam dent periti”, OSPC 1, 302. Compare also: Sermo 18, 50–57; Sermo 36, 3–8; Sermo 59, 116–119; Sermo 118, 3–9; Sermo 132, 79–81; Sermo 86, 85–95.

¹⁰³ M. Korolko, Sztuka retoryki. Przewodnik encyklopedyczny, Warszawa 1998, p. 83–87, emphasizes the fact that in antiquity, the introduction to a speech (Greek: prooimion, Latin: exordium) was meant to prepare the listener for the speech. The speaker should therefore, create a favourable atmosphere and help the listeners concentrate. Attracting the listener’s attention (Latin: captatio benevolentiae) was done by using conventional methods (loci communes). In his Institutionis oratoriae, Quintilian suggested the use of modesty, succinctness and perfect diction as a way of attracting the listener’s attention. One of the forms of captatio benevolentiae was the use of a simple introduction (Latin: simplex), simple in thought and media. In the so called simple introduction one should have a natural stage fright, which is a way of showing modesty and by doing so respect for the topic and the listeners.


His efforts to impart an aesthetic function to his sermons were based on *elocutio*, that is the right choice of language and style. In order to achieve symmetry he would use isocolons and anthithesis. This led to an accumulation of words and concepts (*ampfilacatio*, *congeries*), which obscured the disquisition. Perhaps, such an opinion comes from the fact that the 21st century readers are used to short texts, especially in written form. Ancient listeners probably accepted such methods because the less educated listeners were able to follow the line of thought and better remember the plot of the sermon thanks to the lengthy style. Whereas, the better educated listeners would admire the so called *facunia et abundia*, which had always been important for Latin oratorical art.\(^{106}\)

Other efforts connected with *elocutio* include the use of anaphora and puns (*paronomasia*), rhyme and assonance, anthithesis, cacophony, oxy-morons and epanalepsis. Sometimes this gave a better and sometimes a worse oratorical result. Chrysologus tried to find ways to surprise his listeners. Therefore, he sometimes used translations of Biblical words, often compared Biblical facts with events from everyday life. There were many references to the court, to the army, sailors, farming or family life. He used lengthy descriptions (*ekphrasis*), typical of the rhetorical school of the time. Chrysologus’ oratory style also included the use of aphoristic language, typical of North African Latin writers of the 3rd-5th century, such as Tertullian or Augustine of Hippo.\(^{107}\)

The language Chrysologus uses is proof of his education. He makes references not only to the Bible – but mostly to it – but also to Classical Culture. He did not use Attic style in his sermons which was typical of Greek fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries. His form of expression resembles that of St. Augustine although less meticulous in terms of vocabulary or expressions.\(^{108}\)

Chrysologus uses Latin terms typical for 5th century. These include: *annositas* (of age, major), *amarus* (bitter, salty), *christianitas* (Christian), *amoenare* (to make something pleasant, nice), *depretiare* (deprecate), mani-

---

\(^{106}\) G. Del Ton, *De sancti Petri Chrysologi eloquentia*, op. cit., p. 177–189.
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care (get up in the morning), metator (fut.imp of metor, metari, metatus sum – it will be measured off, marked out), mortificare (to kill, destroy), moestificare (to worry), mundanus (cosmopolitan), repaginare (turn sides), septemplicare (multiply by seven), septimana (the 7th), transcursio (to meet).109

As far as cursus is concerned, Chrisologus tried to maintain a metric stress, which was typical of all the best Christian writers prior to Chrysologus, including St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Zeno of Verona, St. Ambrose of Milan, Symmachus or St. Augustine of Hippo. As a preacher he was so careful as to keeping the right metre that he sometimes abused the use of sic, iam or different personal pronouns in the openings of his speeches. Thus, his sentences were rich in Latin classicisms, making them difficult to understand sometimes.

To sum up the importance of the literary value of Chrysologus’ sermons, one must note that they met the standards of rhetoric of the time. He did not lack technique nor intellectual enthusiasm to express his thought with appropriate expressions. He was compared to two other doctors of the Western Church: St. Ambrose of Milan and St. Augustine of Hippo. As a preacher he was sincere and distinctive in his portrayal of theological concepts or explaining the meanings of Biblical lessons. As an orator, he was a praiseworthy and much valued preacher, much appreciated by his listeners. He was compared to his contemporary – Saint Leo the Great. St. Leon’s style was different, more balanced and reserved and sometimes far more grandiose. Chrysologus’ style can be described as more vivid, flexible but sometimes too exaggerated with its concentration of comparisons.110

2.2. The figure of a Clergyman. Salvian

Salvian was married to Palladia. Between 424/425–428, together with his family he retired into a monastery in Lerins. He was then ordained

a presbyter in Marseille (before 429). He was a cherished teacher and ascetic writer. Of his numerous books, three have survived till today: *Adversus avaritiam libri quattuor* vel *Ad Ecclesian*, *De Gubernatione Dei* vel *De praesenti iudicio libri quinque*, as well as, *Epistularum librum unum*.

2.2.1. The biography of Salvian

On the basis of Salvian’s work, as well as, subsequent historical sources I will give an outline of his biography. First of all I will discuss biographical sources and their historical value. I will then present matters connected with the date and place of Salvian’s birth, matters concerning his education, Christian background, marriage to Palladia, his stay in Lerins (together with his family), priesthood and death.

2.2.1.1. Biographical sources

Extracts from the following sources are the basic sources of our knowledge about Salvian’s life and work: Hillary of Arles, *Sermo de Vita sancti Honorati*,111 Eucharius of Lyons, *Instructionum ad Salonium libri duo*,112 Gennady of Marseille, *Denviris illustribus*,113 Ado of Vienne, *Chroni-

111 Hilary of Arles, *Vita Sancti Honorati*, SCh 235, éd. M.-D. Valentin, Paris 1977. Hilary of Arles (died 449), a monk from the monastery in Lerins, who later became the Bishop of Arles. A year after the death of St Honoratus (around 430/431) he wrote a speech in praise of St Honoratus which included a few details about his friend, Salvian of Marseille, ibidem, p. 22.

112 *Sancti Eucherii Lugdunensis opera omnia, pars prima. Instructionum libri duo*, CSEL 31, Praga–Viena–Leipzig 1894, p. 63–161. St Eucherius of Lyons (died around 449/456), a monk in the Lerins monastery, then a Bishop of Lyons, mentions in his *Instructionum ad Salonium Libri duo*, CSEL 31, 65–66, the holiness and wisdom of Salvian of Marseilles and Vincent from Lerins. It is slightly difficult to date the works of Eucherius. It is accepted that it was between 428 and 449/456. To read more, see: L. R. Wickham, *Eucherius von Lyon*, [in:] *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Bd. 10, Berlin 1982, p. 522–525. In L.R.Wickham’s opinion *Instructionum ad Salonium* was written shortly after 428, but definitely before 449 because it mentions Hilary of Arles (died in 449) already as Bishop.

113 Gennadius of Marseille, *Liber de viris illustribus*, TU 14/1, ed. E. C. Richardson, Leipzig 1896, p. 57–97. According to E.C.Richardson Gennadius finished his version of *De viris illustribus* around 477/478. The note on Salvian (number 68) was probably written between 467 and 468. To read more see: S. Pricoco, *Gennadio di Marsiglia*, DPAC 2, p. 1450–1452. We can learn from the notes made by Gennadius that at the moment of writing Salvian’s biographical entry, Salvian was an old man but enjoyed good health.
con,114 as well as, some some works by Salvian himself that is: Epistuale I, IV, V, VIII, IX, a treatise Ad Ecclesiæ115 and a treatise De Gubernatione Dei.116 Those writings do not contain too much biographical data concerning Salvian himself. They are mostly short notes made by later chroniclers, on the basis of which we try to reconstruct his biography.

The authenticity of the name Salvian, supplemented by ‘presbiter from Marseille’ is certified by the named chroniclers.117 The name Salvian also appears in the preface to De Gubernatione Dei.118

2.2.1.2. Date and place of birth

He was born around 390. The date is based on a hypothetical calculation. Since Gennadius wrote his note on Salvian119 between 467 and 468,120 one can deduce that Salvian's old age (in good health) is about the age of seventy. He must have, therefore been born around the end of the 4th century.121 If one makes an assumption that Trier had been besieged and occupied by

---

114 Ado Vennensis, Chronicon sive Breviarium de sex mundi aetatibus ab Adamo usque ad annum 869, PL 123, 104. A short note by by a Bishop Vienne – Ado (also known as Adon, Adonis Viennensis, around 800–875) does not bring forth any new information. It practically repeats what Gennadius had said (number 68).


118 M. Pellegrino (Salviano di Marsiglia (Studio critico), Lateranum, Nova Series, An. VI, n. 1–2, Roma 1939, n. 5, 7) notices that the manuscript De Gubernatione Dei, that is Codex A lacks the name Salvian in the preface. This code was stripped of the first few pages in Medieval times. Other codes clearly mention the name Silvani.


120 F. Diekamp, Wann hat Gennadius seinen Schriftstellerkatalog verfasst?, “Römische Quartalschrift” 12 (1898), p. 420, claimed that Gennadius wrote the note about Salvian between 467–469. S. Pricoco, Gennadio di Marsiglia, DPAC 2, 1450–1452 maintains that the date is 467–468.

121 M. Pellegrino, Salviano di Marsiglia, op. cit., p. 11.
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Franks, respectively in 406, 411–413, 418, 438–439 or in 407, 413, 420, 428 and Salvian had witnessed the third besiege and devastation in the years 418–420 then he must have been born earlier.

Salvian’s works suggest an earlier date. In Epistola IX he writes that his recipient is Salonius, his own student. In Epistola VIII, when addressing Eucherius, the Bishop of Lyon, he mentions his two sons, namely Salonius and Veranius who were Salvian’s pupils. We know that Salonius as Bishop was present at the synod in Orange in 441 and he must have been at least forty then. Taking into account the difference in age between Salonius the student and Salvian as his teacher, the latter one should have been born at least at the beginning of the 5th century. Since Salonius was born around the year 400, Salvian must have been born earlier, tak-

---

124 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 6, op. cit., p. 72–73; SCh 220, 408; compare there, 6, 82–89; SCh 220, 414–420.
125 According to M. Pellegrino, *Salvianio di Marsiglia*, 12 this must have happened before 410.
126 Salvian of Marseilles, *Epistola 9*, 1: “Domino ac beatissimo discipulo, patri, filio, per institutionem discipulo, per amorem filio, per honorem patri, Salonio episco Saluianus. Quaeris a me, o mi Saloni, caritas mea”, SCh 176, 120.
128 Eucherius of Lyons indirectly confirms this (*Instructionum ad Salomonin*), in his preface to his son, Bishop Salonius: “dignum namque est quacumque cura mea ingenium tuum remunerari qui uixdum decem natus annos heremum ingressus inter illas sanctorum manus non solum inbutus uerum etiam enutritus es sub Honorato patre, illo inquam, primo insularum postea etiam ecclesiarium magistro; cum te illic beatissimi Hilari tunc insulani tironis sed iam nunc summi pontificis doctrina formaret per omnes spiritualium rerum disciplinas, ad hoc etiam te postea consummantibus sanctis uiris Saluiano atque Vincentio eloquentia pariter scientia qua praeminentibus”, CSEL 31, 65–66.
129 L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l’anciène Gaule*, vol. 1, Paris 1907, p. 222; J. Gaudemet, *L’Église dans l’Empire Romain (IVe–Ve siècles)*, op. cit., p. 125, mentions the fact that in the Western Church of the 5th century, the canonical age for a candidate for a bishop was 40–45 years of age.
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ing the minimal age difference between the teacher and student. Salvian's birthdate is defined as around 390.131

Salvian most probably came from North-East Galia, from Augusta Treverorum (the province of Germania I, today known as Treves in Germany).132 There are suggestions that his birthplace might have been Colonia Agrippina (the province of Germania II, today known as Cologne) where his distant family resided.133

Based on the extracts mentioned (De Gubernatione Dei) we are unable to depict the exact place of birth of its author. Modern monographs state general territory of Roman provinces Germania (Germania II) or Treves (Cologne), not depicting any particular town.134 The


133 Salvian of Marseilles, Epistola, vol. 1, p. 5–6: “5. Adulescens quem ad uos misi, Agrippinae cum suis captus est, quondam inter suos non parui nominis, familia non obscurus, domo non despicabilis et de quo aliquid fortasse amplius dicerem, nisi propinquus meus esset. Hoc enim fit ut minus dicam, ne de me ipso dicere uidear de illo plura dicendo. Matrem ergo is, de quo dico, Agrippinae uiduit probam, honestam, et de qua forsitan audacter dicere ualeam, uere uiduum, Nam praeter ceteras castimoniae sapientiaeque virtutes est etiam fide nobilis, quae omnis semper ornatum ornamentum est, quia sine hac nihil tam ornatum est quod ornare possit. 6. Haec ergo, ut audio, tantae illic inopiae atque egestatis est ut ei nec residdendi nec abeundi facultas suppetat, quia nihil est quod uel ad uictum uel ad fugam opituletur. Solum est quod mercenario opere uictum quaeritius uxoribus barbarorum locaticias manus subdit. Ita, licet per dei misericordiam uinculis captivitatis exempta sit, cum iam non seruiat condicione, seruit paupertate”, SCh 176, 78. E. Baluze considered Cologne first of all as the birthplace of Salvian: É. Baluze, Sanctorum presbyterorum Salviani Massilienis et Vincentii Lirinensis Opera (Paris 1663) Paris 1847³, PL 53, 26.

134 M. Pellegrino, Salvianio di Marsiglia, op. cit., p. 11, this author points to Trevis as a more likely birthplace of Salvian due to the fact that Salvian described events connected with this city with more enthusiasm asnd precision. This would confirm the hypothesis that
hypothesis that Salvian comes from Roman North Africa has definitely been rejected.135

2.2.1.3. Education, baptism and priesthood

Sources do not mention anything about Salvian’s parents nor his education in early youth. Georges Lagarrigue indirectly suggests that the following imply his aristocratic background: a good education, as well as, opinions he expressed on gentry and slaves particularly in the II and III book of *De Gubernatione Dei*.136 There is speculation that if his parents had been Christians he would have had a Christian upbringing and would have been baptized as an adult. If his parents had, however, been pagan, he would have had to convert to Christianity and then accept baptism. No mention of Salvian converting from he was a witness of the events he describes. Whereas H. R. Drobner, *Patrology*, trad. P. S. Neri, F. Sirlento, Casale Monferrato 1998, p. 620, also mentions Trevis and Cologne but stresses that Salvian’s description of the capture of Trevis by the Franks in the years 418–420 is very much doubted by present day researchers. L. J. Ignace also gives a negative opinion: L. J. Ignace, *Salvien et les invasions du Vème siècle en Gaule d’après le «De gubernatione Dei»*, Toulouse 1966 as well as an article: J. Blänsdorf, *Salvian über Gallien und Karthago. Zu Realismus und Retoric in der spätantiken Literatur*, [in:] Studien zu Gregor von Nyssa und der christlichen Spätantike, Hrsg. H. R. Drobner, Ch. Klock, Supplements to “Vigiliae Christianae" 12 (1990), p. 311–332. 

135 É. Baluze, *Sanctorum presbyterorum Saluiani Massiliensis*, PL 53, 26–27; W. Zschimmer, *Salvianus, der Presbyter von Massilia*, op. cit., p. 7 and finally M. Pellegrino, *Salviano di Marsiglia*, op. cit., p. 9–10, who rightly noticed that Salvian having described Cartagina enjoining itself during the Vandal (*De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 6, op. cit., p. 68–71: SCh 220, 406, 408), appealed to the reader to notice other events close by, that is in: *De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 6, op. cit., p. 72: “Sed quid ego loquor de longe positis et quasi in alio orbe submotis, cum sciam etiam in solo patrio atque in civitatibus Gallicanis omnes ferme praecelliores viros calamitibus suis factos esse peiores”, SCh 220, 408. Salwian specified that he had seen similar, despicable behavior among inhabitants of conquered cities. This also applied to his homeland – Gaul during the third siege of Trier by the Franks (between 418 and 420): *De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 6, op. cit., p. 72: “Vidi siquidem ego Treueros ipse homines, domi nobiles, dignitate sublimes, licet iam spoliatos atque uastatos, minus euersos tamen rebus fuisse quam moribus: quamuis enim depopulatissim atque nudatis aliquid superaret de substantia, nihil autem de disciplinae; adeo grauiores a semet hostes externis hostibus erant, ut licet a barbaris iam euerse essent, a se tamen magis euertentur”, SCh 220, 408. Salvian then described the behaviour of the inhabitants of Cologne (*De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 6, op. cit., p. 73–75: SCh 220, 408, 410) and other cities within Gaul territory (*De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 6, op. cit., p. 75–81: SCh 220, 410–414). Therefore, the term from *De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 6, op. cit., p. 72: “cum sciam etiam in solo patrio atque in civitatibus Gallicanis” refers precisely to Trier, Cologne and Gallic provines – *Germania I, Germania II*, and not to Roman North Africa.

paganism and the characteristic way in which he describes pagans as foreign to
him makes us think that he was born into a Christian family. Salvian was
no doubt already a Christian when he married his wife Palladia, whose father
Hypatius was a pagan and accepted baptism after his daughter’s marriage.
Numerous references to classical works in his writing works show
that Salvian probably studied grammar and rhetoric. He probably did not
know Greek even though he often gave etymology of some Greek words.
This fact does not surprise as knowledge of Greek in the 5th century was
practically fading.

Having done courses in rhetoric Salvian continued his studies, probably
in law. Numerous excerpts of his work show a knowledge of this field and
a good knowledge of judicial speeches. Salvian might have studied law in

---

138 Salvian of Marseilles, *Epistola 4, 6*: “Tu autem quid suscenses, qui ex quo Christianus
factus es, etiam falsas habere desisti?”, SCh 176, 90.
139 G. Wcisło, *Grecka myśl filozoficzna…*, op. cit., p. 131–137, analysing the classical philo-
sophical thought in the works of Salvian, she stresses that he referred mainly to Stoic (com-
pare *De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 1, op. cit., p. 7–8), according to the rule: after certain slight
modifications, everything according to Christian ethics. He accepted the fact that virtue it-
self is enough to be happy and that wisdom is wealth, there, 137. Salvian reminded us of
Pythagoras’ words, that gods look after people (*De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 1, op. cit., p. 2).
He mentioned Plato and all Platonic schools which accept the fact that God rules everything
(*De Gubernatione Dei*, vol. 1, op. cit., p. 3); but he rejected Epicureanism (*De Gubernatione
Presbyter von Massilia*, op. cit., p. 62, suggesting that Salvian took his knowledge of philo-
sophy directly from Lactantius. Salvian’s reading of Marcus Tullius Cicero also widened his
knowledge of Greek philosophical thought.
140 M. Pellegrino, *Salvianio di Marsiglia*, op. cit., p. 16; W. Zschimmer, *Salvianus, der
Presbyter von Massilia*, op. cit., p. 10.
141 H.-I. Marrou, *S. Agostino e la fine della cultura antica*, trad. M. Cassola, Milano 1994,
p. 53–59, taking political and cultural reasons for abandoning Ancient Greek in the Western
Roman Empire, he stressed that at the end of the 4th century the knowledge of Ancient Greek
in the West was vanishing. For the average fairly educated Roman man of letters Hellenistic
studies and Ancient Greek practically paid no vital role. Ancient Greek was a foreign lan-
guage to the Romans. There was poor knowledge of the language even in written form and
Greek literature became known only through translations. Highly specialized Grecians sym-
bolized the phenomenon of completely eradicating Greek among society of the Western
Imperium Romanum, ibidem, p. 58.
142 G. Wcisło, *Salwian z Marsylii – sylwetka twórcy w świetle jego dzieł, a zwłaszcza listów,*
“Studia nad Kulturą Antyczną” 1997 [t. 1], p. 124, suggest that Salvian often used legal terms
The Pastors of the 5th Century. A Comparative Study…

Treves\textsuperscript{143} or more likely in Arles. At the end of the 4th century there were many lecturers of Roman law and Treves which was the capital of the prefecture of Gaul was proud of its law school. When in 407 Arles became the prefecture of Gale, the lecturers of law\textsuperscript{144} moved there together with the administration of the region. It is therefore possible that Salvian studied law in Arles, before he got married. He was a lawyer\textsuperscript{145} for a relatively short period of time.

Between 420–422 he married a pagan – Palladia,\textsuperscript{146} the daughter of Hypatius and Quieta. With time she became a Christian. The offspring of their marriage was their daughter Auspiciola.\textsuperscript{147} We do not know when the ascetic conversion of Salvian and Palladia took place. Encouraged by Salvian the married couple vowed, as a sign of their respect for Christ and love for God – a life in chastity.\textsuperscript{148} This kind of lascetism was their way of perfecting religious life.\textsuperscript{149} This was incomprehensible to Palladia’s parents.\textsuperscript{150} Seven
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years into this decision the couple wrote to Hypatius and Quieta a letter (Epistola IV) to persuade them about the rightness of the above choice. We do not know whether the hoped for reconciliation took place or not.\(^{151}\) They were not alone as Paulinus of Nola and his wife Therasia,\(^{152}\) Apronius and Amanda\(^{153}\) or Saint Eucherius, bishop of Lyon and Gaul\(^{154}\) had made a similar choice.

Around 424 or 425\(^{155}\) Salvian settled in a monastery in Lerins founded by Saint Honoratus.\(^{156}\) His acquaintance with and letters to the monks from Lerins\(^{157}\) – Saint Honoratus, Saint Hilary of Arles\(^{158}\) and Saint Eucherius of

\(^{151}\) M. Pellegrino, Salviano di Marsiglia, op. cit., p. 21.

\(^{152}\) Paulinus of Nola, Epistula 5, 19: CSEL 29, 38.


\(^{154}\) Paulinus of Nola, Epistula 51: CSEL 29, 423–425. Eucherius, who later became the Bishop of Lyon, together with his wife Gallia vowed chastity and led an ascetic life on the island of Lerins. Paulinus of Nola made a statement about them in Epistula 51, 1: “in corde uno, quo terrestria reliquistis, caelum petentes”, CSEL 29, 424; to read more about marriages vowing chastity in the 4th and 5th century see: D. Kasprzak, Il pensiero sociale di Paolino da Nola, op. cit., p. 113–152; and to read about the beginnings of monasticism see: S. Pricoco, L’isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico, Roma 1978; L. Cristiani, Lérins et fondateurs, Saint-Wandrille 19912.

\(^{155}\) G. Wcisło, Salviano z Marylii – sylwetka twórcy, op. cit., p. 125.

\(^{156}\) J. Piłat, Wstęp. Wczesne reguły monastyczne z Gałii, [in:] ŻM 3, tłum. K. Bielawski, wstęp J. Piłat, red. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 1994, p. 10. The author notes that Saint Honoratus founded a monastery on the Lerins Islands (four km away from today’s Cannes on the French Riviera). The first rule (the so called Four Rules of Monastic Life) included obedience, humbleness, personal poverty and physical work, moderation, lengthy fasting and other ways of mortifying oneself, reading, prayer and all-night vigil. Saint Honoratus, the founder of the monastic community also defined its rules of the community he had founded; ibidem, p. 12. Probably, Salvian observed these rules.


\(^{158}\) Hilary of Arles, Vita sancti Honorati 4, 19: “Didicerant omnes, ipso sibi commiserunt, dolores illius suos computare ut non immerito egregius et in Christo beatissimus vir Saluianus presbyter, carorum suorum unus, in scriptis suis dixerit quot, sicut caeli faciem pro sua sol aut obscuritatem aut serenitatem mutaret, ita congregatio illa caelum sibi Sanctam et caelestibus studiis mancipata ab ipso uel nublla uel serenitatem quasi a peculiari in Christo sole susciperet, ipso quoque et adfluicto adflictaretur et respirante reualesceret”, Sch 235, 124. In the opinion of M.-D. Valentin, Introduction. Hilaire d’Arles. Vie de Saint Honorat, Sch 235, 22, the text Vita sancti Honorati was written by Hilary in the first anniversary of Honoratus’ death between 430 and 431.
It is not known why Salvian moved South from North-East Gaul. This could have been for more than one reason only. A series of events could have resulted in this decision. It could have been an escape from constant threat of attacks by barbarians in Germania I and Germania II. Perhaps, as was the custom of educated people Salvian travelled in search of hints for a better life. His decision might also have been due to the transfer of the prefecture of Gaul from Treves to Arles. This would confirm the argument that Salvian might have been an Imperial clerk (lawyer?) in Imperial Arles.

Everything seems to suggest that Sylvian was not a formal monk but a so called convert in Lerins. George Lagarrigue explains that Salvian's

---

159 Eucherius of Lyon, *Instructionum ad Salonium*: “dignum namque est quaquamque cura mea ingenium tuum remunerari qui uixdum decem annos heremum ingressus inter illas sanctorum manus non solum inbutus verum etiam enutritus es sub Honorato patre, illo inquam, primo insularum postea etiam ecclesiari magistro; cum te illic beatissimi Hilarii tunc insulani tironis sed iam nunc summi pontificis doctrina formaret per omnes spiritualium rerum disciplinas, ad hoc etiam te postea consuennenibus sanctis uiris Saluiano atque Vincentio eloquentia pariter scientiaque praeminentibus”, CSEL 31, 65–66.


162 According to an earlier historiography: L. de Tillemont, *Memoire pour servir a l'histoire ecclesiastique des six premiers siecles*, vol. 16, Paris 1712, p. 745–746; W. Zschimmer, *Salvianus, der Presbyter von Massilia*, op. cit., p. 17, admitted that Salvian was a member of the Lerins congregation but he never referred to him as a monk. Also A. Haemmerle, *Studien zu Salvian*, vol. 1, op. cit., p. 10, stated that Salvian joined the monastery in Lerins but never directly said that Salvian was a monk, whereas, M. Pellegrino, *Salviano di Marsiglia*, op. cit., p. 23, described Salvian as a monk in the famous cenobium founded in 410 by St. Honoratus on the island which later was named in honour of its founder.

163 G. M. Colombás, *Il monachesimo dalle origini*, op. cit., p. 256–257, described early monasticism in Roman Gaul and observed the difficulties in noticing the differences between an eremite and a recluse or a laura and a cenobium. But it is especially difficult to define the difference between a monk and a nonverce (Latin *conversi*). People such as Sulpicius Severus were considered monks by their contemporaries. The life of both a monk and a converse was fairly similar. The converse was different in the way that he could marry and keep his wife like a sister, he dressed humbly and poorly but did not wear the black *pallium*. He had a devout family and friends (Latin *familia*) but did not live in a monastery (Latin *monasterium*) understood as erem, laurel or cenobium. He did not isolate himself from the outside world. This was important as a complete isolation from the outside world (in all its forms) meant monastic perfection for the monk. Sulpicius Severus was an excellent example of such behavior (Egyptian monasticism). Sulpicius Severus was the author of the biography and admirer of Saint Martin of Tours. C. Vogel (*La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule des origines à la fin du VIIe siècle*, Paris 1952 [Chapitre V: Les «conversi»], p. 128–138) shared a similar view. C. Vogel an G. M. Colombás' observations confirm that Salvian who had pledged to live with his wife in chastity, did not leave Palladia in Lerins, what is more, he was accompanied by their daughter Auspiaciola. Salvian's
ascetic conversion and later also that of Palladia and Auspiciola (who were not formally known as nuns but as converts) did not oblige them to join the community of Saint Honoratus as monks or nuns. They did not have to obey by canonic norms associated with proper monastic life.\textsuperscript{164}

What is more, seven years into this ascetic conversion,\textsuperscript{165} which Salvian himself calls ‘our little conversion’,\textsuperscript{166} he did not separate from his wife and daughter (which \textit{Epistola} IV suggests),\textsuperscript{167} but obviously continued living with them in Lerins.\textsuperscript{168} This is additional proof that one can treat this family as early Christian converts.\textsuperscript{169}

\textit{Familia} did not live within the monastery but in a separate building for guests. It seems natural that those people saw themselves as monks (brothers) within a community.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{164} G. Lagarrigue, \textit{Introduction}, SC 176, 12.
  \item \textsuperscript{165} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Epistola} 4, 5: “Septimus iam ferme annus est ex quo quo nulla ad nos tam longe a uobis sitos scripta misitis”, SC 176, 90.
  \item \textsuperscript{166} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Epistola} 4, 6: “conuersinculam nostram”, SC 176, 90.
  \item \textsuperscript{168} G. M. Colombás, \textit{Il monachesimo dalle origini}, op. cit., p. 268–269, notices that Eucherius of Lyon, together with his wife vowed chastity and sod id other couples: the former senator Paulinus of Nola and his wife Therasia (a member of Roman aristocracy), Salvian of Marseilles and Palladia (probably also descendants of aristocratic families). V. Desprez (\textit{Początki monastycyzmu}, t. 2: \textit{Dzieje monastycyzmu chrześcijańskiego do Soboru Chalcedońskiego (431)}, ŹM 22, tłum. J. Dembska, Kraków 1999, p. 272) also believes in the aristocratic background of the first monks. He writes that Honoratus and Hillary encouraged Salvian and Eucherius of Lyon. F. Princ (\textit{Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich. Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert). Mit einem Kartenanhang}, München 1988\textsuperscript{2}, p. 16–94) is probably right in thinking that the first monastic communities were of aristocratic nature. The fact that aristocrats from Northern Gaul fled to monasteries in Southern Gaul to escape Barbarians also helped to form the monastic movement. In the opinion of F. Prince, the strength lied in the aristocratic background. As the new generations became more ‘southern’ and ‘provincial’, the gradual downfall began. Compare also: M. Simonetti, \textit{La produzione letteraria latina fra Romani e barbari}, Roma 1986, p. 109–112; F. Princ, \textit{La presenza del monachesimo nella vita economica e sociale}, [in:] \textit{Dall’eremo al cenobio. La civiltà monastica in Italia dalle origini all’età di Dante}, a cura di AA. VV., Milano 1987, p. 241–297.
  \item \textsuperscript{169} I would like to stress the meaning of the word ‘conversus’ (Latin: \textit{conversus}). Sulpicius Severus, Paulinus of Nola and his wife Therasia, Salvian of Marseilles and
Salvian himself never mentioned in his writings that he adapted the life of a monk or that he pledged obedience to God in the presence of an abbot or that he joined a monk community and lived according to the first rule of Lerins, that is the *Rule of the Four Fathers*.\(^{170}\) There was no mention of a life as a brother living in accordance with the rules of the above mentioned community or becoming a brother of St. Honoratus.\(^{171}\) Thus probably no none of the later chroniclers called him a monk, a brother but only a presbiter from Marseilles or a saintly man.

Palladia and Auspicola, Eucherius of Lyons and Gallia are all ‘converes’ of the 5th century. They were people educated in a given monastery, at the same time they were not monks in the strict meaning of the word as they were not seperated from the world. Usually, they came had aristocratic background. Those 5th century converted monks were allowed to marry and keep their wife like a sister. They dressed humbly and poorly but did not wear the black *pallium* typical of monks, had devout families but did not live in a monastery and did not isolate themselves from the outside world. Thus, they were different from converted monks of the early medieval times (up till 12th century), medieval and modern ones. Before the 12th century, converted monks included: 1. monks (*monachus conversus*), who joined the monastery as adults but were usually illiterate (even if they sometimes became clergymen) and uneducated; 2. monks who were part of the *familia* of a given monastery (*famulus conversus*). They led a pious life but did not follow all rules of monastic life. In both cases the term *conversus* was an adjective defining a monk as *monachus conversus* or *famulus conversus*. Beginning with the 12th century the meaning of the word *conversus* changes. It becomes a noun meaning a man belonging to (*familia*) of a given monastery (*ordo*) but he is not a monk, he does not pledge obedience. Thus the meaning of the term is different in the 5th century, in early medieval times and different after the 12th century. To read more about medieval and modern understanding of the term ‘converse’ see: J. Dubois, *L’institution des convers au XIIe siècle, forme de vie monastique propre aux laïcs*, [in:] *I laici nella “società cristiana” dei sec. XI e XII*, Atti della III Settimana Internazionale di Studio (Passo della Mendola, 21–27 agosto 1965), Milano 1968, p. 183–261; J. Dubois, *Converso*, [in:] *DIP III*, a cura di G. Rocca, Roma 1976, p. 110–120.

\(^{170}\) *Regula świętych Ojców Serapiona, Makarego, Pafniucego i Makarego drugiego* (the so called *Rule of the Four Fathers*) 1, 8–14: ŹM 3, tłum. K. Bielawski, red. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 1994, p. 40–41. J. Pilat, *Wstęp*, ŹM 3, p. 20, stresses that the above Rule of the Four Fathers is the oldest monastic rule (established between 400 and 410). One should notice that the ‘basic rule was obedience to one ruler, similar to an obedience to God himself. Obedience, not love was the dominant rule, 16.

\(^{171}\) *Regula Czterech Ojców* 2, 1: “Macarius said that the most characteristic virtues of the brothers, that is a mutual life and obedience have already been defined”, ŹM 3, 41.
Salvian had become a presbyter172 before the year 429. At that time he must have abandoned Lerins and gone to Marseilles.173 We have no information concerning his pastoral activity in the Christian community in Marseilles. We can only assume that he zealously ministered in an ascetic spirit in Lerins.174 Gennadius of Marseilles left a very interesting note, which said that ‘Salvian, the presbyter of Marseilles was competent in secular literature and the Holy Bible, without doubt a master among bishops, wrote many learned and clear works […] numerous homilies delivered by bishops.175 Eucherius of Lyon mentioned the fact that Salvian was very gifted and had great knowledge.176 The texts of the above mentioned homilies delivered by bishops have not survived. We also have no other preacher’s texts written by Salvian.177 As a presbyter he preached no sermons or homilies to the faithful as in Gaul in the 5th century this was solely the right of the bishop.178 He may have written sermons for the bishops and run some

172 In his funeral speech (Vita Sancti Honorati) in honour of Honoratus, the founder of the Community in Lerins Hilary of Arles calls Salvian egregius et in Christo beatissimus uir Saluianus presbyter: SCh 235, 124. As M.-D. Valentin stated in the, Introduction, SCh 235, 22, Hilary of Arles wrote this text for the first anniversary of the death of Honoratus, between 430 and 431. If Hilary had known already that Salvian had accepted holy orders, it is logical that it must have been at least a year earlier, before 429.


175 Gennadius of Marsilla, Liber de viris inlustribus: “Salvianus, apud Massiliam presbyter, humana et divina litteratura instructus et, ut absque invidia loquar, magister episcoporum, scriptis scholastico et apertosermone multa, […] homilias episcopis factas multas”, TU 14/1, 84–85.


177 A hypothesis (A. Schäffer, Römer und Germanen bei Salvian, Breslau 1930, p. 33) repeated by G. Wcisło, Salvian z Marsylii – sylwetka twórcy, op. cit., p. 128, that certain passages of De Gubernatione Dei are simply a series of sermons seems unjustified. De Gubernatione Dei is no doubt moralizing, also sermonizing but this is not sufficient to treat these passages as a series of sermons.

178 J. Gaudemet, L’Église dans l’Empire Romain (IVe–Ve siècles), op. cit., p. 342–343, stresses that the main responsibility of a bishop in the 4th and also in the 5th century is to preach the word of God and take responsibility for the purity of faith. For this reason only the bishop was allowed to teach. With time, presbiters were allowed to teach too, but this was rare. In places were heresy or false teaching took place, especially in North Africa, Gaul and Roman Italy, only bishops were allowed to deliver sermons and homilies. This changed in the 6th century during the evangelization of rural areas.
kind of retreat for the bishops,\textsuperscript{179} for example for his earlier students, such as Salonius, the Bishop of Geneve or Veranius, the Bishop of Lyon.\textsuperscript{180}

\subsection*{2.2.1.4. Death}

On the basis of source documents that we have, we are unable to give the precise date of Salvian’s death. Presumably he died after 467–468 since Gennadius of Masilia\textsuperscript{181} was able to write that Salvian ‘is still alive and enjoys a robust old age.’\textsuperscript{182} He could have lived another few years and therefore probably died after 470.\textsuperscript{183}

\subsection*{2.2.2. The literary works of Salvian}

Of all Salvian’s works, three remain today: \textit{Adversus avaritiam libros quattuor}; \textit{De praesenti iudicio libros quinque}; \textit{Epistularum librum unum}. The first

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{180} M. Pellegrino, \textit{Salviano di Marsiglia}, op. cit., p. 25.

\textsuperscript{181} E. C. Richardson, \textit{Gennadius liber de viris illustribus}, op. cit., p. 57–97, makes the assumption that Gennadius finished writing his version of \textit{De viris illustribus} in 477/478, but he probably finished note number 68 (on Salvian) between 467 and 468. A. Feder, \textit{Die Entstehung und Veröffentlichung des gennadianischen Schriftstellerkatalogs}, “Scholastik” 8 (1933), p. 217–232, suggests that chapters 1 to 29 and 31 to 68 of \textit{De viris illustribus} were written before 467/468, but chapters 69–83 were written around 467–468 and chapters 84–86, 88–92 i 94 after 474, between 475–476; while chapters 30, 87, 93 and the ones following chapter 94, were written later. In another article A. Feder, \textit{Zusätze des gennadianischen Schriftstellerkatalogs}, “Scholastik” 8 (1933), p. 380–399, the author came to a conclusion that the entire work was published by Gennadius between 477–478. J. Feder makes the assumption that chapter 68 (on salvian) was written before 467–468. S. Pricoco (\textit{Gennadio di Marsiglia}, DPAC 2, 1451) shares A. Feder’s view. In his opinion the last chapters of \textit{De viris illustribus} by Gennadius were written between 474 and 476 which means that earlier chapters were written at the end of the 60’s of the 5th century. The entire work is 101 chapters.

\textsuperscript{182} Gennadius of Massilia, \textit{De viris illustribus}, op. cit., p. 68: “Vivit usque hodie in senectute bona”, TU 14/1, 85.

\textsuperscript{183} M. Pellegrino, \textit{Salviano di Marsiglia}, op. cit., p. 25, working on the assumption that Gennadius’ note 68 was written between 468–470, Salvian’s date of death is defined 468–470; G. Lagarrigue, \textit{Introduction}, SCH 176, 13, shifts the date of Gennadius’ note 68 (\textit{De viris illustribus}) to 470 and accepts the years after 470 as the possible death date of Salvian. To read more about hypothetical historical assumptions concerning many dates and events in Salvian’s life see article by P. Badot, D. De Decker, \textit{Salvien de Marseille. Nota critique}, “Augustinianum” 40 fasc. 1 (2002), p. 223–277.
one *Adversus avaritiam libros quattuor* is also known as *De Gubernatione Dei* or as *De praesenti iudicio libros quinque*. It is a polemical-moralizing treatise. *Epistularum librum unum* consists of 9 letters. Having discussed the texts and critical issues of given individual letter I will name the translations of these works into modern languages and assess the historical and literary value of Salvian’s literary legacy.

2.2.2.1. Literary texts
The only literary source, apart from Salvian’s texts, telling us about Salvian’s literary work is Note 68 by Gennadius of Masilia. His *De viris illustribus*: ‘Salvian […] wrote many learned works. I have read the following: To Marcel – On the Virtue of Virginity – three volumes, Against Greed – four volumes, On Contemporary Law Court – five volumes, at the request of Bishops – To Salonius – one volume; a lecture from Ecclesiastes for Claudioius the Bishop of Vienne – one volume (*Epistolarium one volume*) and following the example of the Greeks – he wrote a Genesis creation narrative in one book from In the Beginning (Genesis) to the creation of human being; numerous homilies delivered to bishops and finally On Sacraments, I do not know how many volumes he wrote.\(^{184}\)

Of all Salvian’s works (enumerated by Gennadius) these are the ones which no longer exist: *De virginitatis bono ad Marcellum libros tres* (To Marcel – On the Virtue of Virginity – three volumes); *Ad Salonium episcopum librum unum* (To Salonius – one volume); *Expositionis extremae partis libri Ecclesiastes ad Claudium episcopum Viennensem, librum unum* (a lecture from Ecclesiastes For Claudioius the Bishop of Vienne – one volume); *De principio Genesis usque ad conditionem hominis librum unum* (from In the Beginning (Genesis) to the creation of human being – one volume); *Sacramentorum* (On Sacraments, it is not known how many volumes) as

---

\(^{184}\) Gennadius of Massilia, *De viris illustribus* 68: “Saluianus […] scripsit scholastico et aperto sermone multa, ex quibus ista legi: De virginitatis bono ad Marcellum libros tres, Adversus avaritiam libros quattuor, De praesenti iudicio libros quinque, et pro eorum praemio satisfactionis ad Salonium episcopum librum unum; et Expositionis extremae partis libri Ecclesiastes ad Claudium episcopum Viennensem, librum unum; [Epistularum librum unum] et in morem Graecorum De principio Genesis usque ad conditionem hominis composuit versus quasi Hexemeron librum unum; Homilias episcopis factas multas; Sacramentorum vero quantas non recordor”, TU 14/1, 84–85.
well as, Homilias episcopis factas multas (numerous homilies delivered to bishops).  

Three works have survived: Adversus avaritiam libros quattuor; De praesenti iudicio libros quinque; Epistularum librum unum. The first one, Adversus avaritiam libros quattuor is also known as Ad Ecclesiam (To the Church). It is this one which is used in this publication. It is a theological treaty with moral subject matter with references to social issues typical of Christian society of the 5th century (in the area of Gaul and North Africa). The maturity of theological thought in both Ad Ecclesiam, as well as, De Gubernatione Dei (according to Gennadius: De praesenti iudicio libros quinque) is proof that both treaties were written when the author was advanced in years (that is between 450 and 451).

Ad Ecclesiam (Adversus avaritiam)
Not too many manuscripts of this treaty remain. Up until the 16th century there was a manuscript which Jean Sichard used for edition princeps in 1528. Other manuscripts formed the basis for later editions of Ad

---

186 Salvian gave the first volume this title, whereas with time Gennadius called it. Adversus avaritiam libros quattuor, Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 1: “Timotheus, minimus servorum dei, ecclesiae catholicae toto orbe diffusae: gratia tibi et pax a deo patre nostro et Christo Iesu domino nostro cum spiritu santo. Amen”, SCh 176, 138.
188 C. Halm, Salviani presbyteri massiliensis libri qui supersunt: MGH AA I, 1 (Berlin 1877), München 1991, (prooemium) VI, giving no justification said there is a big time gap between Ad Ecclesia and De Gubernatone Dei / De praesenti iudicio; whereas, M. Pellegrino, Salviano di Marsiglia, op. cit., p. 31, accepted that De Gubernatione Dei was written before 451, whereas Ad Ecclesia at the beginning of the mid fifties of the 5th century (“E siccome non sembra possibile ritardare il De Gubernatione oltre il 451, per le ragioni che si diranno a suo luogo, penso che con molta probabilità l’Ad Ecclesiam si possa collocare in principio del quinto decennio del secolo V”, ibidem). Also É. Griffe, La Gaule chrétienne a l’époque romaine, vol. 2: L’Église des Gaules au V siècle, Paris 1966, p. 40–52, thinks that the treatises Ad Ecclesia and De Gubernatione Dei would come into being after 440 (an allusion to the battle of Toulouse in the year 440; Epistola IX to Bishop Salonius, around 440), whereas De Gubernatione Dei itself around 445. Compare also: G. Lagarrigue, Introduction, SCh 176, 31.
189 J. Sichard used the code described today as s (s: Sichardi codex, nunc deperditus), or as p (p: editio princeps), in which there were corrections which were also present in É. Baluze’s
Ecclesiam and they survive to this day. They are marked A, B, b, C. The oldest is A and is called Parisinus (The Bible 2172, Colbert 1793; Regius 3793) and contains 152 cards in folio format. This manuscript dates back to the 9th or the 10th century and comes from the library of Saint-Thierry de Reims Abbey. It then became the property of Pierre Pithou and finally became the property of Bibliothèque royale in Paris. It was the basis for Ad Ecclesiam edition (first by P. Pithou (Paris 1580)), later C. Halm (MG AA, I/1, Berlin 1877) and F. Pauly (CSEL VIII, Vienne 1883).190

Parisinus 2785 (B) is a much later manuscript than manuscript A (in the past marked as V.31 du XI siècle; Bibli. Roy. De Fontainbleau; Invent. XLIII; Rigault 1375; Dupuy 1503; Regius 4333). It comes from the 10th century and contains 8 books with eight pages each (in folio format) and 1 book with 7 pages (in folio format). It includes Epistola IX with the title: Incipit epistola Saluiani ad Salonium; excerpts from texts by St. Ambrose of Milan, St. Augustine and the work of St. Vincent of Lerins, Tractatus Peregrini A duersum Haereticos. The third codex is Parisinus 2173 (b) (older catalogue numbers: Rigault 1123; Dupuy 1232; Regius 4030). It comes from the 12th century and contains 125 in folio cards. It was used to prepare the Baluse edition but its value was small, it came as minimal help in preparing F. Pauly edition.191 Bernesi 315 (manuscript from group C) (catalogue number Bibl. Nun. 315) contains 30 cards (in folio format) and comes from the 11th century. Its recensiones was done around the 6th century. It contains Biblical quotes, from before the Vulgate thus making it useful in establishing the text of Ad Ecclesiam.192 Georges Lagarrigue in his edition of Ad Ecclesiam (SCh 176) used F. Pauly’s edition from CSEL VIII and and made his own corrections to the text.193

---

De Gubernatione Dei (De praeenti iudicio libros quinque)
This is a moralizing; sententious and polemical treaty, appearing in the biggest number of manuscripts. They are divided into three subgroups:

1. Ancient manuscripts – antiquiores (catalogue numbers: A, A1, A2, B, C);

2. Codices recentiores, revised codexes – the work of many humanists of the 14th and 15th century (catalogue numbers: P, M, F, W, U, Vi, T, Ti); as well as,

3. imperfecti, deperditi, fragmenta (a group of manuscripts known as disparus et excerpta manuscripts), that is manuscripts which are incomplete, lost, fragmentary (catalogue numbers: a, c, m, t, f, r).\(^{194}\)

Of all antiquiores the most important ones include: (A), that is Codex Parisinus 13385 (Bibl.Nat.lat. 13385), previously marked as Codex Corbeiensis Germanensis 776 (earlier catalogue number: olim 248). It comes from the 10th–11th century from Saint-Pierre de Corbie and contains 70 in folio format cards. Its text is closely related to the archetypical text x (the so called codex autographus). Another important text, belonging to the antiquiores group is (B), Codex Bruxellensis 10628 (Bibl.royale 10615–729) from the 13th century. Finally (C), Codex Trecensis 895, earlier known as Codex Claraeuallensis (catalogue number E 13) from the 12th century from Clairvaux Abbey. The most important manuscripts in the recentiores group include manuscript P (Codex Ambrosianus D 35 sup from the 15th c.); M (Codex Venetus Marcianus Cl.2, n 76; from the 15th c.); W (Codex Vindobonensis 826; from the 15th c.). The third group of manuscripts known as imperfecti, deperditi, fragmenta (disparus et excerpta) includes: f (Fragmenta quaedam Bernensis. cod 48, nunc deperditus; from the 15th c.).\(^{195}\) Georges Lagarrigue, the publisher of De Gubernatione Dei in SCh 220, Paris 1975 used F. Pauly edition from CSEL 8, Vienne 1883 as the initial text. He made his own collatio of manuscripts and T, T and W and he used manuscript B. The text printed in SCh 220 by G.Lagarrigue was finally corrected on the basis of antiquiores A, B and

---


partly C. Georges Lagarrigue, the publisher, who published Salvian’s texts in SCh 220, stressed that he used the critical edition prepared by Michaele Pellegrino. In the end, the text was not published because M. Pellegrino was chosen Archbishop (nominated on the 18th September 1965, consecrated on the 17th October 1965, installation in Turin; 21st November 1965). He was made Cardinal of Turin on the 26th June 1967. He was therefore unable to continue his research. He passed the documentation to G. Lagarrigue.196

Epistularum librum unum

Salvian’s *Epistolarium* contains 9 letters. Letters I–VII were first published by P.Pithou in 1580. The manuscripts which this publisher had used went partly missing. Salvian’s publisher in MGH AA (C.Halm) recognized a part of this manuscript in *Bernesis* E 219 (Biblioteca Bomgarsiana, Bern), fol. 1–8, and another one in *Parisinus Colbertinus* 3791 (known as *Parisinus* lat. 2174) fol. 113–115, containing also *De Gubernatione Dei*. Manuscript marked C (Halm’s edition) contained two fragments of other codes (*Parisinus* lat. 2174 and *Bernesis* E 219). *Epistola* VIII (from Eucherius, the Bishop of Lyon) survives to this day in a larger number of copies as it is recognized as Eucherius exegetical works: *Formulae spiritualis Intellegentiae* and *Instructionum libri duo*. The letters 1–7 (G. Lagarrigue (SCh 176) edition) are a revised edition of C. G. Lagarrigue prints *Epistola* VIII, which is an identical text as the one printed by F. Pauly in CSEL 8, 216. SCh 176 additionally included a critical introduction by C. Halm and C. Wotke (in CSEL 31,1, Vienne 1894). Whereas, *Epistola* IX is to be found only in
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Parisinus 2785 from the 10th century before Ad Ecclesiam. Letter 8 (found in SCh 176) is the basis of the Latin text published by F. Pauly, CSEL 8.197

2.2.2.2. Different editions of the text

The earliest editions of Salvian’s work were single editions. The first critical edition of Ad Ecclesiam was published by Johannes Sichard in 1528.198 The first edition of De Gubernatione Dei was Alexander Brassicanus edition,199 published in Basel in 1530. Its weakness lied in the fact that the publisher had used mainly manuscript W and mixed up the order of pages of book VII and VIII. The next publisher (Pietro Galesini) virtually copied the Brassicanus edition but he corrected the order of the pages in books VII and VIII.200

The first complete edition of Salvian’s works was published in Paris in 1580 by Pierre Pithou.201 Altdorf Konrad Rittershausen202 was the publisher of the next complete edition in 1611. The next comprehensive edition was prepared and published in Paris in 1663 by Etienne Baluze.203 In his Patrologia Latina 53 (Paris 1865), Jacques-Paul Migne practically

198 Timothei episcopi ad Ecclesiam catholicam toto orbe diffusam et Saluiani episcopi Massiliensis in librum Thimothei ad Salonium praeclaris; in Antidoto contra diversas haereses Io. Sichardi, 181–202, Sumpt. Henric Petri, Basileae 15281 (editio princeps); 15562.
199 J. A. Brassicanus, D. Saluiani… de Vero iudicio et prouidentia Dei, ad S. Salonium… libri VIII, cura J. A. Brassicanus et cum primis utilibus scholiis illustrati. Anticimenon libri III, in quibus quaestiones Veteris ac Noui Testamenti, de locis in speciem pugnantibus, incerto auctore, ed. J. Froben, Bâle 15301; 15942 (cum Ad Ecclesiam, Epistolae et index), 16273.
203 É. Baluze, Sanctorum presbyterorum Salviani Massilensis et Vincentii Lirinensis Opera, Paris 1663 (notes); Paris 16692 (index, notes); Paris 16843 (index, notes).
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copied the third edition by E. Baluze (Paris 1684). Contemporary editions of Salvian's works include C. Halm's, F. Pauly's and G. de Lagarrigue's editions.

2.2.2.3. Translations

There are the following translations of (partial or complete) of Salvian's works into modern languages: four French translations – Bonnet, P. de Mareuil, J. F. Gregoire and F. Z. Collombet and a modern one – G. Lagarrigue; one German – A. Mayer, two English ones – E. M. Sanford, J. F. O'Sullivan, two Italian ones – E. Marotta, S. Cola, as well as, a partial one in Polish by D. Turkowska and others.

205 Saluiani presbyteri massiliensis libri qui supersunt, op. cit.
206 Salviani presbyteri massiliensis opera omnia, op. cit.
208 Bonnet, Nouvelle traduction des Œuvres de Salvien et du Traité de Vincent de Lérins contre les hérésies par le P. B***, G. Valleyre, Paris 1700.
210 J. Grégoire, F. Z. Collombet, Œuvres de Salvien, 2 vol., Lyon 1833.
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2.2.2.4. Historical value of Salvian’s works
An assessment of historical value of Salvian’s works is a disputable matter for contemporary researchers. What is emphasized is the fact that the author of Ad Ecclesiam and De Gubernatione Dei had no intention of writing historical or chronicle works subject to criteria of scientific objectivity of the time.\(^{218}\)

His work does not include detailed descriptions of historic events taking part in *Imperium Romanum pars Occidentis* in the first half of the 5th century. There is also no characteristics of barbarian peoples. Instead Salvian wrote moral and theological treaties reflecting sociological and historical thoughts, paying special attention to pastoral aspects. From the point of view of an ascetic person and presbiter he portrayed an ascetic and pastoral image of 5th century society. He also assessed social behavior. His works, especially *De Gubernatione Dei* contain moral judgments made in an ascetic and pastoral spirit. There are descriptions of conformity to or rather lack of conformity to the requirements of the Bible. What is missing though is dates, names and geographical names because they were not so important from the ascetic and pastoral point of view of the author.

The first chroniclers Hilary of Arles\(^{219}\) and Eucherius of Lyon\(^{220}\) and Gennadius of Massilia\(^{221}\) saw him as a saintly shepherd and clergyman. Similarly also later monks referred to Salvian as a clergyman. Saint Caesarius of Arles (died 542), a monk from Lerins from 490, referred to Ad Ecclesiam\(^{222}\) in his homily. Saint Ado of Vienne, a Benedictine monk of the 9th century shared views with Gennadius and saw Salvian as an educated monk.\(^{223}\)

\(^{221}\) Gennadius of Massilia, *De viris illustribus*: “Saluianus, apud Massiliam presbyter”, TU 14/1, 84.
\(^{223}\) Adonis of Vienne, *Chronicon*: “Salvianus presbyter apud Massiliam humana et divina litteratura instructus, inter alia quae scripsit, ad Claudianum presbyterum Viennensem, librum unum expositionis extremae partis in Ecclesiam”, PL 123, 104.
In Modern Period the first publisher of De Gubernatione Dei I. A. Brassicanus describes Salvian (as a matter of fact wrongly) as the bishop of Marseille, who as a shepherd and a saintly man calls on Christian people to live an honest life in its purest form, thus criticizing the Romans of the time.224 C. Baronius called Salvian the new Jeremiah, who in the 5th century shed tears over the downfall of his contemporaries.225 C. Heyne considered these opinions exaggerated because of Salvian’s preachy style. C. Heyne interpreted historic events (Roman war defeats) as a punishment from God for lack of mercy from Romans226 whereas J. J. Ampere saw the author from Marseille as a clergyman who in his descriptions did not refrain from irony and sarcasm and used expressive media to stigmatize corruption and other Romanian vices.227 In Gregori’s opinion Salvian’s judgements concerning social oppression and exploitation of the poor by Romanian administration was right from historical point of view.228 L. de Tillemont perceived Salvian as a Christian theologian and moralist cautioning his contemporaries out of the goodness of his heart.229 W. Zschimmer saw Salvian as an extreme ascetic, who often became a fanatic in his opinions, making mistakes but always convinced he was always acting the right way.230

Among contemporary scholars one must mention G. Boissier, who described Salvian as an orator who sometimes exaggerated with facts, a rigorous ascetic. Finally he admitted though that his diagnoses of the fall of

224 I. A. Brassicanus, Saluiani Masiliensis episcopi […], Praefatio, 5–6.
226 C. Heyne, Censura ingenii et doctrinae Saluianii Masiliensis, librique de gubernatione die, post similes Augustinii in volumine de ciuitate dei, Orosiique in historiarum libris conatus, scripti, Opuscula academica 1812, p. 119–142.
Imperium Romanum in the West was historically accurate.\textsuperscript{231} Whereas, A. Haemmerle agreed upon Salvian’s opinions on the economic downfall of the Empire, the slackness in discipline among Roman administration, also the economic exploitation of the poor by corrupted administration (curiales) as well as land owners.\textsuperscript{232} A. Schaeffer saw Salvian mainly as an ascetic who as a pagan lawyer converted into Christianity, encouraged the Church to carry out a moral and ascetic reform. He properly judged the impending downfall of the Empire.\textsuperscript{233} According to P. Courcelle, Salvian was a monk and an rhetorician, a panegyrist of the barbarians.\textsuperscript{234}

For M. Pellegrino the author from Marseilles was first of all a lawyer converted to Christianity, who having become an ascetic seems to be a Christian apologist and moralist.\textsuperscript{235} He makes a judgement of the outside world from the point of view of an ascetic and makes moral judgements concerning Roman civilization.\textsuperscript{236} Therefore they are not objective as they are influenced by the perspective of the prediction, polemics and propagating morality.\textsuperscript{237} G. Bardy appreciated the accuracy of Salvian the clergyman statements concerning the downfall of the Empire in the West.\textsuperscript{238} E. Griffe perceived Salvian as a Christian orator.\textsuperscript{239} W. H. C. Frend saw Salvian as the last historian of the collapsing Empire, who by noticing the common political downfall, corruption and immorality gives a pessimistic vision of the last century of Imperium Romanum in the West.\textsuperscript{240}

For G. Lagarrigue Salvian is first of all a moralist in his \textit{Ad Ecclesiam}. He uses the art of discourse known as rhetoric to appeal to Christians to

\textsuperscript{234} P. Courcelle, \textit{Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques}, op. cit., p. 146–155.
\textsuperscript{237} M. Pellegrino, \textit{Salviano di Marsiglia}, op. cit., p. 217–228.
\textsuperscript{238} G. Bardy, \textit{L’Église et les derniers Romains}, Paris 1948\textsuperscript{6}, p. 124.
\textsuperscript{239} É. Griffe, \textit{La Gaule chrétienne}, vol. 2, op. cit., p. 43.
undergo a religious transformation. He seems to be deep in ascetic rigorism, that is why his ecclesiolog is radical on one hand and nononsense on the other. In *De Gubernatione Dei* he is a rigorous moralist. He notices the moral downfall of the Roman world surrounding him and is pessimistic. His judgements are that of a theologian and a moralist and he sees the Church, *Imperium* and Barbarians from that perspective. K. Baus and E. Ewig came to a conclusion that his judgements on the downfall of *Imperium Romanum* were accurate. For R. Kamiennik he is not so much a historical writer but a preacher, representing Lerins asceticism, which makes a moral and religious assessment of the world. Rhetoric is a means for Salvian, not an aim. He does not have an idealized picture of the Barbarians. It is rather a theory based on the Divine Providence. If reprimands and warnings had not helped, God decided to destroy the Roman world through the Barbarians. For J. Badewien, Salvian is a writer transferring the concept of free will to the history of humankind. That is why he criticizes his own era in terms of ascetic rigorism and faithfulness (lack of faithfulness) to evangelical ideals.

N. Brox sees Salvian as a man of the Church, a clergyman telling the Gospel, an ascetic person and a critic of social inequity who has a pessimistic view of the Church in the Western Empire of the 5th century. A. Baumgartner sees Salvian as Christian rhetorician. For J. M. Blazquez Salvian’s works are a reliable source of information concerning the problems

---

and social & economic changes of the falling Western Empire. He seems to be a moralist and an exaggerated rhetorician.249 According to J. B. Lansdorf, Salvian is only historically correct when describing events in Gale, whereas his descriptions of North Africa are a preachy exaggeration.250 Z. Wojtowicz perceives Salvian more as a politician and a moralist than a reliable historian.251 F. P. Rizzo sees in Salvian a romanticized historian who judges events from his day from a theological, moral, ascetic and rhetorical perspective. He speaks in favour of germanism and foresees the formation of a new Christian society, made up of Germanic peoples and Romans.252

J. A. Pacheo sums up the different views of various historians on Salvian and the historical value of his work and divides them into two groups: a negative and a positive one. Negative and positive opinions were sometimes expressed by the same group of historians and experts on patrologia. He classified the negative group into five main subgroups:

1. He is sometimes one-sided in his opinions on the poor and on Barbarians (G. Boissier, A. Haemmerle, R. Kaminik, G. Lagarrigue)
2. He uses the term ‘barbarians’ as a rhetorical means of stressing the vices of the Romans (J. J. Ampere, J. Badewien)
3. He oversimplifies and uses forbidden generalizations (G. Lagarrigue)
4. Distorting history to achieve sham rhetorics (J. Blansdorf)253

The negative reception of Salvian as a historian was a justified opinion, that he was:

253 J. A. Pacheco, Salviano de Marsella en el «De gubernatione Dei». Un christianos que justifica romanamente a Dios, San Salvador 2000, p. 192.
Part I: Historical background of the Church in the 5th century

1. A rhetorician (C. Heyne, A. Baumgartner, M. Pellegrino, E. Griffe) and that he was
2. A pessimist (M. Pellegrino)
3. An ascetic person (M. Pellegrino)
4. A religious fanatic, who made false judgements but in the name of good faith (W. Zschimmer, G. Lagarrigue)
5. He had a naturally violent character (G. Boissier)
6. He searched the truth and was uncompromising in his logic (G. Lagarrigue)²⁵⁴

Among those who positively perceived Salvian’s work and accepted its historical value, there are eight subgroups. Those authors come to a conclusion that those works are a reliable source of historical information concerning:

1. Social, economic, religious and moral aspects (M. Pellegrino)
2. Social oppression (R. Kamiennik)
3. Roman administration (A. Haemmerle)
4. Social conditions (R. Kamiennik)
5. Paying taxes (J. M. Blazquez)
6. Upper classes of the Roman society in the 5th century (J. M. Blazquez)
7. The fact that the author’s views are based on facts (F. P. Rizzo)
8. The fact that Salvian makes an accurate judgement of Roman Empire (G. Boissier, A. Schaeffer, G. Bardy, K. Baus and E. Ewig)²⁵⁵

Generally, it was believed that as a presbyter and Lerins ascetic, Salvian’s opinions undoubtedly proved right about the changes that were to come within the next one hundred years. New Germanic countries were forming on the ruins of the Western Roman Empire. The author from Marseilles was also a moralist, who accurately noticed evil and tried to call for a Biblical moral revival. He propagated ascetic values which made him a rigorist at times. He was a Christian apologist, rhetorician, encouraging the sinner to repent. No doubt he remained influential for generations to come. His religious thought is discussed fifteen centuries after his death, although it is difficult to give an unambiguous opinion on his activity.

²⁵⁴ J. A. Pacheco, Salviano de Marsella..., op. cit., p. 193.
²⁵⁵ J. A. Pacheco, Salviano de Marsella..., op. cit., p. 193.
2.2.2.5. Literary value

Through his work, today Salvian is seen first of all as a priest, a Christian rhetorician and an ascetic-moral writer. He refers to Cicero, Virgil and among Christian writers Tertullian or indirectly to Quodvultdeus. In *Ad Ecclesiam* vel *Adversus avaritiam libri quattuor* he reminds that Christians have been summoned to holiness and therefore should eliminate vices, especially greed. One of the basic ascetic steps towards this is charity. In his next treaty *De Gubernatione Dei* Salvian ponders the issue of God’s providence, God’s punishment and rewards in the history of salvation in the 5th century. He is a pessimist as he is aware that his contemporaries are not, although they should be virtuous, just, humane and living the Gospel. A collection of nine letters *Epistolarium librum unum*, written to different people (I – to monks in Lerins; II – to Bishop Eucherius; III – to Bishop Agroecius; IV – to inlaws; V – to his sister Cattura; VI – to Limenius; VII – to Apra and Verrus; VIII – to Bishop Eucherius; IX – to Bishop Salonius) concern Salvian’s current affairs, which is also an important contribution to his biography.

Salvian did not use Greek texts or the Greek version of the Bible but he did use Latin translations of the Holy Bible. It is also important that he did not use one version of the Latin translation of the Bible. Usually these were different translations, sometimes *Afra* – quite common at the time in the West and mainly the *Vulgate*. Often he quoted biblical texts from memory, often changing the order of the words of adding his own comments within the quotes or adding his own words.
Salvian’s moral and pastoral reasoning was basically based on biblical theology. *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 4–5 is a characteristic text. Proof based on the Bible alone is sufficient thus the author does not need any witnesses or additional confirmation. His own deliberations based on the Bible are meant solely for Christians.\(^{261}\)

There are 381 direct quotations from the Bible in Salvian’s works. This number is even bigger if we take into consideration all Salvian’s allusions and Biblical reminiscences.\(^{262}\) Salvian thus quotes the following Books:

Old Testament: Rut, I and II Paralipomena (there is a certain confusion as to the nomenclature of these Books: Hebrew Dibre Hajjamim, the Polish ‘events of the day’, the *Vulgate* described as Paralipomena (that is ‘things abandoned’); the current name in the Polish edition of the Bible called ‘Biblia Tysiąclecia’ is ‘Księga Kronik’, I and II Book of Ezdra, Book of Judith, Book of Esther, Song of Songs, Book of Joel, Book of Amos, Book of Obadiah, Book of Nahum, Book of Habakkuk, Book of Zephaniah, Book of Haggai, Book of Malachi, the I and II Book of Maccabees; from the New Testament: Letter to Colossians, the second Letter to Tessalonians. Letter to Philemon, second and third Letter to John and Letter to Jude.\(^{263}\)

As B. Ullrich notices the list of Biblical quotations in Salvian’s works (compiled by F. Pauly) is not complete as the quotations from the Book of Amos 7:9 and the Book of Micah 2:10 (*De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 38) probably do not come from the Vulgate but some Vateres latinae (this corresponds to LXX). Also the quote from Ecclesiasticus 15:17–18 (*Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 7) is not quoted from memory but on ut scriptum est basis. The alleged excerpt from Psalms 118:61 (*De Gubernatione Dei*) is in fact an excerpt from the Book of Proverbs 5:22; whereas the quoted Book of Proverbs 16:9–20. 24 (*De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 40) in fact comes from Book of Jeremiah 10:23. There is a similar mistake in *Ad Ecclesiam* 4, 9: there is Book of Ezekiel 33:12 and it should be Book of Ezekiel 3:20; in *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 39 it should be noted that the second part of the quote is a text coming from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians 9:6. Apart from that

\(^{261}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 4–5: SCh 220, 188.


F. Pauly nine times makes the mistake of identifying a book as the Book of Ecclesiastes (Koheleth), whereas, in fact this is a text from The Book of Ecclesiasticus (Sirah),264 except from Ad Ecclesiam 2, 43.265

Salvian’ Biblical exegesis was literal, unlike the one of his friends from Lerins, for example Eucherius the Bishop of Lyon or Salonius the Bishop of Geneve whose exegesis was allegorical. The author from Marseilles preferred an analysis which would take into account the historical and literal meaning of the text (compare Epistolae 1, 31–36; 2, 39–41, 51–63; 3, 70–75; 4, 1; De Gubernatione Dei 1, 31–32; 35–39; 49–50; 2, 3–5; 27–28; 4, 8–9, 36–38 etc. Sometimes he would explain various Biblical terms. He accepted the figurative meaning, when it was evident and it correlated with everyday language (for example De Gubernatione Dei 2, 27; 3, 39). It was not his manner though to find allegorical meaning, he usually strived to find practical and moral meaning in the Biblical text. It was important to him to show positive moral models, both to individual Christians, as well as, whole community of the time. Sometimes he would overinterpret the meaning of the text to meet the demands of pastoral dialectics (compare De Gubernatione Dei 1, 14; Ad Ecclesiam 1, 58; 2, 44). Sometimes his Biblical reasoning was too imperious (Ad Ecclesiam 1, 58; 2, 44). Other Times, he made mistakes interpreting the Bible or would distort its texts (for example Ad Ecclesiam 4, 5–7: (text from The Book of Proverbs 1:20) by using the expression: sapientia in exitu carnitur, which in the Vulgate reads: sapientia fortis praedicat. It was probably a quote from Afra (the African translation of the Bible into Latin).266

Because of his classical style Salvian was often compared to Christian Cicero. His way of expressing himself was concise, realistic, aphoristic in

264 In the Latin tradition, this book prepared by the catechumen has been called the ‘church book’ (in Latin Liber ecclesiasticus) ever since St Cyprian of Carthage. Today it is called the Wisdom of Sirach (in the past known as The Book Ecclesiasticus). The Latin name might be due to the similarity with Liber Ecclesiastes or Ecclesiastes or the Book of Salomon. The Latin terminology caused numerous misunderstandings concerning both books, therefore it is practically no longer used. Compare B. M. Metzer, M. D. Coogan, The Oxford Companion to the Bible.
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style, clear, elegant. These were mainly antithesis, allusion, paradox, proverbs and word play. The composition sometimes lacks succinctness, the style is lengthy.267

Salvian’s judgements are often vague, there is plenty of rhetoric exaggeration which is a result of his moralizing tone and personal involvement in the topic. A historical description was not the aim. He focused attention on the victory of the Barbarians, but this fact did not make him happy. Phenomena he did not approve of, were often the subject of his observation. He thus described them in his works and thanks to freedom of speech he stigmatized them. As a priest he took note of current affairs and was convinced he was an a rhetorician among prophets. He was not under the influence of historical facts but as an ascetic he related everything to this kind of persuasion according to Adelbert Hamman opened up a road to solutions ‘rich in possibilities’.268

Both authors, who are the subject of this monograph came from Western part of Imperium Romanum. St. Peter Chrysologus came from Italia Annonaria diocese (the province of Flaminia) and Salvian from existent at the time Dioecesis Galliae (the province of Germania I (Germania II). The latter one spent most of his life in Southern Gaul in Lerins and Marseille (the province of Vienensis) in the diocese of Septem Provinciarum. They were therefore a short distance away from each other, in an urbanized and Christianised area. They lived and operated in much the same time: St. Peter Chrysologus (born around 380 – died around 450), Salvian (born around 390 – died after 470).

Because of their moral and intellectual predisposition they were significant figures to their contemporaries and through the writing they


left behind they influenced the posterity. Both of them studied rhetoric and probably both of them were lawyers (St. Peter Chrysologus in Ravenna, Salvian in Arles). St. Peter Chrysologus officially taught as a Bishop and Salvian wrote treatise as a priest. As theologians, they referred to the Bible (Veteres Latinae version). St. Peter Chrysologus mainly used the Vetus Itala and Salvian would use the Vetus Afra, or sometimes the Vulgate. In the exegesis of the Bible Peter Chrysologus frequently used allegory, whereas Salvian preferred literal exegesis and searched for moral sense in the texts. The language of both authors abounds in rhetorical figures and the style is distinguished by aphoristic character.

The fundamental differences between the two were a result of their individual perception of the Bible, as well as, the character of their lessons. St. Peter Chrysologus was a Bishop who managed to effectively integrate pastoral work with a strive for Christian perfection. With time he was pronounced a saint and a Doctor of the Catholic Church. Salvian (as well as his wife Palladia and daughter Auspiciola) was probably a convert who with time took holy orders and died as a respected, pious and learned man.

Both authors were priests but as a Bishop of Ravenna St. Peter Chrysologus taught officially, mainly through sermons. Salvian, being a priest and an ascetic called for radicalism in his works. St. Peter Chrysologus sermons and homilii were full of dignity. Although they were not without personal reflection they were the official opinion of the Church. Salvian's treatise and letters were not officially part of the Church teachings and more of a personal reflection of a priest and ascetic, sometimes radical, sometimes pessimistic and sometimes enslipped into reverie over the behavior of others at variance with Biblical teaching.

As B. Ullrich notices the list of Biblical quotations in Salvian’s works (compiled by F. Pauly) is not complete as the quotations from the Book of Amos 7:9 and the Book of Micah 2:10 (De Gubernatione Dei 6, 38) probably do not come from the Vulgate but some Vateres latinae (this corresponds to LXX). Also the quote from Ecclesiasticus 15:17–18 (Ad Ecclesiam 1, 7) is not quoted from memory but on ut scriptum est basis. The alleged excerpt from Psalms 118:61 (De Gubernatione Dei) is in fact an excerpt from the Book of Proverbs 5:22; whereas the quoted Book of Proverbs 16:9–20, 24 (De Gubernatione Dei 7, 40) in fact comes from
Book of Jeremiah 10:23. There is a similar mistake in *Ad Ecclesiam* 4, 9: there is Book of Ezekiel 33:12 and it should be Book of Ezekiel 3:20; in *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 39 it should be noted that the second part of the quote is a text coming from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians 9:6. Apart from that F. Pauly nine times makes the mistake of identifying a book as the Book of Ecclesiastes (Koheleth), whereas, in fact this is a text from The Book of Ecclesiasticus (Sirah), except from *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 43. Salvian’ Biblical exegesis was literal, unlike the one of his friends from Lerins, for example Eucherius the Bishop of Lyon or Salonius the Bishop of Geneve whose exegesis was allegorical. The author from Marseilles preferred an analysis which would take into account the historical and literal meaning of the text (compare *Epistolae* 1, 31–36; 2, 39–41, 51–63; 3, 70–75; 4, 1; *De Gubernatione Dei* 1, 31–32; 35–39; 49–50; 2, 3–5; 27–28; 4, 8–9, 36–38 etc. Sometimes he would explain various Biblical terms. He accepted the figurative meaning, when it was evident and it correlated with everyday language (for example *De Gubernatione Dei* 2, 27; 3, 39). It was not his manner though to find allegorical meaning, he usually strived to find practical and moral meaning in the Biblical text. It was important to him to show positive moral models, both to individual Christians, as well as, whole community of the time. Sometimes he would overinterpret the meaning of the text to meet the demands of pastoral reasoning (compare *De Gubernatione Dei* 1, 14; *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 58; 2, 44). Sometimes his Biblical reasoning was too imperious (*Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 58; 2, 44).
Part II:

A comparison of chosen pastoral problems according to St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles

The description of the historical situation of the Western Church in the 5th century and the biography of St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles allows an understanding of the socio-historical context and an understanding of the world, which the people of the Church found themselves in. The dramatic political events which took place in the Western Roman Empire did not encourage evangelization and widely perceived pastoral work. In a situation of economic crisis, the members of the Church were succumbed to constant pressure and the need to make choices. Barbarian invasions only made the situation of the political and military institutions of the western part of the Roman Empire worse.

Evangelization in the era of political and moral crisis of the 5th century required from the people of the Church, a bigger determination and trust in God. An institutional and social crisis in the West in the 5th century was no extraordinary matter, if only for the Biblical principle of passing away of
different figures in this world (1 Cor 7:31). The pastoral solutions accepted by both St. Peter Chrysologus, as well as, Salvian of Marseilles were yet another attempt to adapt the Gospel to the Roman world and Germanic Barbarians. This attempt was not only intriguing but worth a pastoral analysis in the 21st century. The following part of my work compares given pastoral issues in view of the Bishop of Ravenna and Salvian of Marseilles.
3. A description of Roman society in the 5th century in its pastoral aspect

The historical and socio-economic events in the Western part of the Roman Empire in the 5th century were reflected in the works of the Catholic priests of the time such as St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian. The Church being a community of the faithful existed in a different political and administrative structure – it was the collapsing Imperium Romanum pars Occidentis.1 Social conditions never did and do determine the nature of the Church but greatly influenced and still influence its organization and the behaviour of the people of the Church in various situations.2

Modern ecclesiology refers to the Church as misterium communio-nis, begins with human community, drifts towards a religious community, through to a Christian community and only finally heads towards an ecclesiastic community which is an eschatological ‘already’ and ‘not yet’

---

1 L. Cracco Ruggini, I cristiani e le istituzioni politiche di Roma nel Tardo Impero, [in:] Cristianesimo e istituzioni politiche. Da Costantino a Giustiniano, a cura di E. Dal Covolo, R. Uglione, Roma 1997, p. 27–44 (BSR, 134), having analysed the situation of the Church from the 4th till the 7th century, he finds that Christianity conquered Rome and the world, but at the same time the world and Rome conquered Christians by changing their ethics in a way in which they strived for very down to earth matters. In relation to St. Gregory’s homily, Homiliae in Hiezechibelem 2, 6, 22–24: OGM III/2, a cura di M. Adriaen, V. Recchia, E. Gandolfo, Roma 1993, p. 170–174, the pope who probably came from the old family of senators (gens Anicii): he condemned the senat and recognized in apocalyptic terms the inevitable weakening of the nobility. Compare St. Gregory, Moralit in lob 4, 59: OGM I/1, a cura di M. Adriaen et al., Roma 1992, p. 364, 366.

in the eternal *communio sanctorum*. However, mutual influence on the structural level has always taken place. This has taken place ever since the Church came into being, first as a religious community (*communio*) then as a community of believers (*societas*). Thus, it existed in the 5th century AD. Roman community influenced the community of believers (*societas*), which made up the Church in theological terms, understood as *communio*. The following chapter describes the social differences perceived by Chrysologus and Salvian, which in their opinion are the root of moral evil. It is also an indication of the negative effects of contrasts dividing Christians, both in political and social terms.

### 3.1. Social differences perceived as evil

As committed Christians, both authors observed and judged the society of the 5th century they lived in. Based on the description of the society of the time, Peter Chrysologus saw the immorality of numerous social organizations (he particularly condemned slavery) and went on from moral judgements to theological ones. The Bishop of Ravenna encouraged Christians to stand by in their faith and to trust God’s promises, saying that ultimately only those who are just and merciful will be rewarded. Whereas Salvian, having described the society of the Western Roman Empire made moral judgements only. He found a fundamental downfall of national institutions and immorality of upper classes. He then went on to give a detailed moral assessment and came to a conclusion that the vices and sins of the

---


Christians indirectly led to the weakening the Roman country and the organization of the Church.

3.1.1. Peter Chrysologus’ view

A cry for conversion and evangelization itself always takes place in a society of good and bad people. The Church should, thus be open to all people. Chrysologus claimed that social differences and anxiety were strictly connected with the imperfection, incompleteness of the conversions. He encouraged a life of justice and mercy, called for internal transformation, which would eliminate sin and its consequences, thus all unfair social order. In that context, he saw Roman slavery as sinful, he noted the weakness of the right of the slave to claim his rights.

3.1.1.1. General assessment of society

One of the main social problems, described by Christian writers as evil, directly influencing life choices of Christians was the social structure, which in their opinion encouraged immoral behavior of Christians living in the 5th century. Peter Chrysologus mentioned this matter in his sermons, which usually did not last longer than a quarter of an hour, which was justifiable but did not allow a broadening of the topic. In his sermons the

---


6 Peter Chrysologus confirms this in *Sermo* 112, 9–13 – he often refers to topics discussed in the subsequent sermons, in which he develops pastoral topics mentioned earlier. This style is proof of his good knowledge of his listeners and his interest in and concern
Bishop of Ravenna claimed that the differences and social anxiety was strictly connected with the imperfection, incompleteness of the conversions of the Christians.\textsuperscript{7}

In \textit{Sermon 47} commenting the parable of the evangelical pearl,\textsuperscript{8} he used the vision of the Final Judgement being compared to fishing with a fishing net (\textit{Mathew} 13, 47–48). The fishing process gathers all the fish in one place but the later division into the good and bad fish causes that only the first ones are chosen. The final choice is up to God. In his allegoric exegesis\textsuperscript{9} of the above mentioned parable, the Bishop of Ravenna persuades that being a Christian is similar. Christianity is for both good and bad people for the faithful. To read about the duration of and concept of an ideal homily according to Chrysologus see A. Olivar’s article: \textit{La duración de la predicación Antigua}, “\textit{Liturgia}” 3 (1966), p. 143–184.

\textsuperscript{7} The incompleteness of conversions and formalistic attitude to religion were typical of pagan mentality of the Greek-Roman world. G. Bardy, \textit{La conversione al cristianesimo nei primi secoli}, Milano 1994\textsuperscript{4}, p. 26–38 noticed that the ancient pagan religions did not offer anything that could be the equivalent of an internal conversion. What was important in pagan religions, was fulfilling certain external rituals, which the followers did not understand. The Latin meaning of faith, understood as ‘religio’ was first introduced by Marcus Tullius Cicero, \textit{O naturze bogów}, II, 71–72: \”[71] […] non enim philosophi solum verum etiam maiores nostri superstitionem a religione separaverunt. \[72\] nam qui totos dies precabantur et immolabant, ut sibi sui liberi superstites essent, superstiosi sunt appellati, quod nomen patuit postea latius; qui autem omnia quae ad cultum deorum pertinent diligenter retractarent et tamquam relegerent, [i] sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo”, http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/cicero/nd2.shtml, 19.06.2007. M. T. Cicero, \textit{Pisma filozoficzne}, t. 1: \textit{O naturze bogów, O wróżbiarstwie, O przeszczeplaniu}, tłum. W. Kornatowski, red. K. Leśniak, Warszawa 1966, p. 114, from the meaning of the term ‘relegare’ – that is ‘read something again’ or ‘understand something’. To read more about the formalism of conversions in the first ages of Christianity see also: A. J. Festugière, \textit{L’idéal religieux des Grecs et l’Evangile}, Paris 1932, p. 116–132; A. D. Nock, \textit{Conversion. The old and the new in religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo}, Oxford 1933; see also the documents from a symposium (Patristic Institute – Augustinum 8–10 May 1986) dedicated entirely to religious conversions in the first ages of Christianity, that is: \textit{La conversione religiosa nei primi secoli cristiani}, XV incontro di studiosi dell’antichità cristiana, Roma 1987, \textit{“Augustinianum”} 27 (1987) fasc. 1–2.

\textsuperscript{8} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 47, 3–5: OSPC 1, 326–330.

and salvation is primarily up to God.\textsuperscript{10} Thus the Bishop’s comparison of the world to the sea with all its goodies, dignified because of its high ranks, churned up by sects, changeable due to ignorance, noisy because of rows, trembling with anger, dangerous because of failures, perceived as the reason for ships drowning, sins being the reason, futile.\textsuperscript{11}

The people living in this world are not sentenced to eternal defeat as the Apostles sent by God act as fishermen who are meant to ‘catch’ them for God.\textsuperscript{12} The tool, the fishing net allowing a successful catch is the word of God – following Law and the Gospel, its moral virtues and gifts of mercy.\textsuperscript{13} In such evangelization taking place – ‘half the people for God’, distinguishing the good from bad concerns living people, living and active in this world.\textsuperscript{14} The matter of the combination of the good and bad

\textsuperscript{10} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 47, 3: “Sit uocatio christiana iustos, inustos congregat; malos bonosque election diuina transmittit”, OSPC 1, 326.

\textsuperscript{11} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 47, 3: “Ad humus saeculi mare tumens pompa, elatum ertice, unduosum sectis, inscitia fluctuans, clamosum libitus, fremens ira, saeuum procellis, peccatis naufragum, impietate demersum”, OSPC 1, 328.


\textsuperscript{13} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 47, 3: “Missit ergo piscatores suos retia portantes praecptis legalibus et euangeliciis innonda, monitis circumcincta uirtutum, donis gratiae dilatata, euangelico sinu congregantia sine fine capturam”, OSPC 1, 328.

\textsuperscript{14} The one thing which differentiated the Christians since the beginning of the Church, apart from their faith and doctrine, was their lifestyle. As J. Gnilka notes (\textit{Pierwsi chrześcijanie. Źródła i początki Kościoła}, Kraków 2004, p. 406–423) Christians knowing that they were expiated by Jesus Christ expected a total redemption during his Parausia. The first generations were convinced this would be imminent. This joyous awaiting and hope for the eschatological ‘now and not yet’ meant showing goodness to everyone (Phil 4:4n). The day of salvation (Lk 21:28) will also be the day of judgement – for this reason, parusion was and still is for Christians, an encouragement to act justly (Phil 1:11), fairly and without fault (1 Cor 1:8), to be proud of Christ (2 Cor 1:14), watchful and alert (2 Thes 5:2–8; Phil 1:5; 2:16). In Christianity, the encouragement to lead a decent life, always applies, thus the evangelical \textit{indicativus} (acknowledging the salvation which we have been granted) is an ethical imperative (compare: Rom 6). Thus, comes the universality of the Decalogue, concern for the poor, the hungry, the needy and the despised (Lu 6:20n; woe directed at the ‘rich’: Lk 6:24–26). The motivation for a good, ethical life comes from the wish to follow the example of Jesus Christ and not just to gain spiritual balance or stoical ataraxia. Christians refer everything to Jesus, who shows them the love of God. Therefore, the double law of love (Mk 12:28–34 paral.) is the criterion of the value
people has been present in the history of salvation ever since the story of Cain and Abel. The congregation of the Church should therefore be open to all people.\textsuperscript{15}

In this rather hermetic Christian society, this Biblical mix-up of the good and bad was clearly visible for the Bishop of Ravenna. This was becoming particularly strong during mass conversions to Christianity, which were taking place in the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{16} Having witnessed the downfall of Roman civilization, Chrysologus came to a conclusion that the eschatological ‘catch’ is taking place here and now: “Brothers this is happening now: Christ has cast his nets on pagans now, they are cast on different nations and they bring a catch of different people, who are to become a congregation of the faithful all over the world”\textsuperscript{17}

The imperfection of mass conversions into Christianity resulted in the presence of people with different awareness, who often did not know in whom and how they believe. The imperfect conversions Chrysologus had of other commandments. For this reason it is important not only in the historical context of the development of the Church, that the model of the so-called home Church was the basis for Christian life. There were some disadvantages of ‘home Church’ (isolation, retreating into one’s home, constantly being with the same, usually few members of the family etc.). The home was the synonym of brotherly atmosphere and mutual love of all Christians and only then a training ground for future pretenders of important roles in the Church.

\textsuperscript{15} The motif of the Church compared to the sea, which accepts everyone appeared earlier in the exegesis of Saint Ambrose of Milan, \textit{Exaemeron} 3, 4–5: OOSA 1, a cura di C. Schenkl, G. Banterle, Milano–Roma 1979, p. 112. To read more about ecclesiology and some historical and social aspects (St. Ambrose) see: J. Pałucki, \textit{Nawróceni grzesznicy i ich wkład w kształtowanie obrazu świętego Kościoła na przełomie IV i V wieku}, “Teologia Patrystyczna” 1 (2004), p. 29–41.


\textsuperscript{17} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 47, 3: “Hoc tempus, modo hoc agitur, frатres: per gentes, per populos Christi retia nunc trahuntur, ec ducunt confusas toto orbe credituras sine discretione personas”, OSPC 1, 328.
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witnessed at the turn of the 4th and 5th century were one of the reasons for lowering the quality of Christian life.18

Partial Christians are people partially converted to God, in reality they are only superficially converted, therefore not believing in epiphany of Christ and not following His rules. Chrysologus had no clear answer to the question of ‘how to deal with partial Christians?’. The 5th century system of not allowing inappropriate catechumen to receive Baptism did not function effectively if it allowed people who were weak and not converted. Chrysologus did not want to accept mediocrity and suggested an internal purification by eliminating one’s own faults and coming to virtues, turning one’s mind to God and various ascetic practices. Chrysologus’ demands concerning family, upbringing within those families and increasing the ascetic level of Catholic clergy were all part of his social improvement programme.19

In the opinion of Chrysologus, the Barbarian invasions and social disturbances in the Western part of the Roman Empire in the 5th century were also to blame for the weakness of faith of the Christians of the 5th century.20 Chrysologus came to a conclusion that they promise an end of the world in near future. Finally, God will distinguish between the good and the bad. It is difficult to decide which historical events the Bishop of Ravenna had in mind. Probably it was the Vandalic invasion of Roman Africa.21

18 W. A. Meeks, The origins of Christian morality. The first two centuries, New Haven–London 1993, p. 26–36, notes that since the 1st century, at the very beginning of the Church, the conversion into Christianity was, from a religious point of view synonymous to turning away from idols and life with God. However, the religious turn had its notable moral and social implications (respect for other people, proper relationships with other people, proper sexual relationships fulfilling evangelical standards – emphasis on monogamic, heterosexual marriage) as well as, ritual implications (baptism, exorcisms). As a converted Christian, man would become ‘different – pure – better’ in his new morality and as a ‘new person’ would follow the the path of perfectionism Jesus Christ had shown. Therefore, remaining mentally pagan, while nominally performing Christianity was right from the beginning a form of crypto-paganism.

19 I have written more about the moral and ascetic issues in Chapters 5–7.

20 To read more about the issue of migration during the later period of Imperium Romanum see: L. Cracco Ruggini, La fine dell’impero e le trasmigrazioni dei popoli, [in:] Il Medioevo. Polis popolari strutture politiche. (La Storia. I grandi problemi dal Medioevo all’età contemporanea), a cura di N. Tranfaglia, M. Firpo, Torino 1986, p. 1–52.

21 Under Genseric, the Vandals crossed the Strait of Gibraltar to North Africa in the year 429. They founded a country, which lasted up to the year 534. This was a country of the Vandals.
which caused the population to flee the occupied territory: “Clearly godless people are widespread and successful, whereas Christians all over the world are locked up as if they were imprisoned. Godless people can enjoy their success but the religious people are ground down by a series of failures. Masters are controlled by slaves, the slaves order the masters around; sons oppose their fathers and the elderly feel contempt as opposed to the young, all forms of nature and order are violated. The strong do not worry about this state of the matter, the weak do. This situation need not worry the strong because they gain strength and stability from this. The fish, all mixed up and thrown by the sea, flap about on the seashore but one can immediately differentiate the bad ones, leaving only the good ones. The good ones, separated from the bad ones do not worry about the time of the mix-up as it passes quickly. The differentiation comes from heaven and brings punishment for the bad and elevates the good ones, bringing them honours. It humiliates the bad, pushing them into the Tartarus and allows the good an entrance into the Kingdom. It rewards the just, despite their earlier oppression”.

Social anxiety, Barbarian invasions, expulsions and people fleeing from territory overtaken by Barbarians, referring to the ‘strong and godless’ and the ‘weak but devout were all very much part of the world St. Peter Chrysologus lived in. But as the Bishop of Ravenna noticed, human society will always be a melting pot of the good and bad until the end of the

and Alans and included Mauritania, the islands of the Mediterranean, among them Sardinia, Corsica and temporarily Sicily. The Vandals lived off spoils and piracy. They were a threat to the entire Mediterranean basin. One of the most important Polish books on the subject of Vandals in the 5th century and their African country is: M. Wilczyński, Zagraniczna i wewnętrzna polityka…, op. cit.; J. Strzelczyk, Wandalowie i ich afrykańskie państwo…, op. cit.

22 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 47, 4: “tota se rerum dispensatione conlidunt, uidentes impias gentes triumphis succedentibus ampliari, angustiari captuos toto orbe populos christiannos, inpios prosperis gaudere successibus, pios malorum continuata successione calcari, subdi dominos seruituti, dominari dominis seruos, rebellis filios in parentes, senes iuuenibus esse contemptui, ommemque naturae statum, uitae ordinem deperisse. Sed haec cum ita sint, forties non turbant, immo infirmos turbant; forties turbare non possunt, quia sumunt uires de similitudine, fortitudinem de figura. Eiecti de profundo pisces parum quidem in litore sui confusione voluuntur, sed citata discreto, dum malos abicit, eligit bonos. Facit bonos, non turbat breuis ista et cito transitura confusio. Ista discreto superna, quae dat malos poenesis, bonos rapit ad honorem, impios deducit ad tartarum, pios transmittit ad regnum, patres, senes iustos de contumelia exigua perpetua gloria consolatur”, OSPC 1, 328.
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world.\textsuperscript{23} According to the preacher from Ravenna such situation existed not only in Roman society of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century but also within the Church ever since partially converted people started joining it in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century. The Church itself was made up of good and bad people. A final division will take place at the end of the world and this will not be a human action but one of God and His angels.\textsuperscript{24} At the end of this world God will place the just man in Heaven, where the angels will obey him. This vision was a clear encouragement for Chrysologus to withstand hardship of the earthly life of the faithful. The faithful should until the end of time, show justice and mercy by offering material help to the poor.\textsuperscript{25}

Chrysologus did not concentrate on the eschatological encouragement to lead a life of justice and mercy but he soteriologically justified the possibility of change.\textsuperscript{26} Even though there is a great diversity in society (depending on how much we own), the polarization is due to unjust human relationships, caused by sin. This is why Chrysologus did not call upon a social revolution. Instead he encouraged internal transformation which would eliminate sin and its consequences, that is all unfair interpersonal relations. Faith in God, remaining in Christ’s grace gives the believer the possibility of overcoming one’s sin.\textsuperscript{27} By eradicating injustice and lack of mercy, Christians can through their internal development restore equality of all men intended by God.\textsuperscript{28}


\textsuperscript{25} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 47, 5: OSPC 1, 330. We see a similar encouragement for justice and to help the poor in his Lent sermons.


\textsuperscript{28} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 6–7: OSPC 1, 204, 206.
3.1.1.2. Slaves

The Bishop of Ravenna clearly perceived the Roman institution of slavery as sinful, which of course was in line with what other Church writers had said earlier. Peter Chrysologus often used the term ‘bondage’ or ‘slavery’ when speaking about this issue.


The term ‘structure of sin’ is part of the modern Catholic social science and this is understood in this work. In his book *Struktury grzechu* Janusz Mariański discusses in detail the term ‘structure of sin’ in the light of social rules based on human dignity. He analyses the situation and the social systems, condemns living conditions which afront human dignity, that is in short, the author judges the value of the structures. Political structures, social and economic ones, as well as any other structures, should strengthen people in their dignity in freedom (KDK 9). John Paul II also uses the term ‘structure of sin’ in his *Sollicitudo rei socialis* 36.

Christianity found itself part of the slavery as a way of life in the ancient world and some Fathers of the Church found it an economic necessity. But with time, the attitude to slavery changed. Ever since apostolic times, slaves were members of the Church and enjoyed the prerogatives of free people. A. Hamman, *Schavitù*, Casale Monferrato 1983, p. 3111–3112 (DPAC II) writes that a slave who was a Christian, just like a free Christian, could take part in liturgy, he had the same duties and could take offices, including that one of a bishop. The marriage of a slave was recognized as *coniugium*, and not as *contubernium*, and therefore, was holy and indissoluble. Christian families often accepted dead Christian slaves in their graves. Pope Callixtus, a former slave endorsed a church law, acknowledging marriage between a free woman and a slave. This stood in contradiction to Roman civil law. If a slave became a martyr, his name was written down next to other free martyrs, there was no difference between the two. To read more about the attitude of the ancient Church towards slavery read the following: A. Steinmann, *Sklavenslos und alte Kirche*, München–Gladbach 1922; S. Talamo, *La schiavitù secondo i Padri della Chiesa*, Roma 19272; J. Vogt, *Sklaverei und Humanität*, Wiesbaden 1965; R. Sierra Bravo, *Doctrina social y económica de los Padres de la...
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‘slave’ in the allegoric sense in his sermons. He found the analogy between the person living in sin and the ‘bondage’ from which Christ had freed himself from. Sometimes he would compare the Christians themselves to God’s servants who should show obedience.

The Bishop of Ravenna touched upon the problem of literal slavery in his sermons. Slavery was evil to him. It was a result of human sin and consisted of depriving another human being of the freedom granted by the Creator himself. Human slavery was a consequence of human sin when he stopped being obedient to God. Everything comes from God, everything man is and everything he owns. Rejecting this relationship with the Creator, man lost freedom and began to gain control over other people.

The lack of the basic right to self-determination of the slave, his degradation and subordination to that of a useful object was evil, an evil resulting from human sin and remaining in that evil. In Sermo 2, which is a second

---


32 The allegorization of the low value of the sinner’s life – the slave of sin: Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 1, 3–5: OSPC 1, 50. 52; freeing from the bondage sin by: Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 72 tert., 4: OSPC 2, 88. 90; Sermo 96, 3: OSPC 2, 242; Sermo 113, 7: OSPC 2, 352. 354; Sermo 114, 4. 7: OSPC 2, 358. 360; Sermo 138, 3: OSPC 3, 214; faults, sin, death, idols are a consequence of spiritual bondage imposed on man by the devil: Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 6, 2: OSPC 1, 82; bondage caused by sins and faults: Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 74, 4: OSPC 2, 100.

33 Chrysologus teaches that Christ does not want his servants to flaunt their external elegance through a perfumed coiffure or make-up of the face: Sermo 7, 4: OSPC 1, 88.

sermon in the cycle of sermons about the prodigal son, the Bishop of Ravenna described the situation of the slave at the time in the following way: “Treat me as one of your workers, as slavery is renewed by a new agreement every year, working conditions worsen, the poorly paid slave sells himself and cannot ever refuse labor”.

The owner never took the slave’s opinion into consideration and the slave had to respond to his every whim. Chrysologus, noticing the hopeless situation of the slave during any dispute with the master, bitterly commented on the minuteness of the his right to seek justice. “The anger of the one who rules, against the slave becomes a law, whereas, the slave has no voice in the decisions of his owner”.

The attitude of the master towards the slave in the Roman Empire became more gentle with time and in the 5th century became incomparably more humanitarian than during the Republican era or as was at the be-

35 In the opinion of A. Olivar, Los sermones, op. cit., p. 242–243, Peter Chrysologus’ Sermo 2 stresses the importance of fasting and penance. Together with Sermones 1, 3, 4 i 5 it makes up a series of Lenten sermons which are a commentary on the Biblical Parable of the Prodigal Son. Compare: F. Sottocornola, L’anno liturgico, op. cit., p. 65.

36 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 2, 4: “Fac me sicut unum de mercennariis tuis, ut locatio-ne annua seruitus innouetur; ut labore iugi condition conducta deteratur; ut die toto in ope-re suspiret miseræ uema mercedis; ut sit semper uendor sui, nec umquam negare suam ualeat seruitutem”: OSPC 1, 56.

37 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 161, 3: OSPC 3, 228.

38 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 161, 3: “Imperantis ira subdito ius est, et ad libitum domi-ni uocem non habet condition seruitutis”: OSPC 3, 228.

39 There were few slaves in Rome up until the 3rd century BC, while the institution of slavery itself existed next to other social institutions such as nexum and clientela. The slaves belonged to the so called familia and were supervised by pater familias. The situation changed at the turn of the 2nd and 1st century BC. Due to wars, there was a big inflow of cheap slaves to Rome. This changed the social structure and Roman society itself became slave based. According to L. Morawiecki (Niewolnictwo, [in:] Słownik społeczny, Kraków 2004, p. 757) at the end of the Republic, according to Keith Hopkins of all 6 million inhabitants, 2 million were slaves and according to P. A. Brunt 3 million out of 7,5 million people were slaves, making the proportion 1:3. K. Kołonia, (Prawo rzymskie, Warszawa 1973, p. 247–264) in ancient Rome the slave was subordinate to his master. This rule was based on ‘the law of all poeple’ (ius gentium). The slave was perceived as moveable wealth (res mobile) and as a thing producing goods, he could become part of a contract. Towards the end of the Republic, the offspring of the woman slave was excluded from the list of things inherited by the owner of the mother. L. Bielas, Kościół a niewolnictwo, [in:] Niewolnictwo i niewolnicy w Europie od starożytności po czasy nowożytne, red. D. Quirini-Popławska, Kraków 1998, p. 58, notices
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ginning of Imperium Romanum.⁴⁰ This did not mean that the slave enjoyed a life of a free person having his dignity and independence. The slave was required (by a yearly contract) to do hard physical work for a minimum wage. Also in the 5th century he was assigned to his master for a lifetime. In another sermon Chrysologus noted “slaves suffer evil and are desperate as their owners do not want to help them”.⁴¹

As a Bishop, Chrysologus encouraged Christians to take care not only of their slaves’ work output but also to show interest in their spiritual development⁴² and bring those who are still catechumen to Church, to be bap-

that towards the end of the Republic, the slave was even ‘granted’ a soul and Roman temples gradually became open to slaves.

⁴⁰ J. Carcopino, Życie codzienne w Rzymie w okresie rozkwitu Cesarstwa, tłum. M. Pąkcińska, Warszawa 1966, p. 66–67. The author comes to a conclusion that apart from some exceptions, the human misery of the slave was not eternal. The slave was able to buy himself out. Thanks to a practical approach and common sense, paradoxically they were protected from the cruelty of their masters. According to L. Morawiecki (Niewolnictwo, op. cit., p. 758), during the times of imperial Rome, even though each slave was a thing (servile caput nullum ius habet – Digesta 4, 5, 3, 1), their status and situation was varied. Roman lawyers (Paulus, Ulpian) recommended that the slave be fed and clothed according to their ordinem et dignitatem. Apart from public slaves (servi publici), there was a group of slaves, living in the city, usually in their owner’s house (familia urbana), as well as, a group of the most hard working slaves who worked on farms, the so called (familia rustica). Pax romana caused more slaves to become slaves through trade and ‘breeding’ (the so called vernae) than through war (except year 46 Britainia; 66–70 – Judea; and year 106 – Dacia). Freeing became so common that legal steps were taken to limit this (for example lex Fufia Caninia year 2 or lex Aelia Sentia year 4 BC). At the same time, new rules were issued, protecting the slaves against groundless loss of life, bad treatment and protecting female slaves against prostitution (e.g. lex Petronia in the year 19).

⁴¹ Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 15, 2: “Serui hominum sunt qui mala patiuntur inuiti, quia illis in disperatione sunt domini, nequeunt subuenire”: OSPC 1, 136.

⁴² M. L. Lama, Des chretiens dans le monde, Paris 1988, p. 96 emphasizes the fact, that it was not enough for the slave himself to wish to become a Christian, the lord of the house had to give his consent. The wish to become Christian was never initiated by the slaves. What is more, it was quite common that the slaves informed the authorities that their lords are Christians (for example in Lyon). Tertullian, Apologeticum 7, 3: “ex natura etiam ipsi domestici nostri”; CChSL 1, Tertulliani Opera, pars 1: Opera catholica, ed. E. Dekkers, p. 99; Tertullian, Ad Nationes 1, 7, 15: “Our domestic servants (perhaps) listened, and peeped through crevices and holes, and stealthily got information of our ways. What, then, shall we say when our servants betray them to you? It is better, (to be sure), for us all not to be betrayed by any” (origin of translation: www.newadvent.org/fathers/03061.htm). CChSL 1. Tertulliani Opera, pars 1: Opera catholica, ed. J. G. Ph. Borleffs, Ad Nationes libri duo, p. 19. Therefore, before taking part in pre-christening cathesis, a slave needed to obtain the assent and references from his/
tized. What he had in mind was not only an introduction into Christian life, but also further spiritual development. He called upon owners of slaves to avoid despotic behavior attitude but encouraged justice and moderation. A master should be driven by Christian values. Decent behavior towards slaves would be nothing out of the ordinary if, but thanks to it a master could pay his debts to God.

Chrysologus called upon the slaves to do humble service and reminded the servants that Christ had offered his Kingdom to servants. This fact became obvious when Christ washed the feet of his disciples, offering them this humble service. Of course in the Roman world the

her Christian owners – the so called Hippolytus of Rome, Traditio Apostolica 15: SCh 11 bis, éd. B. Botte, Paris 1968, p. 68. 70 (Traditio Apostolica, no. 14: “If they are the slaves of any of the faithful, and if their masters permit them, they may hear the Word. If their masters do not bear witness that they are good, let them be rejected. If their masters are pagans, teach them to please their masters, so that there will be no blasphem”, origin of translation: www. bombaxo.com/hippolytus.html).


45 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 15, 5: OSPC 1, 140; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 45, 6: OSPC 1, 316.

46 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 161, 5: OSPC 3, 228. 230.
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masters rejected the idea of servants coming to power and forming a kingdom of servants. However, Chrysologus has a theological explanation of what free people were afraid of in case of slaves gaining power. For them this was an offence, something unheard of, but at the same time something Christ had already offered the slaves by incarnating into a servant himself. 47 Chrysologus did not see the possibility of changing the fate of the slaves through military uprising. 48 On the contrary, he encouraged the slaves to patiently accept their position and reminded them that this situation is temporary as Messiah incarnated into a servant lived on Earth as ‘a servant of time’. 49 In terms of mercy slaves are equal in front of God, but temporarily they are limited by their slavery. Therefore the Bishop of Ravenna encouraged Christians who were slaves to undergo an inner change to treat their slavery as a sign of loyalty to God: “Also you servants should be loyal to God in your state of slavery, because those who do not give due worship with their sacred and clear heart to the master on Earth, are due to give it foremost God, even more than man, as God sees hearts and has made you equal in your virtue of mercy, whereas your slavery has humiliated you”. 50

47 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 23, 2: “Regnum uelle serum crime nest, audire periculum, temeritas non timere. Sed hoc ad Christum quantum est, aut quam mirum quod dat seruis regnum, quod sibi seruos facit in dominatione consortes, qui seruorum pedes lauat, ut extrema seruis seruiat seruitute?”. OSPC 1, 186. R. Benericetti, OSPC 1, n. 2, 186, notices that Chrysologus uses a typical word play in this sermon ‘seruis seruiat seruitute’. Compare also: Sermo 98, 4: OSPC 2, 256.

48 Christianity was never a revolutionary movement of social nature. In Rome, the newly converted did not belong to the lower classes. Particularly, Christianity was not a religion of the slaves. Most of the converts of the early ages were Jews, who saw the Messiah in Jesus, while the so called ‘etnochristians’ were middle class: merchants, craftsmen and soldiers. To read more on the subject see: G. Theissen, The social setting of Pauline Christianity. Essays on Corinth, Philadelphia 1982, p. 3–23; R. E. Brown, The Churches the apostles left behind, New York–Ramsay 1984, p. 75nn; W. Wischmeyer, Von Golgatha zum Ponte Molle. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Kirche in dritten Jahrhundert, Göttingen 1992, p. 91–111.

49 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 162, 6: “In homine agebat deum, in seruo dominum, ut esset uernaculus temporis, qui erat et factor et cognitor saeculorum”: OSPC 3, 236.

50 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 26, 6: “Vos quoque serui debitis deo fidem in ipsa, quam geritis, seruitute, quia qui pio et puro corde carnali domino debitum non reddit obsequium, deo ante, qui corda uidet, quam homini tenetur obnoxius, qui te parem fecit per gratiam, quem conditio fecerat disparem uilitate seruili”: OSPC 1, 204. Compare Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 95, 6: OSPC 2, 240.
3.1.2. Salvian’s perception

From a theological point of view for Salvian the sins of the faithful were fundamental evil. To a great extent the vices and sins caused in an internal disintegration of Roman community, becoming the reason for drastic social differences, also within the Church itself by introducing the classical division into *honestiores* and *humiliores*. Characteristic evil resulting from social structure of the 5th century, that is slavery, was for Salvian the result of human sinfulness, which comes from human disobedience. In his humanity, the slave was equal to any other free man, but because of his social order he was subject to his owner – another human being. For this reason Salvian demanded from Christians respect for human dignity of the slaves.

3.1.2.1. General assessment of society

By observing political and social events taking place at the turn of the 4th and 5th centuries, Salvian of Marseilles also came to general observations concerning the social situation of his times.\(^{51}\) For him the Western Roman Empire was a dead or dying institution,\(^{52}\) and additionally he expected a temporariness of the Empire rule.\(^{53}\) By watching the people who significantly influenced the Roman country, especially land owners and their reprehensible habits,\(^{54}\) the existing hatred among them, he drew conclusions about the morality of the Catholics of the beginning of the 5th century.\(^{55}\)

---


\(^{54}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 43: SCh 220, 218.
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From a theological point of view for Salvian, the sins of the faithful were fundamental evil. To a great extent the vices and sins caused in an internal disintegration of Roman community, becoming the reason of drastic social differences, also within the Church society itself by introducing the classical division into bonestiores and humiliores. For Salvian the catalyst for the disintegration of the Roman society were Barbarian invasions on the Western Roman Empire. Together with the noticeable downfall of national institutions there was a decline in morality and a degeneration of mass
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Church, made up of pagans, only partially converted to Christianity. In his description of Christian vices, Salvian didactically states: “apart from a few who avoid evil, isn’t the community of all Christians nothing else but a gutter of sins? How many can you find who are not drunkards, gluttons, adulterers, harlots, heartbreakers, lechers, thieves or killers? Worst of all, is the fact that all of these sins are committed daily.”

This peculiar list of sins, existing in the Church in the 5th century made Salvian state that “nearly all members of the Church have reached such level of immorality that one who sins less than others, almost seems a saint in his community.” In the opinion of Salvian moral evil of so many Christians was due to lack of knowledge of the principles of faith and no sense of sinfulness, which was a result of an influx of unconverted pagans into the Church. Those people were still afraid of earthly Roman authority, therefore did not dare ignore it as simply they would be “beaten with sticks, kicked out or punished in a way that would restore them to proper respect for authority and acceptance of its dignity.”

Large numbers of not fully converted pagans, making up a community of partial Christians had no respect for the institution of the Church. Thus this half-pagan, half-Christian, living in the 5th century did not understand the Christian teaching, accepted it partially only and was afraid

---

61 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 3–4: SCh 176, 140, 142.
63 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 44: “Aut, praeter paucissimos quosdam qui mala fugiunt, quid est aliud paene omnis coetus Christianorum quam sentina uitiorum? Quotum enim quemque inuenias in ecclesia non aut ebriosum aut helluonem aut adulterum aut fornicatorem aut raptorem aut ganeonem aut latronem aut homicidam? Et quod his omnibus peius est, prope haec cuncta sine fine!”: SCh 220, 220.
64 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 46: “In hanc enim morum probositatem prope omnis ecclesiastica plebs redacta est ut in cuncto populo Christiano genus quodam modo sanctitatis sit minus esse utilissimum”: SCh 220, 220.
66 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 46: “si quispiam fuerit insolenter ingressus, aut caedatur aut propellatur aut aliqua uereundiae atque existimationis suae labe multetur”: SCh 220, 222.
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solely of earthly punishment.67 In a pagan way such a Christian lived in hatred and envy towards his neighbor.68 Salvian noticed a basic lack of Christian identity of the faithful, leaving no doubt “it happens sometimes that in Churches or even around altars and places dedicated to God villains and those who are disgraced gather, without minimum respect for sacredness. I am saying this, not because I think that everybody should pray to God, but because someone comes to reconcile with God, he should not leave to arouse anger. One must not plead for forgiveness and at the same time arouse anger!”69

Salvian finally came to a conclusion, that false conversions cannot bring forth true Christians. People superficially converted to Christianity did not think in terms of God in Biblical terms, nor did they follow the example set by Epiphany.70

“Hardly does the sacred ceremony end, when everybody runs to their usual daily chores, that is some – to steal, others – to get drunk, yet others – to commit adultery, some – to mug, and finally it becomes clear, that while in Church they did nothing but think what they would be doing next.”71

---

68 E. Bordone, La società romana del quinto secolo nella requisitoria di Salviano Marsiliense, [in:] Studi dedicati alla memoria di Paolo Ubaldi, a cura di A. Gemelli, Milano 1937, p. 315–344.
69 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 3, 47: “In templaque atque in sacraria dei passim omnes sordidi ac flagitiosi sine uilia penitus reuerentia sacri honoris inrumpunt, non quia non omnes ad exorandum deum currere debeant, sed quia qui ingreditur ad placandum, non debet egredi ad exacerbandum; neque enim eiusdem officii est indulgentiam poscere et iracundiam prouocare”: SCH 220, 222.
70 J. Badewien, Geschichtstheologie und Sozialkritik im Werk Salvianus von Marseille, “Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte” 32, Göttingen 1980, p. 83–85, the lack of correspondence between the declared faith and the life of the Christian was Salvian’s main moral criticism and the basis of his theology. J. A. Pacheco, (Salviano de Marsella, op. cit., p. 210–216) does not agree with J. Badewien, who not only stresses the elements of moral criticism in Salvian’s theology but also the very act of putting one’s life to God and the possibility of punishment for the inconsistent believer, also in his earthly life.
Salvian had no doubt that the superficiality of conversions in the 5th century took place on a mass scale in the Church. He pointed to a typically pagan superficiality in participating in Christian liturgy, which was treated by masses of nominal ‘Christians’ as a ritual act. Salvian noticed that the superficiality, pretentiousness of conversions was not a vice of one single social group but that of a wide section of society of different professions, who treated the Holy Communion in a ritual-pagan way. Among them were both vile slaves and vile free men, un-
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fair decurions\(^{76}\) (Roman cavalry officer), public clerks using slander,\(^{77}\) notoriously thieving soldiers,\(^{78}\) as well as, arrogant, lustful aristocrats.\(^{79}\)

Salvian also showed other sins destroying the community of Christians in the 5\(^{th}\) century. One of their main faults was greed for material goods, described simply as ‘idolatric slavery’ and simultaneous rejection of mercy towards your neighbors and a rejection of good.\(^{80}\) Lack of faith in the value of good deeds and the simultaneous greed for wealth were the cause of various sins among the superficially converted Christians. Such a catalogue of sins was portrayed by Salvian in the beginning of his *Ad Ecclesiam*; hatred, hostility, cruelty, insolence, unchastity, as well as, perversion.\(^{81}\) Together with the growing number of partially converted Christians in the first half of the 5\(^{th}\) century, one could notice a growing number of sins they commit.\(^{82}\) The result – turning away from God
and lack of faith: a growing number of faithful but diminishing faith itself.83

One of the severe consequences of the social and economic changes in the Roman society of the 5th century was growing poverty. Salvian used the example of his own relative, a youth coming from impoverished Roman nobility, whom he directed to Monastic Community in Lerins.84 The family of this young man had been very rich earlier and well known in the Roman city of Agrippinae (today known as Cologne). Due to Barbarian invasions and loss of wealth his mother was forced to serve those Barbarians.85 In case of the relation recommended to the monks in Lerins, we perhaps have the first documented case of the so called welfare based priestly vocations into a Christian monastery.86 In this case the motivation was not a religious one, but lack of economic perspectives in his current environment.87

3.1.2.2. Slaves

By using the terms ‘serfdom’, ‘slave’ Salvian referred to associations inspired by Biblical texts88 or he used them metaphorically to define a condition of dependency from Devil, being Devil’s slave.89 For him slavery meant lack of freedom of choice in making decisions and the dependency of the slave on his master’s will. The slave had no right to decide for himself and the owners did not even allow the idea of giving the slave any choice.90 Slavery

83 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam I, 4: “Multiplicatis enim fidei populis fides immi-nuta est et crescentibus”; SCh 176, 140.
86 Salvian of Marseilles, Epistula 1, 10: SCh 176, 80. 82.
88 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 2, 23: SCh 220, 178 (David’s slaves condemn their master running away from the enemy (compare 2 Sam 12:14)).
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in its genesis was a consequence of human sinfulness which comes from human disobedience to God.91 Salvian wrote that not only did Romans acquire slaves through wars but the Romans themselves became slaves of the Barbarians after the downfall of Roman cities.92

In Salvian’s opinion in his humanity a slave was on equal terms with the free person but because of his social position he was subordinate to his master – another human being: “therefore, if we sensitive people, which we are, demand that our slaves do not disrespect us. The slaves must follow our orders because of their social position but they are our equals on a human level […].] Unless our typical showing off and our boundless intelligence will dissuade us from tolerating insults from the slaves and will later demand God himself to forgive our insults! We therefore, consider some behavior as unacceptable and we consider ourselves worthy of God’s tolerance!”93


92 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 77–80: SCh 220, 410. 412. 414; compare also Salvian of Marseilles De Gubernatione Dei 6, 99: SCh 220, 428; De Gubernatione Dei 7, 1: SCh 220, 430. In the opinion of Brower-Masen, Antiquitatet et Annalium Treuerrensium libri, 25, 1671, vol. 14, 275 what Salvian meant was the Roman Moguntiacum (today known as Mainz); whereas, A. Haemmerle, Studien zu Salvian I, Prog. Landshut 1893, 18. 27. 28 claimed that Salvian had in mind was the Roman Agrippinensium, conquered by the Barbarians. To read more about slavery in Salvian’s work see: R. Kamienik, Niewolnicy w pismach Salwiana z Marsylii…, op. cit., p. 1–19; R. Kamienik, Quelques problemes biografiques…, op. cit., p. 74–110.

93 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 3, 28: “Si ergo nos, qui homunculi imbecilli sumus, contemni tamen a seruis nostris omnio nolumus, quos esti nobis seruitutis condicio inferiores humana tamen sors reddit aequales […] Nisi tanti fortasse consilii ac tamen profundae intelligentiae simus ut qui pati seruorum iniurias nolumus subditum iniurii nostris nostris deum esse uelimus, et quae ipsi toleratu humano indigna credimus deum a nobis digne haec tolerare credamus”: SCh 220, 208. Compare Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 3, 43: SCh 220, 218. St. Cyprian of Carthage (Ad Demetrianum 8: SCh 467, ed. J.-C. Fredouille, Paris 2003, p. 84, 86) described a similar concept of human demands towards God while not respecting the rights of other people. As for God’s ‘tolerance’, that is one of the synonyms of patience understood as the sole virtue of God himself (the Biblical makrhothymia), the term longanimitias or longa Dei patientia that is the ‘good patience’ with which God waits for the sinner to repent was used by Latin authors, beginning with Hilary of Poitiers or Augustine of Hippo. Sometimes, but definetly not as often the term tolerantia was used to describe makrhothymia. To read more about the meaning of the term tolerantia see: tolerans; tolerantia, -ae, [in:] A. Blaise, H. Chirat, Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens, op. cit., p. 819, also: W. Meikle, The vocabulary of “patience” in the Old Testament, “The Expositor”
Salvian demanded from Christians respecting human dignity of the slave and requiring necessary work only of the slave, after which they would not be required to do inessential work and they should have the right to rest. His Roman common-sense attitude to slaves was based on the Bible. In the allegoric periscope about indignation (Mt 5:29–30; Mk 9:46) he reached a conclusion in which slaves were ‘the eyes and hand’ of their masters. On one hand such precious organs should not be exposed to damage, on the other – by exposing the slaves to indignation in this world, the owner risked his own eternal life. Despite clear bans concerning despicable treatment of slaves, as well as, trading them, the owners disgraceful-
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ly abused slaves, both men and women. In Aquitaine there was not only a bad example but there was also a certain violence. Women slaves were forced to obey highly abusive, lustful owners, in a way in which their sickly demands became law for those who were in their disposal.

According to Salvian the servants were not free from sin and weaknesses. There was a certain degenerated slavish mind: 'our liking for wickedness is slavish; we accept violations but we do not agree to punishment. We have the same mentality as our servants: all of us – both them and us – we strive to commit sins which would not be liable for punishment. Basically though, he justified their reprehensible deeds of the slaves by their social situation. He rejected therefore, several common accusations addressed to slaves by the owners. The slaves were often accused of break-ins, theft and fleeing from the masters but their deeds were often a result of their poor life situation. They committed theft out of hunger or because their wages were not able to cover their basic living expenses. Salvian justifies theft in conditions described in The Book of Proverbs: “People don’t despise a thief if he steals food when he is hungry.”

---


98 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 20: “Quamuis non exemplum illic tantummodo malum fuerit, sed ipsis ac necessitas quaedam, quia parere impudicissimis dominis famulae cogebantur inuitae et libido dominantium necessitas subiectarum erat”: SCh 220, 444.


100 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 4, 11: “Natura in nobis et nequitia servilis est. Volumus delinquere et nolumus umererati: ipsi in nobis mores sunt qui in serviulix nostris: omnes uolumus impune peccare”: SCh 220, 240. Salvian also speaks of the contaminated nature of the slave in his *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 14: « cum servulix animos iam per se malos etiam dominorum faceret nequitia peiores”: SCh 220, 518. 520.

101 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 4, 14: “Ac primum servii, si fures sunt, ad furandum forsitan egestate coguntur, quia, etiamsi eis stipendia usitata praestentur, consuetudini haec magis quam sufficientiae satisfaciunt, et ita implant canonee quod non PLICIT satietatem. Ac per hoc culpam ipsam inopia minus culpabilem facit, quia excusabilis furti reus est, qui ad furturn cogi uidetur iniitus! Nam et scriptura ecclesiastica quasi subexcusare quodammodo miserorum omnium noxas uidetur dicens: Non grandis est culpae cum quis furatur fuerit: furatur enim ul esurientem implecte animam. Furatur ut expleat animam suam: ac per hoc non satis a nobis accusandii sunt qui diuino sermone excusantur”: SCh 220, 242.
Proverbial stubbornness and unruliness was another typical accusation against the slaves. Torture was often the reason for their violations. They were tortured by their masters or their prosecutors or silencers (workers responsible for keeping peace and quiet in the owners homes) but also by other slaves. Salvian tried to justify the slaves who turned to lying to avoid serious punishment from the owners, usually in the form of flogging. Salvian had a similar attitude to sluggishness and greediness because the slaves were often humiliated and hungry and naturally wanted to eat and rest. He encouraged Christian slaves not to break down and fall into an even larger trap, trap of sin. The first one can merely lead to the death of the body, whereas the consequence of the second is inevitable death of the soul. Such stand concerning slavery of Peter Chrysologus

102 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 92: SCh 220, 422.
103 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 15: “Quod autem de furtis seruorum dicimus, hoc etiam de fuga. Immo hoc rectius de fuga, quia ad fugam seruus non miseriae tantum, sed etiam supplica compellunt. Pauent quippe actores, pauent silentiarios, pauent procuratores, prope ut inter istos omnes nullorum minus serui sint quam dominorum suorum: ab omnibus caeduntur, ab omnibus conteruntur. Quid amplius dici potest? Multi sevoro ad dominos suos fugiunt, dum consuero timent. Vnde illorum fugam non tam ad eos debemus referre qui fugiunt, quam ad eos qui fugere compellunt. Vim patiuntur infeli-cissimi: famulari optant et fugere coguntur. Discendere a seruito dominorum suorum omnino nolunt et conseruorum suorum crudelitate non permittuntur ut seruiant”: SCh 220, 242. 244 Salvian of Marseilles in De Gubernatione Dei 4, 18: SCh 220, 246 gives evil and cruelty as the reasons why the slaves run away from their masters.
105 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 70: “Cuius sors peior fuerit incertum est: illi quidem errant extrinsecus carne, sed isti intusmente captiui, et ex duobus letali-bus malis leuibus, ut reor, est captuiutatem corporis Christianum quam captuiutatem animae sustinere, secundum illud quod docet saluator ipse in evangelio, grauius multo animarum mortem esse quam corporum. An credimus forte quod captiuius animis populosis illa non fuerit, qui laetus tunc in suorum captuiutatibus fuit?”: SCh 220, 406. Salvian of Marseilles refers here to events connected with the Vandals invading Africa and Roman occupation of Carthage in the year 439. The only city in the Roman Numidia, which managed to defy the Vandals until the year 455 was Constantine.
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or Salvian was no different from that of other Church Fathers or early Christian writers.106

Salvian described the phenomena of classical patronage (patrocinum) as a flight of single, independent farmers and leaseholders or sometimes the inhabitants of entire suburbs from anarchy and fiscal oppression.107 Having no real choice and no hope of ever changing their situation, the free farmers turned themselves in to the rich owners, to avoid an even bigger oppression from the tax collectors.108 Practically, they were becoming slaves of the land109 and the patronage was clearly changing into another legal institution.110

When describing the idea of patronage, Salvian pointed out to incidents of poor people being exploited by rich owners. This made free farmers assigned to their land and thus only partially free.111 With time, poor peo-

---

106 G. Spychalski, Myśl społeczno-ekonomiczna starożytności i średniowiecza, Łódź 2000, p. 242, comes to a conclusion that “according to the Fathers of the Church all people are equall. Slavery was based on human law and not on God's law and it will be the result of the original sin, an evil as an act of God's punishment.”


108 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 5, 38: “Et quidem mirari possim quod hoc non omnes omnino facerent tributarii pauperes et egestuos, nisi quod una tantum causa est qua non faciunt, quia transferre illuc resculas atque habitatiunculas suas familiasque non possunt. Nam cum plerique eorum agellos ac tabernacula sua deserant ut uim exactionis eu- adant, quomodo non quae compelluntur deserere ulleent sed secum, si possibilitas pateretur, auferrent? Ergo quia hoc non ualent quod forte mallent, faciunt quod unum ualent: tradunt se ad tuendum protegendumque maioribus, dediticios se diuitum faciunt et quasi in ius eor- rum dicionemque transcendentu”: SC 220, 340.


111 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 5, 45: “Nam suscipiuntur ut aduenae, fiunt praetidianam habitationis indigeneae; et exemplo quondam illius maleficæ praepotentis quae transferre homines in bestias dicebatur, ita et isti omnes qui intra fundos diuitum recipiuntur, quasi Circaeai poculii transfiguratione mutantur. Nam quos susciptiunt ut extraneos et alienos, incipiunt habere quasi proprios; quos esse constat ingenuos, uertuntur in seruos”: SC 220, 346.
ple formally became half-free and their fate was no different from the fate of the slaves.\textsuperscript{112} Just like the slaves, they were abused and economically exploited by wealthy owners.\textsuperscript{113}

3.2. The consequences of social differences in the 5th century

Social differences resulted in specific social sins (arrogance, greed as well as remaining in sin and fault). For Salvian defective social structure led many Christians into morally wrong behavior. Immorality was the quality

\textsuperscript{112} From legal point of view the colonii were free people but in reality they were attached to the land they farmed. Having been granted land from the owner of the latifundium, they were obliged to take care of it. This was hereditary which meant that the children of the coloni inherited this obligation, creating a class of people farming the land. The coloni had to give a part of his crops to the owner (reditus) and he paid poll tax (capitatio), whereas the land tax (iugatio) was paid for by the owner. Many free people who became poor, accepted these conditions to provide their family means to live. At the end of the 4th century colonatus was regulated by certain imperial laws: C. Th. IV, 23, 1; C. Th. XI, 1, 12, a. 315 [313] nov. 1; C. Th. XIII, 10, 3, a. 357 mai. 30, but despite these laws, the situation of the colonii themselves was becoming worse because of the demographic and economic crisis of the Roman Empire. The colonii were called the slaves of the land (servi terrae), even though, theoretically they were free people, they could marry and acquire wealth. Giving away large areas of land (perpetual usufruct) belonging to the emperor and rich owners of latifundiums to small farmers, were the reasons for the formation of colonatus. The landleases, by reciving single plots of land, later became colonii. The colonii thus became partly free farmers. To read more about colonatus see: R. Clausing, The Roman colonate. The theories of its origin, Rome 1965, p. 17–202; A. Marcone, Il colonato tardo antico nella storiografia moderna, Como 1988 (Supplementum Athenaeum, 7); F. de Martino, Il colonato fra economia e diritto, [in:] Storia di Roma, 3\textsuperscript{a}, L'età tardoantica, vol. 1, Crisi e trasformazioni, a cura di A. Schiavone, Torino 1993, p. 789–822; B. Szymczuk-Cysewska, Kolonat w prawie rzymskim, Warszawa 2005.

\textsuperscript{113} A. Marcone, Il lavoro nelle campagne, [in:] Storia di Roma, 3\textsuperscript{a}, L'età tardoantica, vol. 1, Crisi e trasformazioni, a cura di A. Schiavone, Torino 1993, p. 823–843, aptly notices that when it comes to C. Th. 12.I. 33 (the so called acceptance of the rights of the colonii) and C. Th. 5. 17. 1 (the attachment of the colonii to land and the right to handcuff them until they have fulfilled their duties), maybe there was some difference between a coloni and a slave for the authors of those imperial laws, but the use of coercive measures and the above mentioned punishments prove a weakening of the rights and the concept of freedom of the coloni, ibidem, p. 826–827. J.-M. Carrié, Un roman des orgines. Les généalogies du colonat du Bas-Empire, Opus II (1983), p. 205–251 notices that Codex Theodosianus does not define the legal status of the coloni in terms of his personal rights, it questions the concept of his legal freedom. For J.-M. Carrié this is proof that the coloni was never granted personal freedom, ibidem, p. 233–234.
of the upper classes of the Roman society (theft and assault done publicly and in the name of justice).

3.2.1. Peter Chrysologus

By noticing and describing evil in Roman society of the 5th century, Saint Peter Chrysologus comes to an explicit, negative from a theological point of view judgement of social differences and its consequences. His criticism was mostly based on his moral judgements of Christian society of the Imperium Romanum in the West.114

For Peter Chrysologus the society of the 5th century, which was only partially converted to Christianity, burdened with slavery, was definitely not a congregation of saints. The above mentioned social differences resulted in committing specific sins which took on a social dimension. In his opinion, Christians committed sins against each other, led by arrogance and greed which had destroyed the community from the inside.

He points to different factors delivering man from God in his Sermon 16, which stresses the divine nature of God. In it, he also discusses the arrival of Christ in the country of the Gerasenes (Mt 8:28–34).115 Various offences and sins against society become their symbolic grave. For the Bishop of Ravenna, they are mainly sins of greed and pride.

“Let us listen to what they are plotting, what they are building through evil, those whose cruelty has no measure. What do people do, those who make a display of their wealth in order to promote greed. To show pride,

114 Considering that the world population in the 1st–5th century was about 60 million people, R. Stark (The rise of Christianity. A sociologist reconsiders history, Princeton, New Jersey 1996, p. 5–7) estimates a 40 percent growth by the decade. He assumes that in the year 300, the Church had 6 299 832 members (10.5 percent of the population), whereas in the year 350 there were 33 882 008 Christians (56 percent of the population). This sort of socio-historic simulation only seems possible till the year 350 because by accepting a 40 percent growth, there would be 182 225 584 Christians by the year 400. This of course, is impossible from historical point of view. Therefore, we can only accept the Rodney Stark model until the year 350. Despite the vagueness of numbers we can assume a systematic growth of the Christian population in Imperium Romanum of the 5th century. To read about the gradual disappearance of paganism in the Western Roman Empire see: G. Boissier, La fin du paganisme. Etude sur les dernières luttes religieuses en Occident au quatrième siècle, vol. 2, Paris 19096.

115 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 16, 2: OSPC 1, 142.
they pretend magnificence in order to exclude anyone else, to liven quarrels, they amplify the reasons. To insult mercy, they give their loved ones reasons to complain, and even if they wish to explore something further they have many gods, only to ignore the one and only real God.”

According to the Bishop of Ravenna the Christian community of the 5th century was becoming socially, morally and religiously degraded because of remaining in fault and sin. Having accepted Christ as God in words only, many Christians did not accept him in their spirituality. The result of this superstitious treatment of Christ, was fear, similar to the one experienced by the demoniac Gadarenes people. The Bishop of Ravenna notices that those people distanced from God, those who recognized Him, but did not accept as their God, become particularly evil, hard-hearted, do not improve with time, on the contrary, they become more sinful. Evil and sinfulness accumulates, resulting in moral degradation. Man has the chance, however, to reform even from the greatest moral degradation. The condition is an alliance with God, not with demons. We can, as the Bishop of Ravenna says, choose Christ, allow him to triumph and enliven the virtues or surrender to demons and allow vices. The choice belongs to man.

---

116 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 16, 3: “Sed sentiamus quid machinentur fraudibus, quid moliuntur malis, quorum crudelitas modum non habet in aperto; quid faciunt isti, quando diuitias ostentant, ut auaritiam serant; ut inferent superbiam, pompam proponunt; singularitatem uenditant, ut quod est communiois exclusand; ut iram nutriant, causas colorant; ut pietatem uiolent, affectibus dant querelas; philosophiam fingunt, ut faciant nihil scire homines plus quaerendo; deos multos figurant, ut deus, qui unus et uerus est, nesciatur”: OSPC 1, 142.


119 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 16, 8: “Daemones omne quod est, agiteur, mouetur, uiuit ardent perdere, non habere. Ne quis ergo talis fieri homo praesumat, humano generi inimicitia uetus, fixa ira, malitia destinata est. Daemones nisi uicti non cedunt; laedere non
3.2.2. Salvian of Marseilles

By watching the Christian community of the first decades of the 5th century Salvian was convinced that the faulty social structures led many Christians to morally wrong behavior. He made the assumption that the assessment of the scale of the sin depended on the social position of the sinner. For this reason he treated the sins of the aristocracy or clergy as greater evil than those committed by simple people. In Salvian’s opinion immorality was mainly the hallmark of the upper Roman classes.

Immoral behavior was expressed in the form of theft and mugging done by aristocracy publically and in the name of the law with the full sanction of the law. According to the moralist of Marseilles this testified the institutional impotence of the Roman Empire. By not properly defending the material goods of its citizens, it allowed their exploitation by a small group of the privileged. At the same time the fact that eternal exploitation of the poor by the rich was legitimized or tolerated by different countries, made him understand that permanent social injustice was an imminent feature of almost every society. Salvian, a moralist makes a clear

uarant nisi iussi. Traditur ergo uile pecus, ut luceat daemonibus in homines nil licere, qui
bus in porcos ius-sum est ut liceret. Nos ergo aut uitiis nostris facimus ut iili accipient po
testatem nocendi, aut uirtutibus subiecta nobis daemonum colla Christo triumphante cal
cumus": OSPC 1, 146.
120 R. P. C. Hanson, The reaction of the Church to the collapse of the Western Roman Empire in the fifth century, “Vigiliae Christianae” 26 (1972), p. 272–287.
121 G. Sternberg, Das Christentum des fünften Jahrhunderts im Spiegel der Schriften des
122 J. Straub, Christliche Geschichtsapologetik in der Krise des römischen Reiches, “Historia”
123 A. Alföldi, A conflict of ideas in the later Roman empire. The clash between the Senat und Valentinian I, Oxford 1952.
Beiträge des I. Und II. Kolloquium jungen Wissenschaftler archäologischer und althistori-
scher Disziplinen der DDR, Hrsg. Zentralinstitut für alte Geschichte und Archäologie der
125 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 20: “Sed quid ego tam minute et quasi
allegorice de hoc loquor, cum facinoribus apertissimis non furta tantum diuitum sed latro-
cinia comprobentur? Quotus quisque enim iuxta diuitem non pauper aut actus aut statutus
est? Siquidem persuasionibus praepotentem aut sua homines imbicelli aut etiam se ipso cum
suis pariter amittunt, ut non immerito de utrisque personis sacer sermo testatus sit dicens:
statement about corruption and degeneration of the upper classes, which destroyed the Christian community.¹²⁶ What else is the dignity of the upper classes, if not the possibility to confiscate the goods of its citizens? If the prefecture is for someone whose name I will not mention, only a hunting ground? There is no greater desperation for the poor than the one caused by political authorities and the fact that public posts are bought by a few, who then use them to strip other citizens. Can anything be more scandalous and despicable? It is the poor who bear the costs of the posts, which do not serve them; they do not know the term ‘buy’, only the term ‘pay’. The whole external world is submitted to a few individuals and their splendors: condescending towards others equals their downfall. The Spaniards experience this, the other Spaniards are Spaniards in name only, the provinces of Africa have experienced this, they are already ruined. The same happens in the two Gales? Which are robbed, perhaps not by all prefects; thanks them there is still some life in a few odd places on Earth, thanks to food given by a few unblemished ones, despite the voracity of the majority.¹²⁷
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In Salvian’s opinion sanctioned theft and exploitation of one group by another group was responsible for further moral degeneration of the privileged upper classes.\(^\text{128}\) Knowing the impotence of the state apparatus and their own impunity, the aristocracy consistently committed crimes like: killing,\(^\text{129}\) adultery\(^\text{130}\) or treating common-law marriage as an alternative to paid sex.\(^\text{131}\) Salvian’s criticism of many Christians becoming pagan again was justified, first of all on the level of Christian argumentation related to Biblical morality.\(^\text{132}\) However, his suggestions for an aristocrat to marry a slave woman he had seduced advantage of

\[\text{read: A. Haemmerle, Studien zu Salvian, vol. 3, Neuburg 1899, p. 21–32. Saint Augustine of Hippo (Epistula 153, 6, 25: NBA 22, 552) also tried to draw attention attention but in vain, to similar behaviour of the rich Romans.}\]

\(^\text{128}\) To read about the peculiar duality of Roman law see: G. Gualandi, Privilegi imperiali e dualità legislativa nel Basso impero alla luce di alcuni testi di Libanio, “Archivio Giuridico” 156 (1959), p. 5.

\(^\text{129}\) Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 23: “Homicidia quoque in seruis rara sunt terrre ac metu mortis, in diuitiis adsidua spe ac fiducia impunitatis. Nisi forte iniqui simus hoc quod diuites faciunt ad peccata referendo, quia illi cum occidunt seruulos suos, ius mutant esse non crimem” SCh 220, 250.

\(^\text{130}\) Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 24: “Quotus enim quisque est diuitum conubii sacramenta conseruans, quem non libidinis furor rapiat in praeceps, cui non domus ac familia sua scortum sit, et qui non, in quamcumque personam cupiditatis improbae calor traxerit, mentis sequatur insaniam? secundum il lud scilicet quod de talibus dicit sermo diuinus: Equi insanientes in feminas fadi sunt. Quid enim aliud quam de se dictum hoc probat, qui totum peruadere uult concubitu quicquid concupierit aspectu?”. SCh 220, 250. Compare: Jer 5:8.

\(^\text{131}\) Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 25: “Nam de concubinis quippiam dici forsitan etiam iniustum esse uideatur, quia hoc in comparatione supra-dictorum flagitiorum quasi genus est castitatis uxoribus paucis esse contentum et intra certum coniugium nume-

\[\text{rum frenum libidinum continere. Goniugum dixi, quia ad tantam res impudentiam unit ut ancillas suas multi uxores putent.}.”; SCh 220, 252. Salvian talks about masters who are formally married to a free woman but sexually abuse their women slaves, thus humiliating their official wives in his De Gubernatione Dei 4, 26: “Atque utinam sicut putantur esse quasi coniuges, ita solae haberentur uxores. Illud magis taetrum ac detestabile quod quidam, matrimonia honorata sortitori, alias sibi tursum seruills status coniuges sumunt, deformantes sancti conubii honorem per degeneris contubernii utilitatem, non erubescentes maritos se fieri ancillarum suarum, praecipitantates fastigia nobilium matrimoniiorum in cubilia obscura seruarum, digni prorsus etiam illarum statu quorum se putant dignos esse consortio”: SCh 220, 252.

could not be realized as Roman law did not allow a senator or a dumivra to marry a slave.\footnote{C. Th. IV, 6, 3 (21 July 336).}

Another example of corruption and institutional downfall of the Roman country was a faulty system of paying off debts and the tax law itself.\footnote{A. Déleage, \textit{La capitation du Bas-Empire}, Mâcon 1945; A. Cérati, \textit{Caractère annonaire et assiette de l’impôt foncier au Bas-Empire}, Paris 1975.} The issue of paying taxes imposed by the rich,\footnote{J. M. Blázquez, \textit{La presión fiscal en el Bajo Imperio según los escritores eclesiásticos y sus consecuencias}, “Hacienda pública española. Instituto de Estudios Fiscales” 87 (1984), p. 37–56.} by the majority of citizens was another eternal issue worrying Salvian. In his opinion a privileged group of rich people imposing taxes was a source of injustice and exploitation of the poor by the rich.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 33–35: SCh 220, 336–338. To read more about imposing special taxes in the late period of the Empire see: A. Piganiol, \textit{L’Impôt de Capitation sous le Bas-Empire romain}, Chambéry 1916.}

He found constant raising of land tax\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 4, 30: “Nam illud latrocinium ac sceclus quis digne eloqui possit, quod, cum Romana respublica uel iam mortua, uel certe extremum spiritum agens in ea parte qua adhuc iuuer euidetur, tributorum uinculus quasi praedonum manibus strangulata moriatur, inueniuntur tamen plurimi diuitium quorum tributa pauperes ferunt, hoc est, inueniuntur plurimi diuitium quorum tributa pauperes necant. Et quod inueniri dicimus plurimos, timeo ne uerius diceremus omnes: tam pauci enim mali huius expertes sunt, si tamen ulli sunt, ut, in ea parte qua multis diximus, omnes paene diuites reperire possimus”: SCh 220, 254. 256. Compare also: \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 4, 31: SCh 220, 256 or \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 17: SCh 220, 322. 324. Salvian probably mentioned the customs of the owners in respect to the colonii (those which were not legally settled in the Empire). To read more about the custom of the possessores paying their taxes towards the colonii see: M. Pallasse, \textit{Orient et Occident à propos du Colonat Romain au Bas-Empire}, Lyon 1950.} particularly reprehensible. As patrocinium this tax was usually imposed on poor people employed to farm this land.\footnote{F. M. De Robertis, \textit{La produzione agricola in Italia dalla crisi del III secolo all’età dei Carolinghi}, “Annali della Facoltà di Economia e Commercio, Universita di Bari” 8 (1948), p. 67–271.} A similar situation took place (in provinces usually not expected by law to pay taxes) in case of a new consul being nominated, a victory or a peace treaty or announcing a new emperor.\footnote{To read more about introducing new taxes during extraordinary circumstances compare: C. Th. VIII, 11, 1–5, and 364–389; about the so called epistulaires bringing letters from scrinium officii sacrarum largitionum see C. Th. VI, 30, 7. a. 384.} 

Salvian’s description
of Roman administration abusing law and imposing extraordinary taxes best defines the situation: ‘Often new couriers or new delivery men come with a message which means the downfall of many people as only a chosen few were to receive bonuses and the remaining people had new taxes imposed on them. The most important people introduced them and the poorest paid them.\textsuperscript{140}

Salvian of Marseilles reproached the Roman administration the injustice of the taxes they imposed. Had they not been paid the property was confiscated.\textsuperscript{141} Tax collectors were entitled by imperial law to confiscate property and putting it up for action, which naturally led to a financial ruin of its owners.\textsuperscript{142} Decurions who had the right to remit taxes or to collect them were considered tyrans as they were often unjust and arrogant towards taxpayers.\textsuperscript{143} The situation of those who had lost their homes or property, having no rights to any ownership, who still had to pay tax (\textit{tributum capitis}) was tragic.\textsuperscript{144}

\textsuperscript{140} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 30: “Veniunt plerumque novi nuntii, noui epistolarii a summis sublimitatibus missi, qui commendantur inlustribus paucis ad exitia plurimorum. Decernunur his noua munera, decernuntur nouae indicationes: decernunt potentes quod soluant pauperes”: SCh 220, 334.

\textsuperscript{141} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 17: SCh 220, 322. 324.

\textsuperscript{142} Imperial law concerning the so called: \textit{exatores}: C. Th. XI, 7, 4 a. 327; C. Th XI, 9, 1–2, a. 323, 337. Themistius (4\textsuperscript{th} century), \textit{Orations} 6–7, ed. W. Lindorf, Leipzig 1832, p. 137, notices that it was common thinking that one should be more afraid of the tax collector than the invasion of Barbarians. There were, however, imperial laws allowing tax return in case of illegally collected taxes, but was very difficult. (Compare: C. Th. XI, 1, 2, a. 385; C. Th. XI, 1, 26, a. 399; C. Th. XI, 13, 1, a. 383; C. Th. IX, 40, 14, a. 385; C. Th. XI, 4, 1, a. 372; C. Th. XI, 7, 20, a. 412; C. Th. XIII, 11, 11, a. 406). It seemed almost impossible to stop the greedy tax collector. To read more about tax collectors see: A. Haemmerle, \textit{Studien zu Salvian III}, Prog. Neuburg 1899, p. 39–40.

\textsuperscript{143} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 18: SCh 220, 324. Ever since the times of Septimius Severus, the decurions (\textit{curiales}) were personally responsible for collecting the whole sum from the public. Thus, this post was more of a burden than a privilege. It was difficult to free oneself from this role as it was hereditary. The decurions sometimes had no choice but to tyrannize the citizens with high taxes, emigrate or become a member of the Christian clergy. Compare: A. Haemmerle, \textit{Studien zu Salvian I}, Landshut 1893, p. 35–36.

Horrible fiscalism, immorality of tax clerks and financial inefficiency of the Roman Empire were unquestionable for Salvian.\(^{145}\) “The State Treasury is really going through a difficult time and the Roman treasury is poverty-stricken: therefore, there is no room for wasting money on mere trifle.”\(^{146}\) The Barbarian invasions on Sardinia and Sicily have ruined the country’s proverbial granary.\(^{147}\) The Vandal invasions in Africa had a similar effect. Up till then Africa had been called ‘the heart’ of the Roman agrarian system.\(^{148}\) The systematic economic and political downfall did not improve morals among the Romans.\(^{149}\) In Salvian’s opinion the country was robbed by the rich, who were acting officially or privately. The rights established by clerks who were at the same time proprietors served their own private purposes only. Therefore, they did not obey rules because as Salvian said, only humble people, under the authority of others, were forced to obey legal regulations under threat of punishment and the richest regularly ignored and exceeded law as if it did not exist.\(^{150}\) The following Roman proverb became a norm: “We like other people’s goods, they


\(^{150}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 92–93: “Illud grauis ac magis intolerabile quod hoc faciunt et priuati, isdem ante honoribus functi! Tantum eis indeptus semel honor dat beneficii ut semper habeanit ius latrocinandi. Adeo etiam, cum destiterint ad administrandum potestatem habere publicam, non desinunt tamen ad latrocinandum potes tam habere priuatum […] 93. Ecce quid ualeant statuta legum, ecce quid proiect definition sanctionum, quae illi spernunt maxime qui ministrant. Sane ad parendum humiles abiectique coguntur, compelluntur iussis obtemperare pauperculi, et nisi obtemperauerint, puniuntur. Eandem enim in hac re rationem habent quam in tributis: soli iussis publicis seruiunt,
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like ours more too.”\textsuperscript{151} Salvian summoned Christians to obey law on the principle that “it is not truth that destroys us, but sins, it is not law that harms us but the way citizens live.”\textsuperscript{152}

Salvian came to a conclusion that social status influenced the importance of the sin? “As a result, it is the fault of the person with the higher status. The higher the status of the sinner, the bigger the sin.”\textsuperscript{153} He applied this rule not only to aristocracy but all educated and conscious citizens. He treated Christians and Catholics with bigger severity than pagans and Barbarians. He demanded more of the Catholic clergy who were bigger sinners than God’s entire world.\textsuperscript{154} The same applied to all sinning ascetic people than entire humanity.\textsuperscript{155}

Salvian was put off by the immorality of the Roman state and provocatively claimed that Barbarians have higher morals and a better social

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{151} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 1, 47: “aliena nobis, nostra plus aliis placent”: SCh 220, 144.
\textsuperscript{152} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 1: “non ueritatem his obesse sed uitia, nec legem nocere sed mores” SCh 220, 310. Compare: 1 Tim 1, 8–9: The law of the Old Testament was meant to prevent evil. St. Paul often reminded people of this in his works. He used a variety of sins to illustrate the difference in behavior between a just man and one that is not (for example: Rom 1:27–31; 13:13; 1 Cor 5:10n; 6:9n; 2 Cor 12:20; Ga 5:19nn; 2 Tim 3:2–5).
\textsuperscript{153} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 4, 57: “Criminosior enim culpa est, ubi honestior status. Si honoratior est persona peccantis, peccati quoque maior inuidia”: SCh 220, 278. 280.
\textsuperscript{154} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 4, 58: “Furtum in omni quidem est homine malum facinus, sed damnabilius absque dubio si senator furatur aliquando. Cunctis fomicatio interdicitur, sed grauius multo est si de clero aliquis quam si de populo fornicetur. Ita et nos, qui Christiani et catholici esse dicimur, si simile aliquid barbarorum impunitatibus facimus, grauius erramus. Atrocius enim sub sancti nominis professione peccamus. Vbi sublimior est praerogatiua, maior est culpa. Ipsa enim errores nostros religio quam profitemur, accusat. Criminosior est eius impudicitia qui promiserit castitatem: foedius inebriatur sobrietatem fronte praetendens”: SCh 220, 280.
\textsuperscript{155} Sal Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 4, 59: “Nihil est philosopho turpius uitia obscena sectanti, quia praeter eam deiformitatem quam uitia in se habent, sapientiae nomine plus notatur. Et nos igitur in omni humano genere philosophiam Christianam professi sumus, ac per hoc deteriores nos cunctis gentibus credi atque haberi necesse est, quia sub tam magnae professionis nomine uiuimus et positi in religione peccamus”: SCh 220, 280.
\end{footnotesize}
system than Romans claiming to be Christians. This is so because unlike Christians who are increasingly hateful and envious, the Barbarians are cooperating and showing each other mercy.

3.3. Summary

The descriptions of Christian society of the 5th century made by both authors seems very much similar. Both authors were Christians making moral judgements of the society of the time. But they did not propose any significant changes and they did not have their own social programmes. Both had gone from observing the situation to assessing it from a religious point of view. They also tried to prevent evil through pastoral methods. This is the reason why they stressed Christian upbringing and encouraged individual acts of mercy.

They differed in their approach to individual matters and some matters were looked into by one of them only. This was a result of the way they taught as Peter Chrysologus spoke as a preacher and Salvian of Marseilles reflected on things in his treatise. There are also some factual differences. What is interesting is that unlike Salvian of Marseilles, Peter Chrysologus tried to solve social problems. The religious description of the society of the 5th century in the works of the above authors was their priestly reaction to the mass conversions of the 4th & 5th century and the lack of authenticity of the faith of many Catholics. In the opinion of Chrysologus and Salvian the reasons come down to two factors: moral-religious ones and socio-structural.

---

156 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 5, 15–16: SCh 220, 320, 322.
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Religious and moral factors

Peter Chrysologus noticed a significant pastoral problem connected with the falseness of conversions to Catholicism. Salvian of Marseilles expressed his view on the reasons for weakening Christian faith from a theological point of view. For him evil resulting from sin was the fundamental reason for the fall of the Roman society and the Christians remaining in sin, contributed to a characteristic spiritual degradation of a major part of the Church. False conversions could not give birth to real Christian life. For this reason nominal Christians limited themselves to ritualism only, treating Christianity superficially.

Social and structural factors

Chrysologus noticed that the structure of the society weakened the faith of Christians. Other factors included: Barbarian invasions, social riots, wealth polarization of Christians, as well as, slavery. For Salvian, the Barbarian invasions themselves acted as a catalyst of the downfall of the Roman society. Neither of the two clergymen spoke openly against slavery but Salvian of Marseilles called for its gradual eradication through a personal internal transformation.

Religious and moral consequences of social differences

In the opinion of Chrysologus, remaining in sin, both on the collective, as well as, individual term leads to hard-heartedness and an escalation of sin. Salvian also thought that faulty institutions and faulty social structures lead to moral degradation in all aspects of life. At the same time, he stressed the immorality of the high society who commit sin in the majesty of the law. Their gradual degradation and remaining in sin led to a feeling of impunity and remaining in sin.

The two authors also share similarities. They both share the opinion that slavery is the result of man’s sin against God. Their judgements of slavery differ. Without doubt, Salvian thinks that the slave is equal to a free man in terms of his humanness, whereas Chrysologus is not so explicite. Both authors stress that both Barbarian invasions and the society growing
poorer negatively influenced social bahaviour. When it comes to Barbarians, Salvian is lenient and a lot more sympathetic than Chrysologus. The motif of Salvian’s thinking is the degeneration of Roman elite. This motif is missing in the sermons of the Bishop of imperial Ravenna.

Pastoral efforts counteracting social differences

In order to prevent negative social phenomena, both Catholic clergymen called upon an evangelical transformation. As the Bishop of Ravenna, Chrysologus encouraged Christians to persevere against all odds and stressed the importance of a virtuous life on Earth to allow God to praise this man in his future life. He encouraged an internal transformation which would result in a moral healing of the entire society. Apart from a few encouragements for masters of slaves to lead a decent life, Salvian did not give any particular pastoral or spiritual solutions for countermeasures against evil. He limited himself to diagnosing and judging evil.

Some of the socio-pastoral issues that both authors were acquainted with are still true today. These include: preventing imperfect conversions, identifying and fighting with structural sin, eliminating immoral legislation in relation to financial charges on citizens, despicable relationships between employers and employees, defying institutional failure of the state by not accepting corruption, finding proper sanctions for stealing public property by political or financial elite, enforcing effective criminal law on the high and mighty, trying to evade justice.
4. The perception of the Church in the 5th century

The following chapter introduces a description of the Church in the 5th century made by Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles. It is juxtaposed with the rather negative description of pastoral community of the Roman-Christians in Chapter 3. It also includes their Christian suggestions of possible changes. Having described the deficiencies of the Church community I will present the ideal Church, the community was hoping for around 400 AD. Two clear ecclesiological perspectives presented in the works of both authors. Firstly, both of them see the Apostolic Age as an ideal community. Secondly, each author has an individual vision of an ideal Church. Chrysologus – a deeper, theological and more pastoral one, whereas, Salvian a more religious and definitely more moralizing one.

4.1. Admonishing the Church of the 5th century

In the minds of Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles, the Church was a community of the faithful summoned by Christ to advocate God’s Kingdom. But they did not fail to notice various weaknesses of the faithful and the institution itself. The above mentioned writers made it clear that the Church was never a foundation in itself. Instead its foundation lies in Christ and in the word of God and its aim is God’s Kingdom as man’s final destination.1 Whenever they criticized anything within the

---
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Church, they would do it in accordance with God’s spirit. Their criticism never came down to ‘the criminal history of the Church’, instead they showed the holy mystery of the Church which is *casta meretrix*, as well as, Babilon and Jerusalem. The internal criteria were the same ever since the beginning of the Church; a community of brothers and sisters, openness towards other people, a testimony to the world and a perseverance in suffering and religious persecution. The constructive criticism of the Church was not meant to bring forth a return to the spontaneity of the first Christians but a concentration on the truth of Christians belonging to God.

4.1.1. A summoning to return to zealousness – description by St. Peter Chrysologus

The pastoral observation and consistent warnings that Peter Chrysologus makes, refer to several weaknesses of the Church of the 5th century. The clearly visible faults encouraged Saint Peter Chrysologus to call for a return to Christian zealousness. The Bishop of Ravenna claimed that the shortcomings of his times included: a general laziness connected with religious practice, absence from mass, lack of knowledge of the Church doctrine and heresy and apostasy due to it. For him the most worrying social problem was drunkenness.

The Bishop of Ravenna reproached his people for their absence at mass at daybreak, lack of eagerness in morning prayer all of which in his opinion was an indication of a submission to Satan and an insult to God and laziness. He encouraged change, especially that lack of religious zealousness

---

4 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 39, 5: OSPC 1, 280.
5 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 43, 4–5: OSPC 1, 304.
6 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 39, 5: OSPC 1, 282.
made 'the already faithful and the not yet faithful' not willing to accept the pre-baptism advice.\footnote{7} He also noticed the threats of paganism,\footnote{8} apostasy and idolatry,\footnote{9} a slow return to paganism through lack of faith,\footnote{10} selective treatment of Epiphany which led to the heresy of arianism,\footnote{11} superstitiousness and magical practices.\footnote{12} Another clear sin among Christians of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, laymen and clergymen\footnote{13} alike was drunkenness. For this reason Chrysologus encouraged everyone to stay sober.\footnote{14} He expected God to send punishments\footnote{15} in the form of numerous epidemics\footnote{16} if they continue to give in to their weaknesses.

\footnote{7} F. Sottocornola, \textit{L'anno liturgico}, 74. \textit{Sermo} 39 suggests that St. Peter Chrysologus delivered sermons for those preparing for baptism, at the beginning of Lent to emphasize the resurrection of Christ. We learn from \textit{Sermo} 39, 1 that he did not deliver sermons at the end of Lent as he was busy preparing those awaiting baptism. Compare Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermi} 74–75: OSPC 1, 98–103, 104–109.

\footnote{8} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 40, 3: OSPC 1, 284. 286.


\footnote{10} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 51, 3: OSPC 1, 352; compare: Mk 9:18.

\footnote{11} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 98, 4: OSPC 2, 254, 256.

\footnote{12} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 71, 5: OSPC 2, 68.

\footnote{13} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 3: OSPC 1, 202. To read about the burning of the priests in the Old Testament – Datan and Abiud, Aaron’s sons, for their personal sin, see: Lv 16. The typical Old Testament expression ‘the Holy of the Holiest’, which suggested the holiest place in the Jerusalem temple, occupied by God and accessible to the priest only once a year see: Ex 26; Lv 16:2; 1 Kings 6:3; Ezek 41:3–4; Heb 10:1–3; In the New Testament the expression ‘the Holy of the Holiest’ is used to define Heaven, which Jesus Christ, the only true priest had entered: Heb 9:12. 24; When Chrysologus speaks about the apostle in his sermon, he means St. Paul: compare: 1 Thes 5:19.

\footnote{14} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 4: OSPC 1, 202.

\footnote{15} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 45, 7: OSPC 1, 318. To read more about God’s anger as a theologoumenon in the Bible understood as payment for earthly life see: R. Miggelbrink, \textit{Gniew Boży. Znaczenie pewnej gorszącej tradycji biblijnej}, Kraków 2005.

\footnote{16} Other authors mention the constant plagues and epidemics in the Western Roman empire of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, for example: Marcellinus Comes, \textit{Chronicon} 14–15, ad a. 446–447, [in:] ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH 11: \textit{Chronica minora saeculi IV. V. VI. VII} (vol. 2), Berolini 1894\textsuperscript{1}, München 1981, p. 82.
4.1.2. “Evil Should Be Discussed and Described and the Wrongdoings Should Be Recognized and Atoned for” – Salvian’s Description

When describing evil hounding the Catholics of the 5th century, Salvian of Marseilles tried to observe the following universal pastoral rule: evil should be discussed and described and the wrongdoings should be atoned for, as all Christians are plagued by sin. He noticed a fundamental lack of faith among many Christians, resulting in many daily sins. Because of this, he encouraged penance for both laymen and clergymen but also for monks, should they contemplate any evil. When talking about the most obvious sin, that is greed, Salvian reproached all Christians for this, clergymen and laymen alike.

Salvian criticized the morals of Catholics but he particularly stressed the vices of the clergy. He noted a certain arrogance of newly accepted clergymen and asked the question whether this sort of behavior is customary and expressed his hope that Bishop Eucherius of Lyon would not yield to such behavior. He warned clergymen who were becoming too rich. He accused consecrated widows, virgins, ‘white marriages’, monks and clergymen of lack of asceticism and excessive acquiring of wealth, which is contradictory to the Gospel. This is particularly gross among members

---

17 Salvian of Marseilles, Epistula 9, 10: SCh 176, 124. 126.
21 Salvian of Marseilles, Epistula 9, 11: SCh 176, 126.
22 Salvian of Marseilles, Epistula 9, 11: “Et ideo uidens ille qui scripsit commune esse hoc malum prope uniuerorum, labemque hanc non ad mundiales tantum homines, sed etiam ad paenitentes atque conuersos, ad uiduas quoque iam continentiam professas atque ad puellas In saris altaribus consecratas, quodque, ut ita dixerim, prope inter monstra reputandum est, ad leuitas etami ac presbyteros, et quo his feralius multo est, et etami ad episcopos peruenisse”: SCh 176, 126.
23 Salvian of Marseilles, Epistula 2: “Pedisequa enim plerumque noui honoris est adrogantia, licet in te nec generalis uiuii opinio admitenda sit”: SCh 176, 84.
24 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 4, 24: SCh 176, 326; Ad Ecclesiam 4, 33: SCh 176, 330. 332.
of the clergy. People, whose lives are dedicated to Christ at their own free will, should out of their holiness and poverty, donate the goods they have earned to the Saviour. But by constantly thinking about money they were becoming people whose lives were dedicated to God but acquiring wealth in an worldly manner.

Salvian reproached each partially converted Christian, the base behavior of collecting wealth as idolatry and drifting away from God. He treated those Christians living without faith and in sin as non-believers and refused to accept their complaints on God’s verdicts. In his opinion, suffering was some kind of deserved punishment for sins.

4.2. The Church – its own teaching

Chrysologus saw the primal Church, the Church of the Apostles as an ideal era, a time when the Apostles were the shephards. The aim of their mission was to free people from death and offer them a life in eternity. This was never done against people’s will and thus both the Apostles and the Bishops should allow them to make a final choice of God and eternal life, or to reject it and choose condemnation. For Salvian, the Church of the Apostles was perceived through its joint character and morality. For this reason, it encouraged the love for God. Christian faith should lead to a life of morality and increase the glory of the Church.

---

4.2.1. The ideal of the Primal Church – Chrysologus’ description

In his sermons, Chrysologus described the Apostles as ideal shephards of the Church and these times as ideal for the Church itself. He talked mainly about the Apostles and their missionary work and less about the faithful of the Primal Church. He compared the bishops of his times to the ideal of the first apostles.

He understood the Gospel (Lk 12:41–46) as proof that the Apostles were chosen by Christ to deliver the word of God diligently as good shephards.30 Similarly to Saint Peter, the bishops were also appointed by the Lord to teach in a responsible way and to rule the Church.31 And in the spirit of this responsibility (Lk 12:48 and Wis 6:7) they will be assessed by God as the administrator’s of His goods. Footnote.32

The aim of the apostolic mission was freeing people from death to live a life in eternity,33 but never against their will. The apostles should lead people to God, to make the choice to choose Him or to reject Him, to an eternal life or to condemnation.34 They were supposed to enlighten people about the Gospel,35 In order to be successful, the Apostles were given the gift of the Holy Ghost,36 through whom Christ himself comes to people.37

Similarly to the Apostles, the bishops were appointed because of their excellent pastoral work. Like Christ, they were supposed to care about the salvation of the whole world, done peacefully and calmly38 by sacrificing in

30 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 26, 1: OSPC 1, 200.
31 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 26, 1: OSPC 1, 200.
32 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 26, 2: “Homo, si hoc ipsum quod das accepisti, accepisse te quod habes quomodo tu negabis? De caelestibus conditis, de horreis diuinis rationem reddet, praestabit causas ecclesiae prorogator; et quantum maius suscipit credidum, tantum maius se debitum non dubitat redditurum, dicente domino: *Cui plus est creditum, plus exigetur ab eo.* Et alibi: *Potentes potenter tormenta patientur*”: OSPC 1, 200.
33 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 28, 1: OSPC 1, 124; compare: Mt 4:19.
34 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 89, 1: OSPC 2, 198; compare: 2 Cor 2:16.
38 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 6, 1: OSPC 1, 80.
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the name of the whole world like Christ did. Symbolically, the Apostles were like fishermen, who caught for God’s eternity. The Apostles were chosen by Christ. As poor people they were meant to train themselves in virtues, as the virtue of poverty strengthens the unity and brotherhood of the Apostles.

Christ’s intention was to make the Apostles carry out not only pastoral work but also simple work that people do to strengthen their perseverance and that of the other faithful. Chrysologus did not exaggerate about the perfection of the Apostles. He noticed that they were not the first witnesses to Christ’s resurrection and before the resurrection, they seemed to play a smaller role than women. But as secondary witnesses to the resurrection, their role was by no means smaller.

But generally Chrysologus had an idealized picture of the Apostles themselves and the Church of their times. The fact that Christ had chosen them was supposed to glorify their work – concern for the salvation of the world. Similarly to the Apostles, the bishops were idealized too.

4.2.2. The ideal of the Primal Church – Salvian’s description

By reproaching the faithful, Salvian wanted to multiply the glory and love of God, and to increase the glory of the Church itself. When talking about the ideal Church of the Apostles, he stressed the importance of ‘brotherhood of the Apostles’. The Church of the Apostles was first of all a congregation of faith.

---

39 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 6, 1: OSPC 1, 80; compare: J 10:11; Ps 100 (99):2. Entire *Sermo* 6 is a comment on Psalm 100 (99). Right here, Chrysologus concentrates on excerpt from Jn 10:11. To read more see: F. Sottocornola, *L’anno liturgico*, op. cit., p. 65.
41 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 28, 1: OSPC 1, 214.
42 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 28, 1: OSPC 1, 214.
46 Salvian of Marseilles, *Epistula* 4, 1: SCH 176, 88; *Epistula* 9, 19: SCH 176, 132 (concerns his treatise: *Ad Ecclesiam*).
Church, one that obeys the rule of sharing material goods.\textsuperscript{49} However, the concept of sharing goods, typical of the early Church was not obvious for everyone in the 5th century.\textsuperscript{50}

When talking about the first Christians, Salvian stressed that the people of the primal Church were poor, as in those days the fathers taught their children faith.\textsuperscript{51} The faith of the first Christians led to a life of morals, there were no killings or incest.\textsuperscript{52} Early Christian life was religious and dedicated to God, the martyrs being an example.\textsuperscript{53}

Modern people should follow the example of the Apostles, in matters of faith. A life in faith which means imitating Christ in one’s life.\textsuperscript{54} Apostles like Saint Peter taught perseverance.\textsuperscript{55} When talking about the pagan Roman Africans and the beginnings of their Christianization, Salvian said that they were kinder to the Apostles than the Roman citizens of the 5th century.\textsuperscript{56}

\begin{flushend}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{49} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 5: Sch 176, 142; compare: Ac 4, 32; Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 41: Sch 176, 270; compare: Ac 2, 44; Ac 4, 32–35.


\textsuperscript{51} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 43: Sch 176, 272.


\textsuperscript{54} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 16: Sch 220, 198; compare: Gal 4:19; 1 Cor 11:1.

\textsuperscript{55} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 17: Sch 220, 200.

\textsuperscript{56} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 8, 23: Sch 220, 524.
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushend}
Salvian exaggerated here a little bit. By praising the first missionaries, he said that it was the Apostles who founded the African Church.\(^57\) It is true that the Church in Roman Africa had its beginnings in the times of the Apostles but the Apostles did not found it.\(^58\) By idealizing the Church of the Apostles, Salvian stresses its joint character in matters of faith and material goods. The motivation behind this was to encourage the Catholics of his time to imitate the Apostles in their faith and piety.

---

\(^57\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 79.
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4.2.3. The ideal of the 5th century Church – complementary concept of Chrysologus and Salvian

What was the congregation of the Church in Chrysologus and Salvian’s ecclesiology? Both authors shared a similar view on the ideal Church in their times. During various pastoral situations, they used Biblical and early Christian symbolism to talk about the Church. In their opinion, in the prefiguration of the Old Testament, we can see the harbinger of the Church as God’s institution. The Church was perceived as the congregation of the faithful, where the sin is transformed into virtue. As a liturgical congregation it was also the place of religious cult. A place of prayer and the Church played the role of the administrator of God’s goods. Both Chrysologus and Salvian talked about the hierarchy in the Church that is the clergy (the pope, bishops, presbyters) and the laity (laymen and monks). Both authors also shared their opinion on marriage and virginity. They also undertook the subject of different Churches and heresy.

4.2.3.1. The Church in Biblical-Christian symbolism

Peter Chrysologus sees the Church symbolism as a ‘virgin and mother’ or as the ‘wife’ of Christ. The symbols most often used by Salvian include the allegory of the Church as a ‘woman-mother’ of the faithful, the ‘provider of hope.’

In the sermons of Chrysologus, Catholicism is perceived as the universality of faith which leads to salvation. Thus, Chrysologus talks about...
the universality of the Church understood as peoples complementing each other: ‘the unity of peoples,’63 the Church which was born as the child of Christ and the symbolic ‘mother in law’ is the Synagogue.64 By giving an allegoric explanation of different events in the Bible, in his sermons, he mentions the meeting of the Church and the Synagogue; in the house of the Pharisee (Lk 7:36–50) where the Synagogue is the house of the Pharisee and the Church is the woman absolved by Christ.65 In his comment to Luke 13:6–9,66 Chrysologus compares the Synagogue to the fig tree covered in fruit.67 In Matthew 8:22–26, the blind man of Bethsaida is the Synagogue according to Chrysologus, and the same blind man healed by Christ is the Church.68 In the form of two women who visit the grave on Easter morning (Jn 20:1–18), Chrysologus notices the figuration of the Synagogue and the Church which together accept the Christ.69

Chrysologus considered the Church, the act of God announced in the Old Testament. He pointed to Abraham, figuratively shown as a lamb (Gen 22:1–19) and the Christians as Christ’s herd – Psalm 50(49).70 He came to a conclusion that the fact that Israel remains in religious impurity against the summoning of Lev 15:25–32 and according to Jn 20:29 was an indication of a new group of the blessed, “who have not seen but

63 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 75, 3: OSPC 2, 104; compare: Mt 28:1; Mk 10:31; compare: Sermo 76, 1: OSPC 2, 110; Sermo 82, 7: OSPC 2, 152; Sermo 105, 6: OSPC 2, 306.
64 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 164, 8: OSPC 3, 250; compare: Lk 12:52–53.
65 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 95, 3–5: OSPC 2, 236–240. In this sermon, Chrysologus reminds us about two essential ways of reading the Bible, which he describes as ‘historia veritas’ and ‘sacramento caelestia’. To read an article about the dual sense of understanding the Bible see the following article: A. Olivar, Els principis exegètics de sant Pedro Crisòleg, Montserrat 1953, p. 413–437 (Miscellanea biblica B. Ubach).
67 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 106: OSPC 2, 310–315.
68 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 176, 8: OSPC 3, 314.
70 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 10, 4: OSPC 1, 108.
believed’ that is the Church; he also believed that the Church began where the Old Testament had ended.” He stressed the testimony given by the Ninevites (Jon 3) and the Queen Sheba (1 Kings 10:1–10), who recognized the signs of the coming of God as opposed to the Jews who did not recognize Him and rejected Him (Lk 11:29–30). Chrysologus mentioned the four periods of God coming to people: from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Moses, from Moses to Christ, from Christ to Parousia (the time of the Church). He referred to the figures of God’s friends in the Old Testament – Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Isaiah and Daniel, people who believed God, as a harbinger of Christians, who believed Jesus Christ and are to live forever. Finally, Chrysologus saw the Church as the wife of Christ (Hos 2:19–20).

The Church was a community which was spiritually perfect. As opposed to the Synagogue, which was spiritually imperfect as it did not accept the Messiah because of jealousy and hatred. In the opinion of Peter Chrysologus, the main mistake the Jews made was the rejection of the Gospel and the Messiah himself in the form of man. The synagogue continued to be a negative term, meaning the house of the Pharisee, who did not notice that by rejecting the Messiah who came and ate with them, an era of lack of faith began for the Jews. Chrysologus stressed that Christ had once healed the Synagogue, and despite the fact that He was later

---

71 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 35, 5: OSPC 1, 258; OSPC 1, 258.
72 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 37, 5: OSPC 1, 270.
73 To read more about the fourfold outline of the periodization of the history of salvation, in which the fourth period is the period of Christ see: A. Luneau, *L’histoire du salut chez les Pères de l’Eglise. La doctrine des âges du monde*, Paris 1964, p. 412.
76 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 146, 5: OSPC 3, 140.
78 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 131, 4: OSPC 3, 48; compare: Jn 8:51–53.
79 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 95, 3: OSPC 2, 236; compare: Lk 7:30–36.
81 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 18, 8: OSPC 1, 156; compare: Mt 8:14–16.
rejected by the Jews, He still wishes to glorify all beings, both Jews and pagans.\textsuperscript{82} Chrysologus stressed the patience of God and he differentiated ‘His three stages of coming’ to the Synagogue in which the Jews bore no fruit of good deeds but despite that God wishes their salvation.\textsuperscript{83} The Bishop of Ravenna calls the Church sacred, adopted by Christ – God and is led by Him to divinity.\textsuperscript{84} He accepts the woman from whom Christ had driven out seven bad ghosts (Lk 13:11–16) as the symbol of the unity of the Church. The woman is healthy and blessed with God’s power.\textsuperscript{85} The healing of the woman who had suffered for eighteen years is a symbol of the Church healed by Messiah\textsuperscript{86} when the set time had fully come, during the arrival of the Messiah, also compared to the Ogdoada.\textsuperscript{87} The Church of those days is made up of the faithful, as well as, atoning sinners.\textsuperscript{88} God’s work is portrayed as “the searching woman from the Gospel,”\textsuperscript{89} who has “lost the drachma and then found it” having lit the ‘lamp’ – that is the

\textsuperscript{82} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 78, 7: OSPC 2, 126; compare: Jn 21:7–18; Ps 27 (26):13.
\textsuperscript{84} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 60, 14: OSPC 1, 408; \textit{Sermo} 60 is his sixth sermon dedicated to explaining the Symbol of faith. It was delivered by the Bishop of Ravenna at the end of Lent. Compare: F. Sottocornola, \textit{L’anno liturgico}, op. cit., p. 78.
\textsuperscript{86} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 105, 7: OSPC 2, 308.
\textsuperscript{87} The Ogdoad itself, that is the unity of the eight was one of the favourite symbols of the Gnostic system. See: H. Jonas, \textit{Religia gnozy}, Kraków 1994, p. 196. 205. 208. 210. 216. 322; K. Rudolph, \textit{Gnoza. Istota i historia późnoantycznej formacji religijnej}, Kraków 1995, p. 67. 72, 167–169. 197. 274. Most ancient peoples of the Mediterranean Sea (the Persians, the Greeks – the Pythagoreans, the Israelis and the Ethiopians) considered number 8 as the symbol of everything that is perfect, connected with God and eternal glory. Only, the school of Alexandria, considered number eight as mathematically not perfect. The majority of Fathers and Christian writers of the first centuries, considered number eight the symbol of resurrection, the eighth day (that is Sunday) and the symbol of happiness. Also in in the 5th century, in the West, number eight symbolized perfection and fulfillment. Chrysologus mentioned the Ogdoad in \textit{Sermo} 122, 22. To read more see: A. Quacquarelli, \textit{L’ogdoade patristica e i suoi riflessi nella liturgia e nei monumenti}, Bari 1973; M. Szram, \textit{Duchowy sens liczb w allegorycznej egzegezie alexandryjskiej (II–V w.)}, Lublin 2001, p. 138–140.
\textsuperscript{88} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 95, 4–6: OSPC 2, 238–240. In his allegorical interpretation of the Bible, Chrysologus sees the Church as women who are perceived as good and converted – the converted harlot from Lu 7, 37–50, who was rescued by her own faith. St. Ambrose used the same argumentaion, \textit{Expositio evangeli secundum Lucam} 6, 12–35: OOSA 12, 18–36.
\textsuperscript{89} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 169, 3–4: OSPC 3, 272–274.
internal look of the heart at God and having abandoned the ignorance of lack of faith.\textsuperscript{90} The lost drachma would be God’s Law in the Decalogue,\textsuperscript{91} earlier perished by people but found by Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{92}

Salvian said much less about the Church in a Biblical and symbolic sense. He stressed its universality – the Catholic aspect of the Church and its laws,\textsuperscript{93} and the fact that what makes it ‘Catholic’ is the quality of Christian life and not just the verbal declaration not backed up by everyday life.\textsuperscript{94}

4.2.3.2. The Church as God’s congregation

Chrysologus perceived the Church as ‘his fold (flock),’\textsuperscript{95} ‘the Lord’s fold,’\textsuperscript{96} ‘little flock’\textsuperscript{97} (the Church of the Apostles), the ‘flock of the Church,’\textsuperscript{98} the
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‘Lord’s sons’ (the catechumen – ‘a large part of the Lord’s flock’).\(^99\) He believes in it as the ‘Holy Church – the Body of Christ,’\(^100\) or Christ’s body.\(^101\) He describes it as ‘Christ’s wife,’\(^102\) ‘the wife’s chamber,’\(^103\) as a ‘boat’\(^104\) or ‘Christ’s boat’ attacked by the world.\(^105\) The law of the Old Testament and the teaching of the Church is compared to the ‘light of the faithful.’\(^106\) Chrysologus perceives the Church as a congregation, where the Gospel is

---


\(^100\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 61, 12: OSPC 1, 414; *Sermo* 62 bis, 11: OSPC 1, 426.


\(^103\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 22, 6: OSPC 1, 182. In the opinion of R. Benericetti, OSPC 1, no. 1, 183 the expression *thalamus* was a traditional term suggesting the Church. It is also found in the so called *Decretum Gelasianum*: “quibus ecclesia catholica per gratiam dei fundata est, etiam illud intimandum putavimus quod, quamvis universae per orbem catholicae diffusa ecclesiae unus thalamus Christi sit”: *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 8, ed. J. D. Mansi, Florentiae 1759, p. 492–536, 640–641. The meaning of the term is wide but usually refers to the woman’s, the wife’s chamber. The Latin term *thalamus* can mean a married couple’s bedroom or a married couple’ bed: *Thalamus*, [in:] *Słownik łacińsko - polski*, t. 5, red. M. Plezia, Warszawa 1994, p. 375; comes from Greek *θάλαμος*, meaning the chamber of a woman, a bedroom but also a temple or a chapel. *Słownik grecko-polski*, t. 2, red. Z. Abramowiczówna, Warszawa 1960, p. 437; the early Christian meaning of the term *thalamos* is similar to classical Greek: 1. admit to the bridal chamber; *met.*, of S. Stephen’s entry into heaven; 2. espouse; 3. keep at home; 4. *pass. intrans.*, stay at home. In Christian Latin, the meaning of the term *thalamus* was similar to the one Blaise-Chirat gives, 815, *thalamus*, i. m. 1. chambre (poët. cl.), (pl.) chambres (du temple); 2. lit. nuptial (poët. cl.); (métaph.) nid (de la tour-terelle veuve); 3. la chambre nuptiale; mariage, épousailles (myst.): (en parl. de l’Église, épouse du Christ).

\(^104\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 8, 1: OSPC 1, 94 (a description of the Church as a boat, where Christ is the steersman, the Holy Ghost fills the sails, leading the faithful to happiness in eternal life); Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 32, 5: OSPC 1, 242; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 37, 2: OSPC 1, 266; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 50, 2: OSPC 1, 343. The notion of the Church as a boat is a constant topos of 5th century Christian symbolism. To read more see: H. Rahner, *Simboli della Chiesa. L’Ecclesiologia dei Padri*, Cinisello Balsamo 1995, p. 395.

\(^105\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 20, 2: OSPC 1, 166.

taught and also a community where the transformation from sin to virtue takes place, \( ^{107} \) where the ‘worldly community becomes a Heavenly one.’ \( ^{108} \)

Despite constant moralizing, reproaching of sins, Salvian of Marseilles tried to speak positively about the Church described as a ‘congregation’ or the ‘churches,’ \( ^{109} \) ‘God’s churches,’ \( ^{110} \) ‘Christian community,’ ‘Christian peoples,’ \( ^{111} \) ‘God’s peoples,’ \( ^{112} \) those who pray in hope of future happiness in God. \( ^{113} \) This worldly Church community would constantly form in imitation of Christ. \( ^{114} \) For this reason, Salvian noticed its weaknesses. Finally he came to a conclusion that the Christians of the 5th century were mostly a ‘community of vices’ \( ^{115} \) or the ‘spoiled Christian community.’ \( ^{116} \)

4.2.3.3. The Church of the Holy Communion
In the works of Peter Chrysologus, one can notice an outline of Eucharistic ecclesiology. \( ^{117} \) The Church was seen as the place the ‘Eucharistic Christ’ \( ^{118} \) or the place of prayer, \( ^{119} \) where God grants His mercy through the clergy-

---

\( ^{107} \) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 95, 6: OSPC 2, 240; compare: Mt 25:42–43; Lk 7:44–47; 1 Cor 15:53; Rom 8:3.


\( ^{109} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 60: SCh 220, 230.

\( ^{110} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 4, 53: SCh 220, 276.

\( ^{111} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 2–5: SCh 220, 360–364.

\( ^{112} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 81: SCh 220, 488.

\( ^{113} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 1, 21–22: SCh 220, 120. 122; compare: 1 Tim 2:1–2.

\( ^{114} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 16: SCh 220, 198; compare: Gal 4:19; 1 Cor 11:1.

\( ^{115} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 44: SCh 220, 220.

\( ^{116} \) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 46: SCh 220, 220.


\( ^{118} \) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 67, 7: OSPC 2, 42; compare: Mt 6:10; In the opinion of B. De Margerie, *Introduction à l’histoire*, vol. 4, op. cit., p. 97–106, Chrysologus question about daily bread in the exegesis, always refers to the Communion and does not concern earthly bread; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 170, 1: OSPC 3, 278. Even if Chrysologus suggests that there was daily mass in his times, F. Sottocornoli (*L’anno liturgico*, op. cit., p. 144–148) suggests that the term *cotidiana* meant that it was celebrated often but not each day.

men of the Church.\textsuperscript{120} What is important, Salvian of Marseilles expressed himself humbly about the Church and its sacramental ministry. He claimed that in return for prayer, a good life in faith and participation in sacraments, there will be a reward in Heaven.\textsuperscript{121}

4.2.3.4. Monarchial Church

Both Salvian of Marseilles and Peter Chrysologus only included members of the clergy in the hierarchy of the Church. Peter Chrysologus talked about the hierarchic structure of the Church. What is interesting, the bishop of the imperial (at the time) Ravenna only mentioned the bishop of Ravenna twice.\textsuperscript{122} But he would speak about the bishops in a more general manner. He used the term \textit{sacerdotis} (clergymen)\textsuperscript{123} and thought that all bishops have the power to absolve sins.\textsuperscript{124}

The teaching of the bishops, similarly to the teaching of the Apostles, is a continuation of the Lord’s words and that is why it is important for all people.\textsuperscript{125} Chrysologus used the term \textit{doctoris} (those who teach),\textsuperscript{126} which usually applied to the bishop as the one who had the power to teach in the Church.\textsuperscript{127} Thus, the bishops are entitled to spread the word of God\textsuperscript{128} and

\begin{flushright}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 2: OSPC 1, 200; compare: Lk 12:48.
\item Blaise-Chirat, 729, writes the term \textit{sacerdos}, -otis, m, 6. In Christian Latin meant (ever since the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century): bishops and priests. But ever since the times of Tertullian and later St. Augustine this term was usually assigned to bishops only.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 84, 7: OSPC 2, 164.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 1–2: OSPC 1, 200; compare: Lk 12:41–46.
\item Blaise-Chirat, 289, suggests that the term \textit{doctor}, -oris, m, in its basic meaning is 1. One who teaches, a professor of something; 2. a doctor of Law (Biblical, Old Testament meaning); 3. A priest, who teaches religion; 4. an Apostle or an important person of the Church (\textit{doctores sanctae ecclesiae; doctores defensoresque ecclesiae}).
\item R. Benericetti, OSPC 1, no. 1, 200.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 140 ter, 1: OSPC 3, 98. This sermon was attributed to Peter Chrysologus by D. De Bruyene, \textit{Nouveaux sermons de saint Pierre Chrysologue}, “The Journal of Theological Studies” 29 (1928), p. 362–368, later indirectly by A. Olivar, \textit{Sobre un}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushright}
Christ himself is the ‘highest Priest.’\textsuperscript{129} Abraham was the prefiguration of the priesthood of the New Testament, as sanctifying in faith, “himself being an offering, a pontiff, a clergyman and the thing offered.”\textsuperscript{130}

Peter Chrysologus did not comment any monastic forms of life in the 5th century Church. Whereas, Salvian listed all known forms of consecrated life (consecrated widows and virgins, the so called white marriages and monks).\textsuperscript{131} For Salvian of Marseilles it was obvious that any forms Christian life dedicated to God can be developed within the Church only. For this reason, Salvian stressed its ascetic, expiatory and eschatological diamination. But what is lacking, is a wider eschatological perspective, where we could see what role monastic life had in the Church.\textsuperscript{132}

Apart from a few moralizing comments about clergymen, Salvian was reserved in this matter.\textsuperscript{133} He only said that, the Church as a spiritual community, it is also a community of material goods. For this reason what the Church owns, should be multiplied by the faithful and the clergymen themselves should support it with their own wealth too.\textsuperscript{134}

4.2.3.5. Marriage

In his discussion on the subject of Christian marriage Peter Chrysologus referred to Biblical texts, without referring to any philosophical tradi-
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tion.\textsuperscript{135} Marriage for him was a divine institution and a natural one in which the spouses strive to join as one.\textsuperscript{136} What is interesting, the basis of marriage for Chrysologus was not love but justice and holiness.\textsuperscript{137} Pointing to the marriage of St. Zechariah and St. Elizabeth as model marriages, Chrysologus stressed the virtues of an ideal marriage: mutual justice in front of God, a unity in their thinking, a unity of holiness of the two and a spiritual unity despite sex differences.\textsuperscript{138} According to Chrysologus the pride and sense of marriage as God’s institution was procreation and spreading kindness (compare Gen 1:28; 2:7. 23–25; Lk 11:11).\textsuperscript{139} In the virtues of the father and mother and their credits, one can distinguish the dignity of their children.\textsuperscript{140} For Chrysologus, marriage was differed in its aim from virginity,\textsuperscript{141} which as an evangelical virtue should herald eternity and for this reason spiritually exceeds the worldly order of marriage.\textsuperscript{142} For Chrysologus, the tension between virginity – marriage was only a rhetoric problem of the end of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{143}


\textsuperscript{136} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermon 99}, 2: OSPC 2, 262. Compare: 1 Cor 11:11; Mt 19:6; Mk 10:9; Gen 2:24; Mk 19:5.

\textsuperscript{137} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermon 91}, 2: OSPC 2, 212; compare: Lk 1:6.


\textsuperscript{139} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermon 55}, 2: OSPC 1, 372; compare: Lk 11:11–13; Ps 34:12; Gen 1:28; 2:7. 23–25.

\textsuperscript{140} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermon 91}, 6: OSPC 2, 216.

\textsuperscript{141} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermon 91}, 6: OSPC 2, 214; compare: Lk 1:7; 1 Cor 3:16.

\textsuperscript{142} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermon 92}, 3: OSPC 2, 218; Lk 1:24.

Together with his wife, Salvian of Marseilles resigned from sexual intercourse for spiritual reasons and lead a life of ascetic chastity instead. For this reason, he did not write about the institution of marriage but only justified his internal choice to his wife’s parents.\textsuperscript{144} By resigning from sexual intercourse, with time in his writings, he ‘spiritualized’ the institution of marriage which from the moment of choosing an ascetic form of life, should bear not physical but spiritual offspring.\textsuperscript{145} The fruit of being together should only be the bond with God and holiness.\textsuperscript{146}

4.2.3.6. Heresy and heretics

Peter Chrysologus talked about about heresy and heretics, who through their teachings destroy the unity of the Church. As heretics he understood Arianism.\textsuperscript{147} It is possible, that just like Tertulian he was convinced that all heresy is a consequence of some human philosophy.\textsuperscript{148} Additionally, in accordance with the Letter to the Romans 12, 1, he thought that the reason for mistaken reasoning was stupidity, arrogance and sin itself.\textsuperscript{149} In the Bishop’s opinion only the Catholic Church represented true faith but even there, there were many heretics, thus in his view conscious Christians are merciful Christians.\textsuperscript{150}

Also for Salvian of Marseilles, Arianism was a common heresy among Germanic tribes.\textsuperscript{151} Discussing the issue of heresy in the Church, Salvian

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{144} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Epistula} 4, 5: \textit{SCh} 176, 92.
  \item \textsuperscript{145} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Epistula} 4, 12: \textit{SCh} 176, 94.
  \item \textsuperscript{146} Salvian of Marseilles was not unique in his thinking. Another famous celibate of the Western Church - St. Paulinus of Nola talked about the spiritualization of the institution of marriage for an ascetic life. To read about the spiritualization of Christian marriage from ascetic point of view see: D. Kasprzak, \textit{Il pensiero sociale di Paolino da Nola}, op. cit, p. 134–152.
  \item \textsuperscript{147} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 21, 4: \textit{OSPC} 1, 312.
  \item \textsuperscript{148} R. Benericetti, \textit{OSPC} 1, no. 4, 313.
  \item \textsuperscript{149} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 109, 4: \textit{OSPC} 2, 330.
  \item \textsuperscript{150} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 21: \textit{OSPC} 1, 176.
\end{itemize}
claimed that the basic reasons for heresy include: incorrect translations of the Bible,\textsuperscript{152} defects in Roman culture and law\textsuperscript{153} and lack of awareness in accepting the wrong faith.\textsuperscript{154}

Even though there are other churches\textsuperscript{155} a Christian should always cultivate the religiousness coming from his own Christian identity as the right to inherit heavenly goods\textsuperscript{156} comes from your own good deeds. The fact that committing heresy was a barbarian act was an important opinion, shared by both Salvian and the Church in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{157}

4.2.3.7. The aims of pastoral work of the Church – Chrysologus’ description
One can wonder why justifying the usefulness of pastoral work was only Chrysologus’ domain. We do not see such reflection in Salvian’s works, probably because he was only a Presbiterian minister and he saw the reason for pastoral work in the pastor in the strict meaning of the word and not in the bishop.

As a Bishop, Chrysologus felt he had been ordained to explain the Gospel to the faithful.\textsuperscript{158} The authority of the Church teaching was to be used to pass the truth about the salvation in Christ.\textsuperscript{159} Christ’s teaching about the freedom of salvation was a Church norm for the Bishop

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
152 Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 6: SCh 220, 314.
153 Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 8: SCh 220, 316.
158 Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 89, 1: OSPC 2, 198; compare: Gen 1:31; Lk 2:34; 2 Cor 2:16.
159 Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 112, 5: OSPC 2, 344; compare: Rom 5:17; Wis 1:3.
\end{flushright}
of Ravenna. One could only become a pastor of the Church, that is a Bishop only through apostolic succession and the candidate had to have the right features of a good pastor. Even though there were norms, describing an ideal pastor, Chrysologus was fully aware of human weaknesses of the human pastors.

Chrysologus testifies that the usual title of the Bishop of Ravenna in the 5th century was pontifex. The Bishop was the lord of the house of Lord as its vigilant and trustworthy administrator who just like a Shephard summoned his sheep, through the voice of the Church – the sheep of the Church. It was the pastor’s role to take care the salvation of the faithful. The evangelical clergyman delivered the word of God in the Church, where he ruled. In the opinion of Chrysologus, the people of the Church were first of all the dispensers of the word of God for all. The clergyman’s power in Church was spiritual, especially to dissolve sins. The faithful were sinful and spiritually weak and that is why...
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the pastors of the Church fulfilled the role given to them by Jesus Christ, one of reconciliation with God.\textsuperscript{172}

The Church as the work of Christ, is always part of its founder and it is always heading towards God.\textsuperscript{173} The visible effect of the work of the pastors of the Church should be the spiritual transformation of the faithful: from wandering human beasts into God’s sheep.\textsuperscript{174} But the final aim of the Church is the resurrection and salvation of the faithful.\textsuperscript{175} This healing and transformation takes place in the community of the Church. Chrysologus compares the pastors of the Church to celestial doctors, who act with the power of Christ humbled to human kind.\textsuperscript{176} Chrysologus stresses the constant presence of Christ in the word of God in the Old and New Testament.\textsuperscript{177} Chrysologus compares the Christians themselves, who fight their own weaknesses and the evil of the outside world to Christ’s soldiers.\textsuperscript{178} The satan is the one who draws them away from the community of the faithful and tempts them.\textsuperscript{179} The pastor should, therefore encourage the faithful to keep their faith and to remain in the Church itself.\textsuperscript{180}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{172} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 85} ter 1: OSPC 2, 174; compare: Ac 1:3; Eph 4:8; 2 Cor 3:17.
\item \textsuperscript{173} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 99}, 3: OSPC 2, 262; compare: Eph 5:32.
\item \textsuperscript{174} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 6}, 1: OSPC 1, 80; compare: Lk 15:25; Jn 10:11–52; 21:15–16; 1 Cor 3:2.
\item \textsuperscript{176} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 38}, 3–5: OSPC 1, 274–276; Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 105}, 3: OSPC 2, 304.
\item \textsuperscript{177} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 169}, 4: OSPC 3, 274.
\item \textsuperscript{178} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 27}, 1: OSPC 1, 208; compare: Ps 74 (73):12.
\item \textsuperscript{179} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 105}, 3–9: OSPC 2, 304–308. Chrysologus stressed the weakness of the demon in order to encourage the faithful to do good. On the other hand, Chrysologus confirmed the widely held opinion that the fight against the devil must be supported by God’s grace as demons are common and strong. To read more about about fighting the devil see: P. G. Van der Nat, \textit{Geister (Dämonen)}, RACh IX, Stuttgart 1976, 734–757; J. B. Russell, \textit{Satan. The Early Christian Tradition}, London 1981; \textit{Il Demonio e i suoi complici. Dottrine e credenze demonologiche nella tarda antichità}, a cura di S. Pricocco, Messina 1995; \textit{Il diavolo e i suoi angeli. Testi e tradizioni (secoli I–III)}, a cura di A. M. Castagno, Fiesole (Fi) 1996.
\item \textsuperscript{180} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 132}, 6: OSPC 3, 58; compare: Ps 133 (132):1.
\end{itemize}
The pastor of the Church also encourages peace among the rulers of his
times\textsuperscript{181} and takes the prayers of those rulers to God.\textsuperscript{182}

Chrysologus also mentioned the common priesthood of the faithful.\textsuperscript{183}
Thanks to the teaching of the Church, it should have the virtues of the
Christian bee: pure, virgin, full of love, obedient, showing the order of
things, convinced about its actions and full of enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{184} The wealth
of the Church are always poor people, who put their trust in God.\textsuperscript{185}
However, Peter Chrysologus regretted that the Jews were not open to the
教学 of Christ, describing their stance as spiritual blindness.\textsuperscript{186}

4.3. Characteristic aspects of the Church’s teachings’
in the 5\textsuperscript{th} c.

Thematic doctrinal teaching was less dominant in the sermons of Saint
Peter Chrysologus than in the works of Salvian of Marseilles. This was due
to the fact that in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, the official teaching of the Church was
done by the bishop.\textsuperscript{187} Salvian did not preach in public and as a writer he
was more of a moralizer than a theologian.

\textsuperscript{181} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 85 ter, 3: OSPC 2, 176. Galla Placidia and her son Valen-
tinian III were present during Chrysologus’ sermon. Chrysologus mentions ‘mutual com-
minion’ to encourage peace in the imperial family. To read more about the empress and the

\textsuperscript{182} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 130, 3: OSPC 3, 42. This sermon was delivered in the pres-

\textsuperscript{183} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 108, 4–6: OSPC 3, 274. 276. To read about the candlestick
given by Galla Placidia as a gift to the Church of Ravenna see: C. Nauerth, \textit{Evangelienbuch,
Leuchter und Kelch – Zur Bedeutung einiger Vasa Sacra für die Ravennatische Kirchengeschichte},
[in:] \textit{Divitiae Aegypti. Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause},

\textsuperscript{184} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 130 bis: OSPC 3, 44.

\textsuperscript{185} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 135, 2: OSPC 3, 64. 66.

\textsuperscript{186} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 176, 8: OSPC 3, 314; compare: Mk 8:22–26; Ps 21:17.

\textsuperscript{187} \textit{Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua} 20: \textit{Canones Apostolorum et conciliorum, saeculi 4–7}, vol. 1,
V\textsuperscript{e} siècles)}, vol. 3, Paris 1918, p. 342–343, analyzing the documents of the Church in the West
in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century (\textit{Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua} 20; the Council of Carthage of May 1\textsuperscript{st} 418: \textit{Codex
Ecclesiae Africæ} 121: vol. 1, ed. H. Th. Bruns, Berlin 1839, p. 192) reached a conclusion that
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4.3.1. God

In the Church of Ravenna of the 5th century, God was seen mainly as the Father who is merciful and the one who gives eternal life in Church. The incarnation of a second person of God and His degradation to man was explained by the fact that God tries to direct man to Himself to make the Congregation the centre of His attention. This Congregation is the threefold God in the form of Christ. Through His healing Incarnation, Christ initiates novus ordo. Thanks to this, God forgives humanity and introduces man to a new life.

Chrysologus taught about Jesus as a merciful God who by wishing to atone for all people, descended to limbo. This eschatological Christ is

in areas prone to heresy such as Gaul, Italy or Africa sermons were still the domain of the bishop as his foremost responsibility to make sure that faith remains pure.

188 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 6, 2: OSPC 1, 82; compare: Ps 100 (99); Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 6, 3: OSPC 1, 82.

189 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 6, 4: OSPC 1, 84; compare: J 1:29; Ps 100 (99):5; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 1: OSPC 1, 86. In the opinion of R. Benericetti, Il Cristo nei sermoni di S. Pier Crisologo, op. cit., p. 215–217, the God of the New Testament, the merciful father of all mankind is the main topic of sermons delivered by Chrysologus in the Church of Ravenna. A God full of mercy and fatherly feelings towards all his creatures, eliminates the strict God of the Old Testament as well as the god in pagan faith. In his sermons, Chrysologus tirelessly proclaims the Truth Revealed in the Bible – that God seemed to be a strict Father and through the mystery of incarnation he wishes the elevation of humanity in Heaven, ibidem, p. 219–232.

190 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 71, 7: OSPC 2, 70. Compare: 1 Tim 3:16; Mt 6:31; Jn 6:59.

191 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 72, 6: OSPC 2, 78; compare: Mt 6:10; Col 3:11; Jn 17:21; expresses a similar view in: Sermo 65, 5: OSPC 2, 26–28; compare: Jn 11:39–42; as well as, in Sermo 160, 5: OSPC 3, 222; compare: Mt 3:14; Lk 1:13–17.

192 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 18, 3: OSPC 1, 154; compare: Mt 8:15. Chrysologus mentions the new order here (novus ordo), whereas, St. Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 3, 16, 16: SCh 211, 312–314, expressed a similar view about recapitulatio in the 2nd century. To read more about the ‘new order’ see: R. Benericetti, Il Cristo nei sermoni di S. Pier Crisologo, op. cit., p. 225–229.

193 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 19, 2: ‘to descend’ [‘with Christ’] to unknown limbo/Tartarus: OSPC 1, 160; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 63, 3: OSPC 2, 28. 30, as J. Speigl, Petrus Chrysologus über die Auferstehung der Töten, op. cit., p. 142–146, notes in Sermo 65, 5 that by descending to limbo – Tartarus, he proclaims redemption of people and frees them from the burden of the underworld, devil and death. In the 5th century Western Christian theology the term ‘tartarus’ was still a synonym (Virgil, Eneida 6, 548–636) of hell (Inferi), a place for the dead in general and not a place for serving a sentence. Compare also: C. Colpe, Jenseitsfahrt, II, Rach 17, p. 466–489.
also constantly present in the Church. What is more, by his Incarnation for people, He is ‘a great misterium of mercy, which is in our body. By doing so, He appreciates man’s faith. A man of faith, who acknowledges his affiliation to God, becomes an heir of the Heavenly Kingdom through his faith and humbleness.

Chrysologus understood Catholic soteriology as the coming of Christ and a rebirth of humanity, as well as, a final divinization of man taking place due to this fact. The redeeming Christ is a merciful and patient shepherd for the weaker and sinful man. God, revealed in Christ, summons man to renounce the devil.

In his works, Salvian of Marseilles described Christ as a Saviour, who lived on earth and suffered for humanity. For this reason in present time eschatology, Christ identifies with the poor and needy. Jesus was shown by him as a Carer, Judge and Teacher, whose providence can be noticed in the history of salvation.

194 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 37, 2: OSPC 1, 266; compare: Jn 3:13.
195 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 49, 3: “magnum pietatis est sacramentum, quod nostra manifestatur in carne”: OSPC 1, 340; compare: 1 Tim 3:16.
196 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 50, 1: OSPC 1, 344; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 50, 3: OSPC 1, 346; compare: Mt 9:1–3.
198 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 156, 3: OSPC 3, 198.
200 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 11, 3: OSPC 1, 114 (Chrysologus stressed here the patience Christ had for the Devil during his descent into limbo, when he allowed the demon to act against Him making the Devil fall into the trap He had set); compare: Mt 4:1.
201 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 158, 8: OSPC 3, 214; compare: Mt 2:8.
202 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 4: SCH 176, 188.
203 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 4, 21: SCH 176, 324; compare: Mt 25:34–42; Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 4, 22: SCH 176, 324.
204 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 1, 25–44: SCH 220, 124–142; the description of God Creator ruling the world He had created and being its judge (De Gubernatione Dei 1, 25–27): seeing and punising people for their crimes – examples from the Book of Genesis 2–4 (De Gubernatione Dei 1, 28–29); allowing man his free will (De Gubernatione Dei 1, 30–34); the God who praises for good deeds and punishes for bad ones (De Gubernatione Dei 1, 34); the God who made man go through ordeal in order to make him withstand (De Gubernatione Dei 1, 35–43); the God who assumed the form of a man as He descended to Earth in order to educate people (De Gubernatione Dei 1, 43–44). To read more about Salvian’s concept of God see: L. J. Van Der Lof, Die Gotteskonzeption und das Individuum bei Salvian, StPatr 13 = TU 116 (1975), p. 322–329.
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4.3.2. Eschatology

This topic was mainly present in the sermons of Peter Chrysologus, the ones dedicated to eschatological matters.\(^{205}\) He thought that after death, there is a gradual separation of the soul from the body, which begins to disintegrate, and the soul descends into limbo and awaits resurrection and Judgement.\(^{206}\)

Chrysologus shared the opinion, that the separation of the soul from the body can last from three to thirty or even forty days after death. In case of Lazarus (Sermo 63), this separation took place three days after death.\(^{207}\) For the faithful to notice God in their worldly life, they need contact with the ‘tree of intelligence’ – the evangelical tree grown from the seed of mustard (Mt 13:31). What Chrysologus had in mind, was the wisdom of the Gospel, available to those faithful who lead a decent worldly life.\(^{208}\) The fruit of the ‘tree of intelligence’ finally led to the ‘cosmic cross’\(^{209}\) that is the transfiguration of the entire world and its submission to Christ.\(^{210}\)

---

\(^{205}\) Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 63, 3: OSPC 2, 14; compare: Jn 11:20–25; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 64, 4: OSPC 2, 22.

\(^{206}\) Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 63, 1: OSPC 2, 10; compare: Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 65, 9: OSPC 2, 30.


\(^{208}\) Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 98, 3: OSPC 2, 254; compare: Mt 13:31.


\(^{210}\) Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 98, 5: OSPC 2, 256; compare: Mt 13:31.
Despite the truth about the Final Judgement, segregating the good from the bad (Jn 5:28–29; Mt 25:31–46), Chrysologus shared the opinion of the so called merciful authors, those who thought that thanks to the mercy of Christ, the Church can save those condemned to hell (*apud inferos*). For Chrysologus, Heaven as the final destination for humanity, is beautiful and is the place where the ‘divinization of man’ takes place. Paradoxically, pagans and those who do not believe and as people who do not know the word of God, reject or ignore the possibility of the existence of Heaven because of its beauty, because of God’s promise of transformation and elevation of man’s nature.

Eschatological themes were scarce in the works of Salvian of Marseilles. Their theological content agreed with the religious instruction of the 5th century. The faithful who fulfill God’s will. Will finally reach Heaven thanks to God’s mercy. Heaven itself, is portrayed as a renewed and beautiful reality of those saved and a community living with God and in harmony with those saved. The condemnation of man takes place on earth as it is due to our wrongdoings, mostly dishonest acquisition of wealth.

---


216 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 40: SCh 176, 166. 168; compare: Rom 7:7; Ex 20:17.
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4.3.3. Woman

In the opinion of Chrysologus a woman has an exceptional bond with God.217 This is stressed by her central role in the history of salvation of man through Christ.218 On one hand Chrysologus depicted a sinful downfall of the woman219 but on the other her rise from sin into a new life in Christ. The Bishop of Ravenna often stressed the evangelical fact that women were the first to witness the resurrection of our Lord.220

Peter Chrysologus saw the Blessed Virgin Mary as a woman of faith in the whole meaning of the word.221 The Virgin Mary believed the Creator,222 she conceived her son by the agency of the Holy Spirit,223 gave birth as a virgin224 and remained a virgin.225 Thus her bond with the Creator is an

---


218 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 64, 2: OSPC 2, 18; compare: Ps 119 (118):105; Mt 2:1–12. To read about the doctrine of man coming to man in the four stages of the history of salvation see: A. Luneau, L’histoire du salut chez les Pères de l’Eglise, op. cit., p. 412.

219 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 44, 3: OSPC 1, 310; compare: Gen 3:16.

220 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 77, 7: OSPC 2, 118; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 74, 3–5: OSPC 2, 98. 100 (women, with the Virgin Mary leading the way, were the first to witness Christ’s resurrection; compare: Mt 28:1–3); Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 79, 3–4: OSPC 2, 130 compare: Lk 24:13–35 (women are the first to honour Christ and the first to eagerly hurry to His grave); Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 80, 4: OSPC 2, 116.


223 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 57, 6: OSPC 1, 386 (the Bishop’s comment on the Symbol of faith: Qui natu est de Spiritu Sancto et Maria uirgine).

224 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 49, 4: “uirginitatis partum”: OSPC 1, 342; compare also Peter Chrysologus, Sermi: 60, 7; 87, 1; 103, 6, 140 bis, 1; 140 ter, 1.

225 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 62, 8: “quomodo spiritus generat, uirgo concipit, parit, permanent uirgo post partum”: OSPC 1, 420. 422; similarly Peter Chrysologus, Sermi 62, 8; 75, 3; 117, 1. 3–4; 148, 1.
example of man’s secret contact with God.226 As God’s Mother she helps the believers develop a better bond with God.227

By commenting various liturgical, Biblical texts, Chrysologus pointed to various sinful women, those who did not believe and were the antithesis of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Not all women listened to God, that is why Chrysologus compared women who continued to live in sin like Herodias’ daughter, to wild beasts.228 The death of St. John the Baptist was a warning against contact with women for the Bishop of Ravenna.229 One can also come across typical for antiquity antifeminist texts in his writing. The woman is usually a weak creature, weepy230 and subordinate to man.231 By using similar contrasts, he wrote about the weakness and strength of women on one hand and on the other he stressed the mutual faith God had in both men and women.233

Referring to their role in the Church, Chrysologus compared their role to the service of the Apostles.234 In his comment to Luke 13:10–13,

---

226 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 49, 4: OSPC 1, 342; Peter Chrysologus, 62 bis, 4: “uirgo et spiritus sanctus commercium uirtutis est, caeleste consortium, maiestatis insigne”: OSPC 1, 426, Peter Chrysologus, 142, 7: “Illo, quo tibi aucta sunt omnia, nil minuta. Uirgo, coepit ex te auctor tuus tua ex te oritur origo, in tuo germine est genitor tuus, in tua carne est deus tuus, et ipse lucem mundi per te cepit, qui lucem mundo dedit”; OSPC 3, 110. 112.

227 Chrysologus stresses the connection between the Virgin Mary and the two sacraments: the sacrament of baptism (Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 146, 7–8: OSPC 3, 142. 144) and the Eucharist (Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 67, 7: OSPC 2, 43).

228 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 127, 9: OSPC 3, 30; compare: Mt 14:8.

229 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 174, 9: OSPC 3, 304; compare: Jn 6:35–51; Mt 11:11.


232 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 79, 2–3: OSPC 2, 128. 130; compare: Lk 24:1–3. 11–35; Rom 3.

233 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 80, 1: OSPC 2, 134; compare: Mt 28:5–6; Mt 26:69–75.
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Chrysologus treats the woman healed by Christ as a sign for the Church. But the most meaningful Biblical symbol for him is the role of women in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. As the witnesses of resurrection of our Lord, women are always a sign of the Church when they announce the resurrection of our Lord to the Apostles and they are a harbinger of the freeing of humanity from death, when they tell men the truth about resurrection.

Salvian does not reflect upon women. He does not say anything apart from typical statements of his era, portraying the woman as a weak being, a widow who needs looking after or an ascetic woman who should, first of all develop spiritually.

4.4. Summary

Both authors noticed rather serious vices among the faithful of the 5th century, which included unfaithfulness towards God and a life in sin. This made Christians suffer because of God’s anger. In their works, Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles tried to reprimand people and to encourage them to live a life according to God’s rules. They tried to show such a picture of the Church which would mobilize the Catholics to live a better life. The role model for both authors was the Church of the Apostles.

Church

Chrysologus gives a wider picture of ecclesiology than Salvian. Chrysologus stresses the universality of faith, which leads to salvation of man in God.

236 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 75, 3; OSPC 2, 104.
237 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 76, 3; OSPC 2, 112. 114.
238 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 77, 11; OSPC 2, 120; compare: Mt 28:7.
239 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 38; SCh 176, 214; Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 42: SCh 220, 460.
240 Salvian of Marseilles, *Epistula* 1, 5; SCh 176, 78; compare: 1 Tim 5:3; Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 30; SCh 220, 452; compare: Jdt 13:11.
241 Salvian of Marseilles, *Epistula* 5, 1–5; SCh 176, 108–110 ( a letter to Cattura’s sister, praising the virtue of a Christian woman, a spiritual commendation of asceticism and the superiority of spirit over the body; compare: Rom 8:26; Gal 5:17).
Whereas, Salvian did not comment on the nature of the Catholic Church but as a moralist, he touched upon the subject of the quality of Catholic life. Only the teaching of Chrysologus includes the following: seeing the role of the Church as God’s congregation of people whose faith can make other people lead a life of virtues; Eucharistic ecclesiology understood as the presence of the Eucharistic Christ in in the congregation of the Catholic Church; understanding the Church as a hierarchical structure, whose basis are the bishops who teach Christian faith.

The moralizing and generally religious view of Salvian came down to the following: the Church is a community, which is shaped on the example of Christ; for this reason its members should strive for a union of material goods.

Marriage

It was first of all St. Peter Chrysologus who taught about marriage, for whom marriage was God’s institution, a natural one, the aim of which was to fully unite the spouses. Its role was to fulfill the virtues of justice, holiness and unity. The aim of earthly marriage as God’s institution was in giving each other kindness and procreation, whereas virginity was an eschatological harbinger of man’s future eternity in God. Salvian treated the institution of marriage marginally and suggested ascetic spiritualism typical of the 5th century.

Heresy and heretics

For both writers Arianism was a heresy destroying the unity of the Church. Peter Chrysologus perceived the genesis of Arianism in human philosophy, and also in mistaken thinking, stupidity, arrogance and sinfulness. He promoted being a conscious Christian, who is merciful and takes into account human mistakes. For Salvian the reason for Arianism was incorrect translation of the Bible, inadequate education of the faithful in Roman culture and law and an unconscious acceptance of misconceptions of faith. He thought, just like Chrysologus that a Christian exposed to many different faiths, should first of all develop the religiousness coming from his own Christian identity.
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The aims of pastoral work of the Church

Only Peter Chrysologus defined them, pinpointing the role of the Bishop as that of a pastor of the Church and a teacher of the Gospel, appointed solely by Christ. The Bishop was to be a careful and trustworthy administrator of the house of God, making the faithful come together. He should care about their faith and harmony between them, but first of all about their salvation in Christ. Chrysologus also mentioned general priesthood of God’s people, from whom he demanded virtues and expected them to see their wealth in poor people, pinning their hopes in the God.

Characteristic aspects of the Church’s teachings’ in the 5th c

As Bishop, Peter Chrysologus was mainly responsible for teaching. His views are expressed in the Sermones. His sermons are a cohesive interpretation of 5th century Catholic ecclesiology. His teaching concerns God, eschatological issues and the role of women in Church. The role of the bishop is defined as in the case of earlier apostles as one which encourages the faithful to consciously choose Christ and to aspire to meet God in Heaven. The ecclesiology of the 5th century is absolutely pastoral. It is orthodox in doctrine and includes theological topics.

Compared to the elaborate ecclesiology of Peter Chrysologus, the ecclesiastic instruction of Salvian of Marseilles who had minor orders and was not entitled to teaching is limited and fragmentary. It has the value of religious education only but is not without personal elements. Salvian had an ascetic and radical attitude to Church issues. He stresses the joint character of the Church, concerning the ideal of missionary work and the responsibilities of the clergy.
5. Sin and Christian virtue in the 5th century

In his theological anthropology St. Peter Chrysologus describes man through the angle of greatness and his meanness. The greatness of man is carried out through God’s creation of human beings, their final life with God, as well as coming to God, not so much through nature but through credit for good deeds. The smallness of man is seen through human weakness, giving in to illusion as well as sin. God frees human being from meanness, God always grants the pleading sinner forgiveness but this is not the result of the sinner’s penance but solely the divine grace of God. In Salvian’s theological anthropology the basis of human dignity is the creation by God who takes care of man, grants life to receive salvation, summons him by cherishing virtues and rejecting sins. Man in his earthly life is first of all weak and sinful and that is why Salvian stresses human strive towards internal perfection.

5.1. Sin

The Bishop of Ravenna St. Peter Chrysologus taught that in their earthly life every human being is a sinner, cannot escape from God, alone cannot free oneself from the evil of sin, from the weakness of one’s body nor the temptation of Satan. God always forgives the pleading sinner but the reason of God’s forgiveness and ultimate salvation of the human being is not the sinner’s penance but solely the divine grace of God. The sin itself is an affliction of human life and itself does not determine the essence of human life as a human is created for immortality and mortality as punishment is the result of the original sin and has ripped the human being of immortality.
The evil of sin has not been created by God together with human nature. It is the result of a catastrophe in history caused by Satan that is why the evil of sin of the individual always comes from Satan. Despite Satan and the weakness of human nature since the original sin, each individual sin is the result of human thought. It is always an act against God and his commandments and distances the human from God. For Salvian each sin is an insult to God and is always some form of a negation of God. A notorious sinner always diminishes the scale of his offence and always justifies it. Many people seem to forget eternal God who is a transcendent Observer and Judge and is omnipresent and judges human deeds.

5.1.1. Earthly weakness of the human

St. Peter Chrysologus perceived the human being, both through his greatness and smallness. A human being examined from earthly point of view is created to live with God which he achieves having sinned, not because of sinless nature but through an advancement in virtues. Human meanness in earthly life is caused by his sinful nature. But thanks to the incarnation of God and his atonement he always wishes to grant divine grace – forgiveness to the pleading sinner, performing penance. Whereas, Salvian, noticing the dignity of human nature as one created and set up to be with God, concentrated in his anthropological reflection on the scale of human weakness and sins. What prevails is ascetic inner perfection but there is no mention of abandoning sinfulness thanks to God’s mercy.

5.1.1.1. St. Peter Chrysologus

An analysis of the Bishop’s sermons allows a reconstruction of his anthropological theology which is a pastoral development of Biblical thesis which he comments. The human being is described by Chrysologus in two major ways in greatness and in smallness. What is emphasized in greatness is the dimension of the human as God’s creation, his final vocation to live

---

1 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 33, 3: OSPC 1, 244, 246; *Sermo* 69, 6: OSPC 2, 58 *Sermo* 70, 3: OSPC 2, 60, 62; *Sermo* 72, 3: OSPC 2, 74, 76; *Sermo* 87, 5–6: OSPC 2, 186, 188; *Sermo* 88, 4: OSPC 2, 192, 194; *Sermo* 91, 7: OSPC 2, 216; 143, 10: OSPC 3, 120.

---

201
with God, in glory of the Almighty. He therefore even crosses Heaven and reaches God himself but not through nature alone but through virtues.

The mightiness of human being depends also on the ability of accepting God’s gifts through faith. The rest of the Creation is meant for man and man being free of other dependence should be God’s servant. Through God’s will the human being is the administrator on earth who should perfect the reality of nature and as a wanderer himself should be heading from earth to Heaven.

What Chrysologus stressed though, was human smallness. In earthly life the human being is viewed as weak, disillusioned, a slave of sin who is forever imperfect and sins because of his imperfection. Each human being is a sinner and a sinner cannot run away from God. A man cannot liberate himself from evil caused by his own deeds, from the weakness of his own body and from Satan’s temptation. A man living on earth is constantly exposed to temptation which is ‘a deceitful appearance, hiding good things in evil ones and evil in good ones.

---

2 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 70, 2: OSPC 2, 60.
3 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 120, 7: OSPC 2, 394.
6 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 161, 2: OSPC 3, 226 compare 1 Cor 7:23.
7 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 125, 4: OSPC 3, 10; compare Gen 4:10; Lk 16:1; Heb 4:13.
8 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 132, 1: OSPC 3, 54.
9 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 44, 3–4: OSPC 1, 308, 310.
10 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 45, 2: OSPC 1, 314; compare Ps 6:3.
11 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 6, 2: OSPC 1, 82.
12 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 30, 4: OSPC 1, 228; compare Rom 6:12.
13 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 34, 1: OSPC 1, 250; compare Ps 32 (31):1; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 41, 2: OSPC 1, 290, 292; compare Rom 7:15; similarly Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 45, 1: OSPC 1, 314; compare Ps 6:3; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 148 bis, 1: OSPC 3, 158.
14 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 30, 4–5: OSPC 1, 228; compare Ps 51 (50):7; Ps 130 (129):3; Ps 143 (142):2; Rom 3:20; 6:12; Gal 2:16.
15 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 2, 3: OSPC 1, 56; compare Lk 15:18–19.
16 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 12, 3; OSPC 1, 120.
18 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 70, 10: OSPC 2, 64.
19 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 67, 9: OSPC 2, 44; compare Mt 6:13; Job 7:1; Peter Chrysologus expresses a similar opinion in *Sermo* 68, 9: OSPC 2, 50.
and by using evil, and through ignorance leads man to his downfall.\textsuperscript{20} The Bishop of Ravenna taught that it is not God who is responsible for temptation\textsuperscript{21} but temptation is a ‘bitter’ instrument of Satan, making it easier for Satan to act on man.\textsuperscript{22} That is why a responsible person wants to obtain God’s forgiveness.\textsuperscript{23} God wishes to forgive the sinner performing penance, that is why he is incarnated as a human being and by being among people he shows the possibility of forgiveness and bringing the human to Heaven.\textsuperscript{24}

God always grants the pleading sinner forgiveness but this is not the result of the sinner’s penance but solely the divine grace of God,\textsuperscript{25} Chrysologus refers here to a close-knit relationship – commercium between God and human, resulting from a unity of man and God in Christ, leading to human salvation.\textsuperscript{26}

His teachings of God’s constant forgiveness are further stressed by using an allegoric symbol of given numbers. Number seven symbolizes our idea of the Holy Spirit and also the enlightenment of the Church, the seven days of creation and the seven decades of saving the world. The symbol of seventy seven is the expression of God’s constant forgiveness to seventy seven generations of people so therefore all people. According to Chrysologus, number forty expresses the abolition of evil during the Ascension of Christ – 40 days after resurrection. The number fifty means the freedom of mankind regained in the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{20} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 71, 9: OSPC 2, 70.
\textsuperscript{21} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 70, 9: OSPC 2, 62; compare Job 1:13; Gen 3.
\textsuperscript{22} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 72, 9: OSPC 2, 78.
\textsuperscript{23} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 139, 5: OSPC 3, 86; compare Lk 17:4.
\textsuperscript{24} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 30, 3: OSPC 1, 228; compare Mt 9:10–11.
\textsuperscript{25} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 85 ter, 1: OSPC 2, 174.
\textsuperscript{26} Compare \textit{Sermi}: 140; 143; 156; 160. Saint Peter Chrysologus uses the term commercium as a technical term describing the mystery of the incarnation of God. To read more about Chrysologus’ concept of S commercium see: M. Herz, \textit{Sacrum Commercium. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zur Theologie der römischen Liturgie-Sprache}, München 1958, p. 111–122; R. Benericetti, \textit{Il Cristo nei sermoni}, op. cit., p. 101–103.
\textsuperscript{27} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 85 ter, 1: OSPC 1, 174; In the opinion of F. Sottocornol (\textit{L’anno liturgico}, op. cit., p. 132; 197), Sermo 85 was delivered during Pentecost, thus the extended symbolism of numbers.
God is looking for man, not his sin.28 As God Christ accepts sinners, not their sins but on the other hand does not allow those he accepts to remain in sin.29 Christ has proved by his incarnation and suffering that he really loves sinners and absolves their sins as God.30 A sinner who has admitted his sin and whom God has forgiven, has his share in Christ and therefore in life, in resurrection, in forgiving sins and finally in divinity.31 The earthly absolution of sin is proof of the Eucharist of sinners aware of their sins. They understand that their absolution happens through God and not through justice.32 That is why the sinner expressing his sins is healed by God but the potential punishment is always individual as it is connected with the freedom of sin.33 In the opinion of Chrysologus a complete absolution will take place once people stop committing sins, therefore in eschatological times.34

5.1.1.2. Salvian
Salvian saw the basis of human dignity in his creation by God. The guarantee of human dignity is the continuity of God’s care for and respect for the human being35 as one created by God and36 meant for salvation.37

28 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 54, 6: OSPC 1, 368; compare Ps 51 (50):11; Ps 138 (137):8.
29 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 168, 3 OSPC 3, 266; compare Lk 15:2.
30 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 29, 4: OSPC 1, 224.
31 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 30, 3: OSPC 1, 228; compare Mt 9:10–11.
33 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 35, 2: OSPC 1, 256.
34 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 139, 8 OSPC 3, 88.
35 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 2, 8: “Ecce habes iugiter disponentem deum, iugiter gubernantem, quamuis in isto scripturae loco non gubernatio tantum sacra sed etiam dignitas declaretur humana”; compare: Sir 39:10; Latin version of the text: Sir 39:10 which Salvian used (perhaps the Afra) is similar to the translation which appears in the Vulgate: “Et ipse diriget consilium ejus, et disciplinam, et in absconditis suis consiliabitur”. Most probably, Salvian compares the Latin term ‘diriget’ (leads, rules) with a phonetically similar term ‘diliget’ (loves, respects).
God loves man on Earth and spreads his Divine Providence\textsuperscript{38} by love of virtues and a rejection of sins, something everyone will be assessed for during Final Judgement.\textsuperscript{39}

In his anthropological reflection man is first of all presented as weak\textsuperscript{40} and sinful.\textsuperscript{41} Salvian’s anthropological perspective is ascetic. It stresses the importance of human action in the process of internal transformation but deliberately does not stress the continuity of God’s influence on man. Man has the ability to change by redefining his earthly life according to the Gospel. We are all destined for perfection leading to eternal life.\textsuperscript{42} But there are unavoidable obstacles along the way which come from earthly settlements and not eternal ones such as family goods or family ties.\textsuperscript{43} In order to avoid earthly judgments, it is necessary according to Salvian to remember about the end of our earthly existence and to redefine our life taking death and the limited amount of time man has, into consideration. Together with human life, all human passions come to an end.\textsuperscript{44}

5.1.2. The science of sin

Peter Chrysologus taught about the nature of original sin and its consequences, about the evil of sin as such and about the sin of the individual from a religious point of view. In his opinion sin is not the essence of man, created and meant for eternal life. Incarnated God, Jesus Christ – renewed...
and expiated man’s nature for all of humanity. Thanks to God’s love and kindness man’s sins can be overcome, therefore Chrysologus encouraged the faithful to combat their sins. Salvian’s opinion of sin was far more modest. He saw sin as an act of man, an act which is always a negation of God and therefore man will be punished accordingly. As a merciful teacher God allows sin but does not prolong their suffering.

5.1.2.1. The original sin. Peter Chrysologus

The way Chrysologus saw the sin of the first people was typical of the teaching of the Church at the time. The Bishop of Ravenna did not argue with the Pelagians. He tried to pass on the basic Biblical and Church view on sin. To describe the nature of sin, Chrysologus used Aristotelian terms used by Roman Neostoics or simply by the Fathers of the Church of the 4th and 5th century. Commenting The Epistle to the Romans 5, 12, the Bishop of Ravenna came to a conclusion that sin itself is a human affliction and does not determine the essence of the human. “Is sin part of nature and substance? No, it is neither nature or substance but an affliction and it is an opposite force, manifesting itself in work done, experienced in punishment, attacking the soul, mind wounding, violating and shaking nature itself.”

Chrysologus viewed man as created by God for eternity. Death as punishment for the original sin has ripped man off immortality. The nature of human being was perceived by the Chrysologus not as metahistorical reality but solely as the individual’s nature, historically handed down by birth. Human nature as such was defined by the first parents – Adam and Eve. Immortal nature, corrupted by sin became mortal by breaking off from God. Sin itself and its main result that is mortality of man was defined as *accidens* or compared to some contagious disease which perverted

---


Part II: A comparison of chosen pastoral problems...

human nature but never defined nature. Man himself was not able to return to his original nature – united with God and immortal. Thus the second ‘first man’ in the form of Jesus Christ – improving and expiating human nature for all humanity.47

Chrysologus differentiated between the sin of the first parents and the individual sin of man.48 The sin of the praparents became a catastrophe resulting in separation from God, physical death, the rule of Devil over man and lust. In his learning he was closer to pre-Augustan theological tradition, especially to the soteriology of Ambrosiaster.49 In his claims concerning handing down sin and its consequences on man, Chrysologus did not pay much attention to the anti-Pelagian controversy. Instead, he confirmed the official Catholic doctrine of Saint Augustine of Hippo.50 But contrary to Augustine while joining in the discussion on ancestoral sin51 (as sin ‘con-
tracted’, not ‘committed’), instead of concentrating on guilt, he stressed the universal character of redemption through Jesus Christ.52

5.1.2.2. The evil of sin
Sin is perceived by the Bishop of Ravenna as specific evil, which had not been created by God together with human nature, but it was the result of an accident caused by the Devil. Chrysologus wished to show the mysterious bond between human nature and sin. He stressed the importance of redemption of human nature through Jesus Christ, who as God took on human nature, but without sin. Evil is not created, instead it is an affliction.53 It is not a being but an affliction of being.54

The evil of individual sin always comes from the Devil, described as ‘the root of evil, the beginning of meanness, no friend of things, an enemy of human being.’55 Evil never comes from God, who created everything as ‘good’ and ‘pure,’ whereas, Devil by corrupting all beings, distorted the good and made the world ‘impure.’56 All human evil has its roots

54 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 96, 6: OSPC 2, 246.
55 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 11, 1: “Diabolus mali auctor, nequitiae origo, rerum hostis, secundi hominis semper inimicus”: OSPC 1, 112.
56 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 96, 4: OSPC 2, 244.
Part II: A comparison of chosen pastoral problems…

in the Devil. The Devil always weakens man and leads him into temptation. The Devil is the cause of evil in man and wants eternal damnation. For this reason the rite of baptism has always played an important role in freeing the faithful from Satan.

Bad deeds are strictly connected with sin. Chrysologus noticed that the fatal consequences of the evil of sin, such as “death, grave, immorality, decay, stench are not God’s will but are a result of man’s fault.” The outcome of evil is not eternal for the faithful. As atoned for by Christ, they experience evil in their earthly life only. By patiently bearing evil, the faithful await the future reward and an eternal victory of the faithful in God.

The resurrection of Lazarus of Bethany an annihilation of death and summoning the dead from limbo is living proof of cancelling the results of sin. This evangelical event was interpreted by Christ as an example of the resurrection of a single member of the congregation, as well as, an announcement of the resurrection of Christ himself.

5.1.2.3. Individual sin

Each individual sin is a result of man’s thought, independent of Devil’s actions and weakness of human nature due to original sin. In earthly

---

57 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 11, 1: OSPC 1, 112; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 67, 10: OSPC 2, 44; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 70, 10: OSPC 2, 64; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 71, 10: OSPC 2, 70; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 96, 4: OSPC 2, 244.
58 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 11, 1: OSPC 1, 112.
59 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 131, 7: OSPC 3, 48.
60 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 158, 8: OSPC 3, 214.
62 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 15, 2: OSPC 1, 136.
64 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 71, 3: OSPC 2, 68.
life, each individual sin of man striving for unity with God, is a flaw and an obstacle in a unity with those living in Heaven. Chrysologus stresses the timelessness of human responsibility, as man is responsible for each individual sin and God knows all of our sins.

As an act against God, sin affects all human activity (intellect, the soul and the body). Man needs God’s grace to free himself from earthly sin and to come back to God. A man left alone, separated from God, in sin, leaves him in weakness and death. Chrysologus notices that the weakness of human nature encourages sin, and an internal feeling of being lost stops man from admitting his weakness to God. Despite these obstacles, resulting from weakness and sinfulness of human nature, man bears full individual responsibility for his sin. Sins are acts committed voluntarily and thus burdens human conscience. For this reason voluntarily committed sins which burden the man are different from illness or weakness which are independent of human will.

Chrysologus notices that sin is always a man’s act against God and His Commandments. Sin distances man from God because where there is God, there is no sin. The consequence of sin perceived as distancing from God is punishment in the form of death, even though human nature is designed for life. Individual immorality through sin leads man to physical death, which is the most characteristic consequence of sin. By drifting away way from God, the sinner commits an offence, no matter whether he committed it consciously or through ignorance. A sin...
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65 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 71, 3: OSPC 2, 68; compare Gal 4:6; Mt 6:9.
66 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 2, 3: OSPC 1, 56; compare Lk 15:18–19.
68 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 6, 2: OSPC 1, 82.
69 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 34, 1: OSPC 1, 250.
70 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 35, 2: OSPC 1, 256.
71 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 44, 5 OSPC 1, 312.
72 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 44, 5: “Vbi deus, peccatum nullum; ubi peccatum, non ibi deus”: OSPC 1, 312.
73 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 111, 5: OSPC 2, 340; compare Rom 5:12; Jn 1:29.
74 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 118, 5: OSPC 2, 382.
75 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 26, 8: OSPC 1, 206.
remains an offence against God, though punishment depends on the consciousness of the sinner at the time of committing the offence. Despite his downfall, a believer wishes repentance, whereas the non-believer prefers to stay away from God. Therefore, Chrysologus describes two types of sinners: Christians as sinners believing in God bewail their sins and hope for redemption and those lacking faith, crying at the graves of the dead, while they remain to be non-believers. Often this takes on the form of hypocritical mourning.

A sinner who believes in God, making his way to God, is aware of his redemption. The Christian believes that Jesus Christ as God Incarnate has washed away all sins in the Jordan River. Because of redemption, man’s sin has been annulled by Jesus Christ who is the Judge of all people in eternal life. One who has through his incarnation proved to be a loving father and servant.

Chrysologus stresses the fact that on his way to abandoning sin, man is never left alone. What brings hope is salvation through Jesus Christ and the opportunity for eternal life to sinners. No one is left alone in their weakness and sinfulness. Each sin, according to Chrysologus, causes God’s reaction. God gives his grace to the sinner just like the father accepts the Prodigal Son (Lucas 15, 11–32). Through penance, a reformed sinner returns to God but is not yet free as this will take place in Heaven. Therefore God constantly offers His help to sinners, granting them grace. This can be compared to the touch of a physician, who frees man of the illness of sin and directs to holiness.

Thanks to God’s love and kindness, His grace, man’s sins can be overcome. All sinners are therefore encouraged to overcome their sins. But
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76 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 65, 2: OSPC 2, 24.
77 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 19, 5: OSPC 1, 164.
79 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 29, 4: OSPC 1, 224.
80 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 45, 6: OSPC 1, 316; compare Is 53:4; Jn 1:29; Ps 6:4–5.
81 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 30, 3: OSPC 1, 228.
82 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 3, 2: OSPC 1, 60; compare Lk 15:10.
84 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 12, 2: OSPC 1, 118; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 30, 4: OSPC 1, 228, 230.
man must concentrate on God, as God like a physician grants grace to the man but not to sin.85

5.1.2.4. Sin according to Salvian

Each sin is an offence against God.86 As a human act, sin is always a negation of God therefore every sinner will be rightly punished for his deeds: “you will be judged accordingly to how you judged others, you will receive what you have chosen. You will not enjoy the company of the Lord you have negated, instead you will be with the contemptible, whose company you have chosen.”87

The very desire to commit evil is the beginning of sin.88 Remaining in bad desire, changes the man’s reasoning and he begins to commit sin out of a liking for bad deeds.89 Remaining in sin makes the sinners lose a sense of reality and leads to mental blindness. This results in personal tragedies and death.90 In a Christian dimension, a sin is perceived as a result of ‘futile faith’ without ‘good deeds’91 or a result of a pharisaical hypocrisy of a judge, who forgives himself an act but condemns others mercilessly for the same act.92

A notorious sinner, constantly diminishes his crime and always finds a justification for it, sticking to the rule that no matter how big the offence, the offender will always find justification for it.93 Whereas, saintly people always look for the word of God and pondering these words, they know that they will be judged for their deeds during the Final Judgement. Therefore, the saintly always acknowledge their sins and try to love their neighbor.94

85 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 113, 3: OSPC 2, 350.
86 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiæm 4, 13: SCh 176, 318.
87 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiæm 4, 40: “Prout ergo iudicasti sic iudicaberis, sicut elegisti sic recipies; nam habebis cum Christo partem, quem despexisti: cum his habebis quos praetulisti”: SCh 176, 334. 336.
88 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 48: SCh 220, 394.
89 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 52: SCh 220, 396.
90 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 80: SCh 220, 412. 414.
91 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 1: SCh 220, 232.
92 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 12: SCh 220, 240.
93 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiæm 4, 40: “quia nullum omnio tam grande crimine est quod non cuius faciunre committitur eius sententia subleuetur”: SCh 176, 336.
94 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiæm 4, 41: SCh 176, 336.
Salvian notices, that in their earthly life people seem to forget the eternal God, who as a transcendent Observer and Judge is constantly present and judges human deeds.\textsuperscript{95} God allows humiliation of the faithful because of their sins but does not prolong their suffering. According to Salvian, humiliation due to sin and a disciplining punishment on one hand, and mercy and peace on the other, are God’s strategy towards the sinner.\textsuperscript{96}

Thanks to Epiphany, Christians know God’s expectations, but continue living in sin despite what the Bible says and against the fact that “whoever calls himself a Christian, should himself behave like He did.”\textsuperscript{97} For this reasons, Salvian comes to a sad conclusion that despite formal conversion and Baptism, many Christians treated it superficially: “Our honour and respect for God is such, that with time we begin to despise what we do not practice because of our lack of religious feelings.”\textsuperscript{98}

It was often the case that Christians did not follow the evangelical rules concerning love for the enemy,\textsuperscript{99} giving up property for the Kingdom of Heaven or taking the cross and following Christ.\textsuperscript{100} What was characteristic of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century was abandoning the commandments and an uneven number of good and bad people, the bad outnumbering the good ones.\textsuperscript{101} Lack of Christian faith was responsible for lack of moral responsibility. Therefore, according to Salvian, the Christians of the time, especially those in Roman Africa, were practically pagans.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{95} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 2, 5: SCh 220, 162; compare Ps 33:17.
\textsuperscript{96} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 6, 90: SCh 220, 420.
\textsuperscript{97} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 14: ”Et qui se Christianum dicit, debet, quemadmodum Christus ambulavit, sic et ipse ambulare”: SCh 220, 198; compare 1 Jn 2:6.
\textsuperscript{98} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 10: ”Tantum apud nos honor et reuerentia dei proficit ut quae indeuotione non facimus, etam odio digna esse ducamus”: SCh 220, 192.
\textsuperscript{99} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 14: SCh 220, 196; compare Mt 5:44.
\textsuperscript{100} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 14: SCh 220, 196; compare Lk 14:33.
\textsuperscript{101} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 6, 5: SCh 220, 362. 364.
\textsuperscript{102} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 8, 10: SCh 220, 516. Salvian often mentioned the three regions of the Western Roman Empire, that is Diocese of Gaul, Diocese of Spain and Diocese of Africa. His judgement of Africa was that the state was bribed and the people were morally corrupted. This, in his opinion led to a quick defeat in the war with the Vandals. To read more on the subject see: Salvian, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 4, 21; 6, 68; 7, 52–108; 8, 1–25. To read more about the social and economic situation about the provinces compare: A. Haemmerle, \textit{Studien zu Salvian}, Bd. 3, Neuburg 1899, p. 21–32.
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The eschatological consequence of sin, is God’s punishment commensurating with the crime. On the other hand, the sinners performing penance should believe in the atonement in Jesus Christ and an undeserved gift of salvation.  

In the end God punishes, both for sins as well as hypocritical religious practices. A sin as an act against God, must always be atoned for as a crime. Salvian introduced the idea of penance to fit the number of sins; for a single sin there is a single price and a man should not put off his repentance and penance for too long towards the end of his life. An aversion for sin, repentance and avoiding subsequent situations which could end in sin are a preventive method against sin. An appropriate penance in earthly life has eschatological consequences. Salvian’s perspective is clearly didactic: a man who has not offered anything to God in his earthly life, cannot expect anything from God in his eternal life.

5.1.3. A detailed description of sins of both pastors

Both pastors gave detailed descriptions of sins in their works. These are not a systematic attempt to try and describe sins, but a pastoral reaction to the ensuing situation, a moral attempt to stigmatize evil and an attempt to introduce a spiritual preventive measures.

5.1.3.1. Lack of faith. Peter Chrysologus

For the Bishop of Ravenna, lack of faith was an expression of internal attitude, manifesting itself in the negation of eternal life. Lack of faith in earthly life, in the rise from the dead, leads man to desperation, a constant mistrust, immorality, evil and finally to death. Therefore, unbelief is an antithesis

---

103 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 4, 10: Sch 176, 316; compare Heb 2:2–3.
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of Christian faith and hope for resurrection.\(^{110}\) Faith is based on trust in the authority of God. The paradox is that the non-believers, questioning the rise from the dead and eternal life, are more likely to trust various earthly ephemeral authorities with no guarantee of an eternal life\(^{111}\) than the authority of God, the only one who can give them the chance of eternal life.\(^{112}\)

Very often, lack of faith was manifested externally. The Bishop of Ravenna saw the participation of Christians in pagan rituals and cultivating pagan customs as a paradox.\(^{113}\) The best known ritual was the celebration of the new year, known as *Kalendis Ianuariis*.\(^{114}\) This pagan celebration came to an end at the end of the 5\(^{th}\) century – people began to celebrate the coming of the new year. But the folk processions continued and they were condemned by Chrysologus as immoral.\(^{115}\)

The Bishop of Ravenna generally thought that polytheism was the most common form of idolatry that Christians came across. It is the Devil’s invention who wishes to juxtapose true sanctity of God with various devilish forms of pagan worship.\(^{116}\) For Chrysologus, idolatry as a form of

---

\(^{110}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 118, 1: OSPC 2, 380.

\(^{111}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 118, 4–6: OSPC 2, 382; compare Is 22, 13; 1 Cor 15:32.

\(^{112}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 118, 7: OSPC 2, 384; compare 1 Cor 15:1–3nn.

\(^{113}\) Formally, all pagan worship was forbidden, in all its forms by Theodosius the Great on November 8\(^{th}\) 392 (C. Th. 16, 10, 12).

\(^{114}\) Traditionally, in the 5\(^{th}\) century this was the traditional Roman holiday celebrating the new year. It was celebrated in the first month after winter solstice in order to worship the god Janus. This was a protective god, looking after gates and houses and also connected with the beginning and end. It was portrayed with two faces, a walking stick and keys. The beginning of celebrating *Kalendis Ianuariis* dates back to the second half of the 2\(^{nd}\) century BC. Originally, March was the first month of the year that is why the consuls began their work on March 15\(^{th}\) (*Idus Martiae*). In 155 BC, this date was shifted to 1\(^{st}\) January to allow the consuls to make it to Spain for the beginning of war. In this way the consuls began their work on January 1\(^{st}\) *Kalendis Ianuariis* became a Roman beginning of the new year, when the two-faced Janus, said goodbye to old year with the back of his face and welcomed the new year with the front of his face. People would give each other gifts and exchange well wishes. To read more about the Roman calendar see: A. Kirssop Michels, *The calendar of the Roman Republic*, Princeton (NJ) 1967, Westport (CT) 1978; A. E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman chronology. Calendars and years in classical antiquity*, München 1972; to read more about the worship of Janus see: T. Zieliński, *Religie Rzeczpospolitej Rzymskiej*, Toruń 2000, p. 136–138.

\(^{115}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155, 2: OSPC 3, 188.

\(^{116}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155, 1: OSPC 3, 188.
religious practice is an indication of pagan stupidity\textsuperscript{117} or their contempt for real God.\textsuperscript{118} In his opinion polytheism was taught by classical philosophy.\textsuperscript{119} Ultimately practicing idolatry was a result of lack of love for God and lack of knowledge about His love for all creatures. Practicing idolatry led to a life in fear and immorality and finally to a physical death in terror.\textsuperscript{120}

For Christians, any form of polytheism was always an insincere faith, a meagre one, full of pain and misfortune.\textsuperscript{121} It always left man enslaved by make-believe idols.\textsuperscript{122} A Christian practicing idolatry was only a nominal Christian. In reality, by taking part in various pagan rituals and games, he negated real God, practically becoming a pagan.\textsuperscript{123} The Bishop stressed the unreasonable behavior of people practicing idolatry as it stopped them from getting to know the one and only God.\textsuperscript{124} As a pastor, Chrysologus stressed that Christians freed from the illusion of idols, should avoid pagan spectacles, any contact with pagan folklore and should even avoid an internal acceptance for such spectacles to protect themselves from a return to idolatry.\textsuperscript{125}

5.1.3.2. Salvian of Marseilles
In his writings, he analysed different attitudes including lack of faith and religiousness, improper faith or idolatry. Incomplete faith or lack of faith and putting man’s trust in the power of money is the result of the Devil’s actions.\textsuperscript{126} Ridiculously, in their earthly life people believe in everything except God, even though “all mankind is based on hope, only they do not believe in God.”\textsuperscript{127}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 89, 1: OSPC 2, 198.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 44, 3: OSPC 1, 310.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 44, 6: OSPC 1, 312.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 147, 2: OSPC 3, 146.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 57, 3: OSPC 1, 384.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 62, 5: OSPC 1, 420.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 155, 5: OSPC 3, 190.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 109, 4: OSPC 2, 328, 330.
\item Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 155, 4: OSPC 3, 190; compare Rom 1:32.
\item Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 1: SCH 176, 138.
\item Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 59: “Totum denique, ut dixi, inter homines spebus agitur. Solus deus est de quo desperatur”: SCH 176, 228.
\end{enumerate}
Rich people are particularly prone to lack of faith, as a man living in earthly riches does not believe in eternal salvation.\textsuperscript{128} A rich man puts more energy into keeping earthly relationships, pays more attention to notable benefits even though mercy, charity or showing kindness would cost him less. He does so because there is no faith in God in him and no trust in eternal life.\textsuperscript{129} The rich man usually rejects the authority of God and the promises of the Gospel, therefore he consistently negates his faith in God's payment in the form of eternity for an a dignified life.\textsuperscript{130} Driven by the constant greed this "seems nothing more but a wish for money but in fact it is a slavish submission to idolatry, that will continue in his afterlife."\textsuperscript{131} Lack of faith of the rich is mainly manifested in ignoring God's commandments – one cannot believe in God when one ignores His commandments.\textsuperscript{132} A rich man with no faith makes idle declarations which are meant to be proof of his alleged faith.\textsuperscript{133} But these declarations soon turn out to be false due to lack of love for his nearest, lack of respect, hostility and sometimes even hatred for God.\textsuperscript{134}

The belief that God is not interested in the world he created and therefore one can commit all possible crimes was lack of faith for Salvian.\textsuperscript{135} In his opinion blatant lack of faith and neglect for God leads to crime and moral lasciviousness. The Biblical fate of the kingdom of Sodom and Gomorrah\textsuperscript{136} should make it clear to the faithful that God will punish the sinners, even if they were not His followers.\textsuperscript{137}

Salvian also stressed the fact that faith can be misunderstood as was in the case of some Africans of his time, who idolatrously worshipped the

\textsuperscript{128} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 69: SCh 176, 234. 236; compare Lk 6:24.
\textsuperscript{129} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 62–64: SCh 176, 286–288.
\textsuperscript{130} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 62: SCh 176, 286.
\textsuperscript{131} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 1: "Nisi auaritiam, id est idolatriae seruitutem, etiam in future post mortem tempora extendant": SCh 176, 138; compare Col 3:5; Eph 5:5; 1 Cor 5:10–11.
\textsuperscript{132} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 89: SCh 176, 302. 304; compare Lb 15:3; Deut 5:29; Ezek 20:19; Jn 14:15; J 14:21.
\textsuperscript{133} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 81–82: SCh 176, 298.
\textsuperscript{134} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 2, 11: SCh 220, 166. 168.
\textsuperscript{135} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 1, 29: SCh 220, 126; compare Gen 41–14.
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goddess Celeste (*Dea Caelestis*), in the 5th century. Salvian clearly criticized the insecurity of conversions among those formally becoming Christians and informally still professing to pagan cult. Idolatry was the result of lack of real faith in one God and the revival of the belief in the devil.


139 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 9: SCh 220, 516.

140 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 10: SCh 220, 516.


142 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 33 SCh 220, 384.
5.1.3.3. Greed (auaritia). Peter Chrysologus

The Bishop of Ravenna considers greed as the source of evil in man, perversion and the break-up of human bonds.\(^{143}\) It is a sin and its source is in earthly goods and therefore to avoid it one must renounce earthly goods and offer them to those in need.\(^{144}\) Greed leads to wealth in our earthly life and results in the loss of internal peace and certainty concerning faith as a result.\(^{145}\) Greed effects human aspirations – by concentrating on gaining material goods, man sees himself only in his mortal life, forgetting his calling for eternal life and Heaven.\(^{146}\) Therefore God himself encourages man to abandon greed and to transform earthly goods into gifts for the Heaven.\(^{147}\) In earthly life material goods are only ‘granted’ for a period of a lifetime, therefore by giving alms, man pays off his debts to God in the form of mercy. Active mercy of the rich towards the poor is an act of trust in God.\(^{148}\)

**Salvian of Marseilles** also saw the sin of greed (Tim 6:10) as the source of evil in man.\(^{149}\) He considered greed and non-human behavior as sins contradicting mercy. A given man “cannot serve God and mammon” (Mt 6:24) (Mt 25:41–44)\(^{150}\) and he will be condemned together with the devil.\(^{151}\) Greed manifest by taking possession of other people’s belongings, strips the rich man of his human dignity,\(^{152}\) evokes injustice and rapacity,\(^{153}\) drunkenness,\(^{154}\) hubris, arrogance, is the cause of usury, lying and perjury.\(^{155}\)

---

\(^{143}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 162, 8: OSPC 3, 238, compare Lk 12:15; 1 Tim 6:10.

\(^{144}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 7, 6: OSPC 1, 90; compare Mt 6:19–20.

\(^{145}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 23, 3: OSPC 1, 178.

\(^{146}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 22, 3: OSPC 1, 180.

\(^{147}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 25, 3: OSPC 1, 198; compare Lk 12:33.

\(^{148}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 25, 3: OSPC 1, 198; compare Lk 12:33.


\(^{150}\) Mt 25:41–45.


\(^{152}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 4, 21: SCh 220, 248.

\(^{153}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 5, 60: SCh 220, 356.

\(^{154}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 77: SCh 220, 410.

In their earthly life, the wealthy are not afraid of God, so they forget about Him. By drifting away from Him, they evoke hatred for themselves and by constantly rejecting their eternity in God, they sentence themselves here on earth to eternal banishment. However, Salvian sees the possibility of freeing oneself from greed. One must reject the temptation to acquire earthly riches and live according to the norm of owning what is necessary (1 Tim 6:8–9). “The Apostol says: By having food and clothes and a roof over our head, let us be happy! And those who want to acquire wealth, run the risk of temptation and devil. He tells us so, for us to understand, that salvation comes from what is really necessary and excess is the trap. God’s grace is in moderation and devil’s trap is in riches. The Apostol adds – unwise greed leads man to his doom and destruction.”

5.1.3.4. Obscenity and contemptible plays
This problem was discussed by both Peter Chrysologus, as well as, Salvian of Marseilles. Their opinion condemning Antique theatrical plays and circus games was identical to the one of Christain critics of Roman pastimes.

---
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**Peter Chrysologus**

In his opinion Antique culture, despite undertaken topics, did not provide hope for the victory over death. What is more, it could not perceive eternal life as whole, with its soul and body. Neither did it understand the issue of eternity of man, on the contrary, it concentrated on human pain. The Bishop strongly criticized it for these reasons.\(^{159}\) He saw even single plays\(^{160}\) as immoral as they all added up to some kind of idolatry.\(^{161}\) For Chrysologus taking part in pagan performances was connected with

---

\(^{159}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 101: OSPC 2, 276.

\(^{160}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155, 3: OSPC 3, 190.

\(^{161}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155, 4: OSPC 3, 190; compare Rom 1:32. See also Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155 bis, 1–2: OSPC 3, 193. 194.
practicing forbidden astrology and magic.\textsuperscript{162} Taking all this into consideration, he discouraged the faithful from taking part in these.\textsuperscript{163}

**Salvian of Marseilles**

He treated taking part in public performances and games as watching crime and obscenity.\textsuperscript{164} The theatrical and circus performances were the act of the devil and a denial of the act of faith undertaken during Baptism.\textsuperscript{165} Because of the public display of obscenity of crime, Ancient performances were an insult to God. By watching them the Christians risked their own salvation.\textsuperscript{166} Salvian listed places of Antique entertainment which were traps for Christian morality: amphitheatres, theatres, inaugural parades, magicians’ acts, athletes, acrobats, pantomime etc.\textsuperscript{167} Both the actors themselves, as well as, the audience finding pleasure in watching bloody death scenes or watching sexual acts were sinful.\textsuperscript{168}

Salvian condemned circus performances which included humans and animals most. These performances were organized secretly because of imperial laws forbidding them.\textsuperscript{169} Participation in such performances was entire-

\textsuperscript{162} Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 156, 2: OSPC 3, 196.
\textsuperscript{163} Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155, 6: OSPC 3, 190; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 155 bis, 3: OSPC 3, 194.
\textsuperscript{164} Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 10: SCh 220, 366.
\textsuperscript{166} Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 15: “amphitheatris scilicet, odiis, lusoriois, pompis, athletis, petaminariis, pantomimis ceterisque portentis”: SCh 220, 370.
\textsuperscript{168} On the 1\textsuperscript{st} of October 326 (C. Th. 15. 12. 1). Constantine the Great issued the first edict forbidding fights in the arena. Constantius and Julian sustained this. An edict was issued on the 17\textsuperscript{th} October 357 forbidding all Roman soldiers and clerks from fighting (C. Th. 15. 12. 2). Finally, Emperor Arcadius and Emperor Honorius sustained this when they forbid recruiting gladiators on the 7\textsuperscript{th} April 397 (C. Th. 15. 12. 3). Despite imperial law and abolishing gladiator schools and forbidding gladiator fights in 404 (Emperor Honorius), there were still gladiator fights taking place both in Rome, Italy and in the provinces. This continued until
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ly voluntary and the spectators had to overcome all obstacles to get to the place. The performances were forbidden by law in the 5th century and they had to pay large sums of money to see them. Christians could only commit sin by watching these performances in cities under Roman rule, as in cities conquered by Barbarians like Moguntiacum (German Mainz), Agrippinae (German Cologne), Treuerorum (German Trier) as well as in most cities in Gale and Spain the performance did not take place.

5.1.3.5. Dissolution (cupiditas, luxuria). Peter Chrysologus

In the opinion of the Bishop of Ravenna lust (cupiditas) comes from the human wish to accumulate material goods. When it becomes dissolution (luxuria), it tortures the man’s soul and becomes an insatiable desire and the man never says enough. It finally leads to wasting God’s gifts given to man.

Salvian of Marseilles perceived dissolution first of all as impurity of human behavior. As despicable acts, they ‘force’ God to punish lechers, condemning them to death, as once buggers. He wrote that lust begins with a covetousness in somebody’s eyes and usually leads to indecent behavior. These are mortal sins. Dissolute lust (libidine) destroys

439–440. After the downfall of the Western Empire, Theoderic forbade gladiator games. In the Eastern Empire, the games were finally abolished in 681. To read more about the games and gladiators see: M. Grant, Gladiatorzy, tłum. T. Rybkowski, Łódź 1987, especially chapter 4: Gladiatorzy i ich widzowie, p. 114–150.

170 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 10: Sch 220, 366. 368.
171 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 39: Sch 220, 388.
172 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 6: OSPC 1, 90.
173 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 1, 5: OSPC 1, 50; compare Lk 15:12–16.
174 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 2, 5: OSPC 1, 88.
175 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 4: OSPC 1, 74.
177 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 49: Sch 220, 394; compare Mt 5:28; Probably, Saint Augustine shares this view, Civitate Dei 1, 32: NBA V/1, 82.
marriage vows and leads to immoral sexual life.\(^{180}\) Having many different common-law wives is a form of adultery\(^{181}\) and leads to prostitution,\(^{182}\) homosexuality\(^{183}\) or incest.\(^{184}\)

5.1.3.6. Sins mentioned by St. Peter Chrysologus only

The sins described, such as lack of faith, greed, depravity as a result of taking part in vile performances or dissolution were widely commented by both pastors. Each one also pointed to sins, which the other made no mention of.

**Jealousy** (Latin inuidia; verb. zelo,-are). The attitude of the prodigal son’s older brother (Lk 15:25–28)\(^{185}\) was a symbol of envy for Chrysologus. In his opinion jealousy is one of the ‘oldest’ sins in the history of salvation, the reason for the downfall of angels in Heaven, the exile from paradise, as well as, the reason for distancing from God and the killing of Christ by Abraham’s descendants.\(^{186}\) It was jealousy that made Cain kill his broth-

---

\(^{180}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 4, 24: SCh 220, 250.


\(^{183}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 76–90: SCh 220, 484–496.


\(^{185}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 4, 1: OSPC 1, 66; compare Lk 15:25–28; Also compare Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 5, 7: OSPC 1, 78.
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Envy (liuor)

Only Chrysologus makes a note of envy in his sermons and sees it as the derivative of jealousy, which is responsible for our bad attitude to our loved ones. Both envy and jealousy are sins against God’s love. Envy spreads jealousy and discord. Envy is the terrifying reason for the first homicide in history. Christ’s enemies – the Pharisees and some of Christ’s students were all united in their envy against Him. In the history of salvation, envy had always caused an evil attitude among non-believers. The most serious example of this is the rejection of the divine nature of Jesus Christ by the Jews, despite the the signs and miracles they experienced.

Of all sins mentioned by Chrysologus only, it is worth noticing that he mentioned the sin associated with envy and jealousy that is hypocrisy (hipocrisis). The person under the influence of hypocrisy behaves unnaturally

---

187 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 4, 2: OSPC 1, 68; compare Gen 4:5–8.
188 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 7: OSPC 1, 78.
190 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 172, 2: OSPC 1, 66.
191 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 4, 1: “Quia sicut nos deo iungit caritas, a deo inuidia sic seiungit”: OSPC 1, 66.
193 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 4, 1: “Liuor non patitur introire”: OSPC 1, 66.
194 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 31, 1: OSPC 1, 232; compare Mt 21:23; Lk 11:15.
195 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 4, 2: “Ut esse solum zeli liuor faceret”: OSPC 1, 68.
196 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 31, 2: OSPC 1, 232; compare Mt 9:14.
197 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 48, 1: OSPC 1, 332.
and his knowledge is fake and leads to hubris. Religious hypocrisy and its tragic self-excuse before God, finally leads to religious legalism, which rejects the possibility of salvation of other people. But in reality, it cuts off the Pharisee from salvation by God.

Chrysologus also mentioned other sins, but not in a way which was typical of his theological view. Rather, this was a typical moral instruction or a pastoral explanation of Biblical parenesis.

5.1.3.7. Sins mentioned by Salvian of Marseilles only.

Immorality of masses
Salvian stressed the problem of the universality of sin and immoral social behavior, especially in the Roman North Africa in the 5th century. He emphasized the hatred of African Christians to saints. The reason for hatred was the dissimilarity of Christian morality. Therefore the invasions

---

198 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 172, 5: OSPC 3, 292; compare Lk 12:1; 1 Cor 8:1.
199 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 5, 7: OSPC 1, 78; compare Lk 15:29.
of Barbarians, especially the invasion of Vandals in Spain or the Vandals and Alans in Africa were adequate punishment for the sinfulness of the local people. The sins of the Africans were God’s punishment in the form of Barbarian invasions.

**Hatred (odium)**

Hatred was only mentioned by Salvian for whom it was not only physically, but also morally devastating. It was an act against God’s will to love thy neighbor. He found it paradox, that the reason for hatred among the Africans was the superiority of moral life of monks. Hatred was common among Roman citizens, but it was most common among Roman

---

202 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 54: SCh 220, 468. Having ravaged Gaul, the Vandals, together with the Alans and the Suebi, moved to Spain in the autumn of 409. They wanted to occupy the rich and untouched by was, Roman province. Having crossed the Pyrenees mountain pass, defended by the so called Honoratici, the Vandals, Suebi and the Alans spent the following year (410) ravaging Spain. In 411, both Vandal tribes, together with the Alans, recognized the command of Emperor Honorius and adopted the *foederati* status. The Suebi received Galicia, the Alans – Lusitania (now Portugal) and the province of Cartaginensis, whereas, the Vandals – Bettica (now Spain). With time, they confiscated ports and shipyards: Karthago Spataria (today: Cartagena), Hispalis (today: Seville) in 428. The Vandals left Spain in May 429 and landed in Africa and starte their conquest of this province under the command of Genseric. To read more about the subject see: zob. M. Wilczyński, *Zagraniczna i wewnętrzna polityka…* , op. cit., p. 13–49; J. Strzelczyk, *Wandalowie i ich afrykańskie państwo* , op. cit., p. 79–136.


205 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 7: SCh 220, 514; Compare Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 8: SCh 220, 514.

206 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 12: SCh 220, 194; compare 1 Jn 3:15.


208 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 21: SCh 220, 524.

209 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 5, 16: SCh 220, 322.
Africa of the 5th century due to the dislike for Christian saints and clergy, who were treated as a form of offence against God himself.210

**Stupidity**

Salvian mentions it quite often. A stupid man who rejects the hope of receiving anything from God,211 does not attend Church, does not pray and has no faith in the mercy of God.212 There is nothing rational in stupidity. It is under the influence of stupidity that people say there is no God (Psalm 94:7).213 Apart from jealousy and envy it is the only motivation for Cain, who by killing had hoped to hide this act of crime from people, but not from God. Many people of this era out of stupidity make the mistake of not taking God into consideration.214 Salvian thus quotes Plato that “only somebody stupid can be bad because a clever man wishes to be good.”215 Under the influence of stupidity, man offends the dignity of others, while thoughtlessly calling them ‘stupid.’216

Stupidity, greed and short-sightedness of imperial clerks was the reason for the growing number of private fortunes, at the cost of a systematic ruining of the Empire.217 Salvian made an ironic comment that to a cer-

---

210 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 15: SCh 220, 520; compare Mt 10:40; Lk 10:16; compare also Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 8, 16–22: SCh 220, 520–524.

211 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 1, 21: SCh 220, 120.


213 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 4, 41: SCh 220, 266. Marcus Fabius Quintilianus introduced a similar reasoning on the irrationality of crime, *De institutione oratoria* VII, 2, 44: “nam vulgo dicitur, scelera non habere consilium”: *De institutione oratoria* libri 12, vol. 2, Lipsiae 1829, 22.


216 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 13: SCh 220, 196; compare Mt 5:22.

tain extent, the Christians, his contemporaries consider evil as wisdom. Religious ignorance is always a result of stupidity understood as lack of an awareness of faith. This is manifested by forgetting one’s duties towards others, never the other way around. An ignorant’s person misdeed depends on his manners and religion, on the knowledge of the laws of religion and on his will to regain awareness.

**Arrogance**

Salvian mentions that arrogance leads to fulfilling only pleasant commandments and draws man away from realizing difficult ones and it hates truth, considering it its greatest enemy.

5.1.3.8. A catalogue of moral sins

Salvian sometimes mentions whole groups of sins, segregated into catalogues of sins, similar to the catalogues of sins of St. Paul, which he often

---

218 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 8: SCh 220, 364; compare Is 29, 14 (LXX); 1 Cor 1:19.


223 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 97: SCh 220, 426.


226 Beginning with the 4th century, first in the East and then in the West, lists of deadly flaws appear which later become known as the deadly sins. Initially, what the Ascetics meant was "a study of bad thoughts or bad ghosts threatening the monk" rather than sins as conscious acts against God. Evagrius Ponticus (died in 399) was the first to portray a branch of knowledge about a monk with eight bad ghosts. In his works (*Antirrheticus* and *De octo spiritibus malitiae*) he describes the struggle against: gluttony, in chastity, greed, sadness, acedia, vanity and excessive pride. His catalogue of ‘eight ghosts’ – ‘main faults’ had generally been accepted in the Christian world and thanks to the works of John Cassian, the eight faults became also known in the West. Each of these faults was surrounded by smaller ones. Also greed was portrayed as a mother who gives birth to and is surrounded by other sins, example John Cassian: *Collationes Patrum* V. 2: SCh 42, éd. E. Pichery, Paris 1935, p. 209; John Cassian, *Institutione Coenobiorum* VII, SCh 109, éd. J.-C. Guy, Paris 1965, p. 290–333. In *Moralia in Job* XXXI, XLV, 87: OGM 1/4, a cura di M. Adriaen, P. Siniscalco, Roma 2001, p. 322, by Gregory the Great (died 604) there
refers to. He mentions a catalogue of sins of language, everyday sins (the most occurring ones), sins of shamelessness and vile, sins con-

is a certain modification. St. Gregory refers to the Vulgate version of the Bible (Sir 10:15): excessive pride (superbia) is the beginning of each sin. He excluded this sin from Evagrius' catalogue as he treated it as the reason for all other sins. Hubris pride was described as the 'root of all evil'. Its first offshoots are: empty glory, jealousy, anger, sadness, greed, gluttony and dissolution. Gregory reduced the number of main sins to seven and introduced jealousy instead of laziness. In the opinion of St. Gregory the Great (Moralia in Job XXXI, XLV, 88) what stems from greed is: infidelity, embezzlement, falsehood, contempt, uneasiness, violence and hard-heartedness in doing good: OGM I, 4, 322. The order of sins established by St. Gregory the Great applied until the 12th century when Hugh of St. Victor (died in 1141) in his De sacramentis christianae fidei II, 13, 1, restored excessive pride in place of vanity and laziness in the place of sadness. Beginning with the Middle Ages main faults are described as main sins and are considered as conscious acts against God. The East retained the original order of eight main faults given by Evagrius Ponticus. To read more on the subject see: M. W. Bloomfield, The seven sins, Michigan 1952; A. Solignac, Péchés capitaux, DSp 12, 1, Paris 1984, p. 853–862; L. Misiarczyk, Osiem "logismoi" w pismach Ewagriusza z Pontu, Kraków 2007.
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connected with greed\textsuperscript{230} and sins destroying Roman society,\textsuperscript{231} sins within the Church,\textsuperscript{232} as well as, cardinal sins.\textsuperscript{233}

Chrysologus expressed a preachy attitude to sin, wide in terms of topic (compared to Salvian who concentrated on the Original Sin and the evil of sin). Using the terminology of classical philosophy, in his anthropology of redemption of man in God, Chrysologus referred to the Biblical concept of human sin and the redemptive role of God. Mortality is punishment for sin, passed on from generation to generation as the Original Sin affects everyone. In his view of individual sin, he stressed the necessity of God’s mercy and subsequent atonement in abandoning sin.

Salvian’s view was rather didactic and ascetic. In his anthropology of ascetic perfection, when describing sin, Salvian concentrated on individual sin, which always offends God. Therefore he stressed far more than Chrysologus, the role of appropriate punishment for sins and the necessity to resign from sinning. He accented the results of humiliation in sin. For Salvian, the science of God’s pedagogy of punishment and mercy towards the sinner was more important.

5.2. Virtues

We learn about virtues only from the writing of St. Peter Chrysologus, who sees virtue as generally perceived gift from God. Thus virtues are always prior to man’s will, they are directed against vices. They exist side by side, never on their own but always lead to God. Both clergymen teach about virtues. They emphasize the virtues of faith, hope, mercy, love and chastity. Teaching about the virtue of justice is typical of Chrysologus. Whereas, Salvian stresses the meaning of freedom, external peace, as well as, wisdom.


\textsuperscript{231} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 6, 86: SCh 220, 416.

\textsuperscript{232} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 44: SCh 220, 220.

\textsuperscript{233} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 6, 17: SCh 220, 372.
5.2.1. Virtues in general – solely the teaching of Chrysologus

It is rather characteristic of St. Peter Chrysologus’ that we find a general outline of the theory of virtues in his writing only. We do not find a similar one in Salvian's works. He speaks only about the use of the obvious rule of pedagogy of Christian repentance, that is introducing active mercy with the inner need to help those in need as an ailment for sins. Contrary to the traditional role of virtues, where they were valued on their own, where man had strived towards them, Christian virtues are virtues revealed by God and they open our souls to God and other people.

---

238 In the primacy of the virtues of faith, hope and love making up Christian life (New Testament Cor 13, 13: So now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; but the greatest of these is love) the above virtues are considered the most important and as theological virtues, they are God’s gift *par excellence* as opposed to classical virtues (prudence, justice, moderation and bravery) which can be achieved by man himself. St. Paul also sees virtue in all good actions (Phil 4:8: In conclusion, my friends, fill your minds with those things that are good and that deserve praise: things that are true, noble, right, pure, lovely, and honorable.) To read more on the subject see: R. Schnackenburg, *Il messaggio morale del Nuovo Testamento. I. Da Gesù alla chiesa primitiva (Supplementi 1)*, Brescia 1989–1990; R. Cessario, *The moral virtues and theological ethics*, Notre Dame (Ind.) 1991; S. Raponi, *Alla scuola dei Padri. Tra cristologia, antropologia e comportamento morale*, Roma 1998; R. Frattallone, *Religione, fede, speranza e carità. “La piena maturità in Cristo”* (Eph 4:13), Roma 2003, p. 83–115; J. Porter, *Virtù*, [in:] *Dizionario critico di teologia*, a cura di J.-Y. Lacoste, Roma 2005, p. 1468–1470.
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Based on the Biblical texts, patristic writers gradually began to form a Christian theology of virtues.\textsuperscript{239} According to Chrysologus virtues were God’s gifts, which are always prior to the will of even the most saintly of martyrs. Therefore, the man who is guided by God’s mercy, bears the fruit of martyrdom in the name of faith or the virtue of love.\textsuperscript{240} In moral terms virtues end all faults\textsuperscript{241} and are their exact opposite.\textsuperscript{242} By bearing fruit of good intentions they enlighten the soul.\textsuperscript{243} The virtues are directed at faults,\textsuperscript{244} they always come together and finally always lead to God\textsuperscript{245} but if they appear independently, they fade out.\textsuperscript{246} According to Chrysologus the principal virtue is mercy (Mt 25:31–46). Without mercy, no virtue is


\textsuperscript{241} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 1, 5: OSPC 1, 50; Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 38, 2: OSPC 1, 272; compare Mt 5:39; Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 108, 6: OSPC 3, 324.

\textsuperscript{242} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 38, 2: OSPC 2, 272. 274.

\textsuperscript{243} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 22, 5: OSPC 1, 180.

\textsuperscript{244} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 22, 4: OSPC 1, 180; Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 23, 1: OSPC 1, 184; Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 29, 3OSPC 1, 222; Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 127, 6: OSPC 3, 28.

\textsuperscript{245} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 147, 4: OSPC 3, 148.

\textsuperscript{246} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 145, 1: OSPC 3, 130.
obvious. What is more, the mercy we show during lifetime acts as our heavenly advocate.

Only Christ is abundant in virtues in the right meaning of the word. Whereas, the Blessed Virgin Mother had virtues granted on God’s mercy. Also other saints had virtues thanks to their similarity to Christ, on God’s mercy. One of them, the blessed representative of priests and the last prophet – John the Baptist, the one witnessed God is described by Chrysologus as the school of virtues. He stresses that practicing virtues is necessary to bear fruit and to understand the Gospel.

Virtues do not exist on their own. They are meant to bring us closer to God. For a moral life to take place, it is necessary to have a proper vision of God. By practicing virtues, we train the body, prevent its weakness and open our minds to God. To believe in God is to gain internal maturity. Therefore, showing off our virtues is wrong as it leads to their disappearance. As practical tips on our way to God, virtues are God’s revelation. The imperfect man entrusted with the Revelation itself can misunderstand it. For this reason it is important that the virtues are interpreted only by the Church.

Virtues developed in our lifetime are an act of spiritual intelligence. For this reason we need a spiritual understanding of God’s word. Having virtues is an act of freedom, not fear. Fear is a captivity of the soul. Sometimes it is difficult to notice the notable benefits of virtues, but they are always a promise of the future eternal heavenly order.

---

247 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 42, 6: 1, 300. Compare Sermo 42, 1–6: OSPC 1, 296–300.
248 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 42, 6: OSPC 1, 300.
249 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 125, 3: OSPC 3, 10; compare Lk 16:1.
250 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 142, 7: OSPC 3, 110.
252 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 137, 1: OSPC 3, 72.
253 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 147, 7: OSPC 3, 150; compare Ex 33:13; 1 Kings 19:9–14.
254 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 24, 2: OSPC 1, 192.
255 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 3: OSPC 1, 88.
256 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 156, 1: OSPC 3, 196.
257 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 35, 4: OSPC 1, 262.
258 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 101, 2: OSPC 2, 276.
259 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 120, 7: OSPC 2, 394.
Chrysologus stresses the fact that in order to keep our virtues we need perseverance and effort on our side. But this is true of any pedagogic success according to the rules of classical upbringing. For this reason we stress the significance of the virtue of perseverance and martyrdom, as well as the hardly understood virtue of patience in our earthly life, but one that bears fruit in our heavenly life, the much hated virtue of innocence and the virtue of poverty recommended by Christ.

5.2.2. Specific sins – pastoral view

In the opinion of both Salvian and Chrysologus, the most important virtues which enlighten man and lead him to God are the following; the virtue of faith, the virtue of hope, the virtue of mercy, the virtue of love and purity. Peter Chrysologus stressed the importance of practicing prayer, fasting and mercy while Salvian of Marseilles saw the need for good deeds as a symbol of our faith and a constant observance of the Symbol of faith. Apart from the above mentioned virtues both authors also mention specific virtues which are typical of their particular teaching.

5.2.2.1. Faith. Peter Chrysologus

Faith is God’s gift, which is shaped by listening to the word of God. Faith backed up by an acceptance of God through Baptism, results in
a justification of eternity. Thanks to faith, man gains a reward in the form of Jesus resurrected and by receiving earthly goods, which he had expected.

Understanding the mysteries of Christian faith: equality of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the incarnations of God, the conception of God-Man from a Virgin, the virginity of Mary in conceiving, during birth and after birth, the rise from the dead, as well as, the Second Coming (parousia) is equally important.

The precondition for remaining in faith, piety and virtues is practicing three forms of worship: prayer, fasting and mercy. Chrysologus encouraged the faithful to abandon any non-religious behavior. This was typical of Jews of the time and expressed by being hard at heart, constant doubt, the rejection of resurrection, accepting human weakness, an internal distancing from happiness in God. Human prejudice against the reality of faith should be abolished to be included in God’s hierarchy and to be included not by yourself, but by God.

1914, p. 33–37, 291–319 czy A. Prümer, Manuale Theologiae Moralis secundum principia s. Thomae Aquinatis in usum scholarum, vol. 1, Barcinone–Friburgi Brisg.–Romae 1958, p. 299–462. There are definitely no tomizing scholastications of theology in Chrysologus work. F. Michalčik’s tomistic reinterpretation of Chrysologus’ text is obvious (Pars II. I. Peculiares obligationes morales creaturae erga Deum; II. Obligationes morales erga seipsum; III. Obligationes morales erga proximum; IV. De sacramentis). From a methodology point of view, such understanding of moral topics is flamboyant but does not help interpret patristic text.

267 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 11, 5–6: OSPC 1, 110. This is an allusion to what many people did that is put off baptism until some terminal disease.
268 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 80, 6: OSPC 2, 136; compare Mt 28:9.
269 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 90, 4: OSPC 2, 206. 208.
270 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 141, 3: OSPC 3, 106.
271 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 141, 3: OSPC 3, 106.
272 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 92, 6–7: OSPC 2, 220. 222.
273 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 143, 1: OSPC 3, 116.
274 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 62, 8: OSPC 1, 420. 422; compare also: Sermi: 62, 8; 75, 3; 117, 1. 3–4; 148, 1.
275 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 75, 4: OSPC 2, 106.
276 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 144, 9: OSPC 3, 126. 128.
277 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 43, 2: OSPC 1, 302.
279 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 65, 3: OSPC 2, 26; compare Jn 11:39.
Salvian of Marseilles

For him faith means complete trust in God, and not in man.\(^{280}\) God demands from man faith and virtues coming from it, as they lead to eternal life.\(^{281}\) Faith allows man to experience God, both through faith and emotions.\(^{282}\) Salvian defines faith in the following way: “What is trust or faith? It is a trustful faith in Christ which means being honest to God. This also means keeping God’s commandments.”\(^{283}\)

Thus faith requires specific deeds, it cannot mean empty verbal declarations.\(^{284}\) To keep one’s faith one must obey the interpretation of the Symbol of faith. “A single apostasy results in losing life.”\(^{285}\) Therefore, in earthly life the Christian must undergo a trial of his faithfulness to God.\(^{286}\)

5.2.2.2 Hope. Peter Chrysologus

The basis of Christian virtue is the hope is the truth about the resurrection of the body.\(^{287}\) Chrysologus justifies this in the following way: “It is a perfect virtue to believe by hope only, what you cannot unlike material things, hold in your own hands.”\(^{288}\) Hope is also a virtue of awaiting payment for a Christian life, which is promised only at the moment of Baptism, but

\(^{280}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 34: SCh 220, 454; compare Judg 7:2.

\(^{281}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 20: SCh 176, 152.

\(^{282}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 2, 7: SCh 220, 164; compare Ps 80 (79):2.

\(^{283}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 7: “Quid est igitur credulitas uel fides? Opinior, fideliter hominem Christo credere, id est fidelem deo esse, hoc est fideliter dei mandata seruare”: SCh 220, 190. In Blaise-Chirat’s opinion, 229 the term ’credulitas’, -atis is a synonym of ’fides’, meaning ’not accepting just any faith, but Christian faith’. What is interesting, he gives Peter Chrysologus as an example: *Sermo* 60, 2: “Credulitatem parturit fides, confesionem credulitas nutrit”: OSPC 1, 402. G. Lagarrigue, SCh 220, no. 1, 190–191, rightly suggests that Salvian represents the same tradition, considering the terms *credulitas* and *fides* as synonyms.


\(^{286}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 6–10: SCh 220, 190–194.

\(^{287}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 118, 1: OSPC 2, 380.

\(^{288}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 110, 6: “Perfectae uiurtutis est, quod in re non teneas, spei robore possidere”: OSPC 2, 334.
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carried out in eternity. Christians, as adopted children of eternal God are happy, as they will “inherit everything and they will not experience pain after their father’s death.” By being adopted, Christians have not only hope for an eschatological resurrection of body and being in Heaven, but also for inheriting an eternal kindness.

**Salvian of Marseilles**

Hope is a way “of striving for eternal life, everyone must make an effort in order to enjoy it.” Man trusts God. As a virtue, it is recommended for all Christians as because as all earthly things pass, what remains is the promise of ‘future-eternal- divine things.’

---

289 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 71, 11: OSPC 2, 70; compare Mt 6:9; Rom 8:24–25.


292 Peter Chrysologus, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 17: SCh 176, 150; compare Ps 78 (77):7; Eph 6:4; compare also Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 35: SCh 176, 280.


295 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 49, 2: OSPC 1, 338.

296 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 8, 5: OSPC 1, 96; compare Hos 6:6; Ps 36 (35):6.

297 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 47, 2: OSPC 1, 326; compare Mt 13:45–48.
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Active mercy towards the poor is an act done to gain one's own resurrection.298 Mercy leads to an absolution of sins and restores man's holiness.299 Mercy supports all other virtues, which are weaker without mercy, they 'wither away.'300 Faith itself, piety and other virtues, are supported by three practices: prayer, fasting and mercy.301 Mercy makes fasting worthwhile,302 fasting without mercy is non-effective as it concentrates on the ascetic aspect only, making it 'hungry and empty.'303

This virtue has the power of transforming man's deeds into ones which appeal to God.304 But the punishment for not showing mercy in earthly life is unbearable Hell.305 What is more, Chrysologus encourages modesty and avoiding ostentation during acts of mercy. Mercy cannot be a pretext for showing off and propaganda full of hypocrisy – this act should be known to God, not to people.306 Mercy is the crowning achievement of life according to God’s rules, not man's.307

Salvian of Marseilles
Mercy is the basic touchstone of faith – a true believer is someone who is merciful towards the poor and needy.308 Mercy is a virtue which frees man from sin309 and – finally from damnation, therefore the Old and New Testament demands it.310 For this reason, the Bible sees the merciful man

---

298 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 42, 3: OSPC 1, 298; compare Ps 126 (125):5.
299 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 8, 6: OSPC 1, 98; compare 2 Kings 11:4; Mt 26:69–75; Mk 14:66–72; Lk 22:55–62; Jn 18:16–18. 25–27.
300 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 42, 6: "Probatum est ergo tibi non ieiunium solum, sed omnes sine misericordia nutare uirtutes": OSPC 1, 300.
301 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 43, 2: “Tria sunt, tria, fratres, per quae stat fides, constat deuotio, menet uirtus: oratio, ieiunium, misericordia": OSPC 1, 302.
302 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 6: OSPC 1, 88. 90.
303 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 8, 2: OSPC 1, 94.
304 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 25, 2: OSPC 1, 196; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 7: OSPC 2, 302; compare Lk 12:33.
305 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 66, 3: OSPC 2, 32. 34; compare Lk 16:23–25.
306 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 9, 4: OSPC 1, 102; compare Mt 25:35. Similarly: Sermo 9, 4–5: OSPC 1, 102. 104.
307 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 38, 2: OSPC 1, 274; compare Mt 5:39, Rom 12:21.
308 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 90: SCh 176, 304; compare Ps 112 (111):39; Lk 12:33; Mt 19:21.
309 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 59: SCh 176, 182; compare Dan 4:24.
310 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 50: SCh 176, 222.
as the man of God. \footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 51: SCh 176, 222; compare Ps 112 (111):9; Mt 6:19; Mt 6:24; Lk 16:13; Lu 6:24; Mt 25:41.}

Salvian comes to a conclusion that not only the Bible, but also human nature itself (\textit{natura ipsa hominum}) and a common custom (\textit{generali cunctos lege}); “who receives a gift, must reciprocate, by making an even bigger offering.” \footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 4, 17: “Plus eis gratiae debeamus: artat quippe nos ad retributionem dati accepta largitio”: SCh 176, 320.}

People, who are merciful and humanitarian towards their neighbours on Earth, are happier in their earthly lives because of their future glory of salvation. \footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 9: SCh 176, 144; compare Mt 6:19–20.}

5.2.2.4. Love. Peter Chrysologus

One of the main attributes of God is love. \footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 178, 2: “Dilectio deus est, probante Iohanne cum dicit: \textit{Quia deus dilectio est}”: OSPC 3, 324; compare 1 Jn 4:8.}

Love unites man with God, \footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 4, 1: “quia sicut nos deo iungit caritas, a deo inuidia sic seiuigit”: OSPC 1, 66.} eliminates sin and is God’s most important commandment. \footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 94, 6: OSPC 2, 232; compare 1 Pet 4:8; J 21:17; Deut 6:5.}

It is a virtue, therefore, its strength “makes one brave because real love does not consider anything difficult, discouraging, hard or bringing about death. […] Love is an infallible armour, pushing away spears, rejecting swords, mocking danger and laughing off death. Love prevails everything.” \footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 40, 2: “Fortem facit uis amoris, quia nil durum, nil aamarum, nil graue, nil letale computat amor uerus. Amor inpenetrabilis est lorica, respuit iacu-la, gladios excutit, periculis insultat, mortem ridet. Si amor est, uincit omnia”: OSPC 1, 284.}

Love is a distinctive feature of God’s saints. A man, who feels loved, clearly shows his love. Therefore, St. John the Evangelist is more sensitive and ardent in matters concerning our Lord, than St. Peter who often referred to opinions of his opponents. \footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 14, 3: OSPC 1, 132.} True love shares suffering with others, \footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 178: OSPC 3, 322–327.}

therefore love for our enemy is typical for Christians. \footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 78, 6: OSPC 2, 124. 126.}

God is described as Forgiving Love, one that not only restores innocence but also honour for the one who is being forgiven. For this reason God is a role
model for all those forgiving someone. That is why parents are encouraged to show love to their children, while God will return good for everything they did for their children.

Salvian of Marseilles

Love and mercy are our Lord’s most important commandment. God is the source of all love, who passes this feature onto all of his creatures. Therefore love, which is typical of our Maker, infects all parents who love their children. Salvian’s observation that love and mutual kindness among Barbarian Goths was more evident than among Romans, was a meaningful sign of the 5th century.

5.2.2.5. Chastity. Peter Chrysologus

Chastity is a virtue typical for Christians. They gain chastity by practicing all virtues, but especially so by practicing moderation and lent. It is something that is done voluntarily because of the Kingdom of Heaven and leads to a dependence on God. It allows a mental contact with God. Practicing chastity leads some Christians to an even greater dedication to God, expressed in the form of martyrdom. The Old Testament demanded a cleanliness of the body, leading the way to meet God. Real chastity is a charismatic gift, it begins with baptism and can be obtained as a grace by being receptive to the Holy Spirit.

---

321 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 3, 4: “Paterna pietas contenta non est innocentiam reparare solam, nisi pristinum restituat et honorem”: OSPC 1, 64.
322 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 33, 2: “quia quicquid filiis parentes impenderint, repensabit parentibus parentis omnipium deus”: OSPC 1, 244.
324 Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 4, 44: SCh 220, 268; compare Ac 17:28.
326 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 22, 4: OSPC 1, 180.
327 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 7 bis, 1: OSPC 1, 92.
328 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 56, 2: OSPC 1, 378.
329 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 24, 2: OSPC 1, 192.
331 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 59, 2: OSPC 1, 396.
Salvian of Marseilles

Chastity, just like other moral virtues embellishes man and is recommended by Christ.\(^{333}\) Christ’s teaching is continued in the teaching of St. Paul.\(^{334}\) Practicing chastity begins with mortifying looks.\(^{335}\) Salvian is positive about legal sanctions concerning sexual morality, introduced by the so called ‘Barbarian’ Vandals in Africa: In order to stop shameful practices, they introduced strict rules concerning sexual morality. By doing so, by introducing legal sanctions they eradicated such offences. Two elements were added to protect men’s and women’s sexual behavior: marital feelings at home and fear of sanctions from the outside. In other words, chastity was based on two effective basis: internally on the love for the partner and externally on the fear of law.\(^{336}\)

Salvian stressed the fact that the Barbarians are more likely to keep moral integrity than the Romans.\(^{337}\) In his opinion, this was the reason for the victory of the reserved Germanic tribes over the hot-tempered Romans.\(^{338}\)

5.2.2.7. Virtues typical of each author

There are fewer virtues, which are recommended by particular authors than vices. They are described by one author only. For St. Peter Chrysologus the most important one, and one widely discussed by him was the virtue of justice. Whereas Salvian of Marseilles concentrated on virtues such as: freedom, peace, wisdom, as well as, modesty and moderation.

\(^{333}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 10: SCh 220, 436.

\(^{334}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 6, 64: SCh 220, 6; compare 1 Tim 2:2. The text (1 Tim 2:2) which Salvian had was probably *Veteres latinae* (similar in the Vulgate: *ut quietam et tranquillam vitam agamus in omni pietate et castitate*). This is clearly an interpolation of the Greek: compare *The Greek New Testament*, ed. K. Aland et al., Münster (We) 1984, p. 715.

\(^{335}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 3, 37: SCh 220, 214.

\(^{336}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *De Gubernatione Dei* 7, 99; ‘Addiderunt quoque hoc ad libidinem comprimendum, seueras pudicitiae sanctiones, decretorum gladio impudicitiam coercentes, ut puritatem scilicet utriusque sexus et domi conubiorum seruaret affectus et in publico metus legum; ac sic duplici praesidio castimonia niteretur, cum et intus esset quod amaretur et foris quod timeretur’: SCh 220, 500. 502.
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Justice
Justice is mentioned by Peter Chrysologus only. In accordance to Matthew 6, 1, this is a virtue which should be practiced secretly and known only to God, not to be flaunted in front of people.\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 9, 1: OSPC 1, 100; compare Mt 6:1. Chrysologus used the Vetus Itala version of the Bible. We do not have a complete text, but it can be compared to the Vulgate in which Jerome translated the Greek ‘dikaiousin umon’ (TGNT) into the Latin iusticiam uestram. Other versions of the Greek text have ‘elemosunen umon’.} Justice which is paraded among people is signifies hypocrisy and blindness,\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 9, 2: OSPC 1, 100.} as the reward for it belongs to people and not God.\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 9, 2: OSPC 1, 102.} A true intention of every man, a just man is known only to God.\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 9, 4: OSPC 1, 104.}

Freedom
Only Salvian talks about freedom, which he defines as an art of good life, freeing the mind from legislature.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 5, 2: SCh 220, 310; compare 1 Tim 1:8–9.} True internal freedom is a freedom from sin. Thus every fall is paying unjustified duty to sin. Remaining in sin does not bring man freedom but an even greater enslavement through weakness.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 99: SCh 220, 428.} Therefore, a truly free man, has a proper internal attitude towards reality.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 1, 9: SCh 220, 108; Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 60: SCh 220, 280; compare Gal 6:3.}

External peace
Only Salvian of Marseilles mentions external peace, which he describes as God’s gift,\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 5, 61: SCh 220, 358; compare Lk 9:24.} which disappears when man commits sin.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 7, 35: SCh 220, 358; compare Lk 9:24.}

Wisdom
Again, this topic is discussed by Salvian only. Following God’s commandments,\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 5: SCh 220, 234; compare Jn 8, 9; Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 7, 48: SCh 220, 464. 350 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 5, 61: SCh 220, 358; compare Lk 9:24.} a liking for good and offering your life to Christ is a sign of wisdom.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 5, 61: SCh 220, 358; compare Lk 9:24.}
5.3. Summary

The teaching of both authors coincides in its perception of man in his earthly life as weak and sinful. On the basis of their analysis of various Biblical texts, they put emphasis on different anthropological issues. Chrysologus puts the weak man, trying to reform, into God's hands. Only later, he mentions the role of man's cooperation with the Almighty in this matter. Salvian advocates ascetic perfection in achieving this goal. As a result, Chrysologus forms an orthadox synthesis of Catholic teaching on sin and the evil of sin and also describes the basic sins and their opposing virtues. Salvian's teaching in the above matter is rather selective and the author concentrates on the description of individual sins and virtues and does not present a complex theology of sin or virtue. But his ascetic means of preventing sin are more radical.

**Sin**

Only St. Peter Chrysologus concentrates on the teaching of original sin and the evil of sin. It is a pastoral view of sin, omitting polemics with Pelagians. Sin is perceived as a downfall and drifting away from God. It affects every man and results in mortality. But the evil of sin caused by Satan, never becomes the substance of man, but is an affliction of human nature. One can overcome it in earthly life by patiently following Christ.

The topic of sin was seen as constant intervention of God, God's mercy by Chrysologus and as God's pedagogy of punishment and mercy for the sinner by Salvian. Chrysologus saw the need for mercy in abandoning sin and saw atonement as its consequence. Whereas, Salvian was more didactic; his view came down to the Roman proverb 'do ut des', meaning that if man had offered nothing in his earthly life, he cannot expect anything from God in eternity.

Both authors thought that lack of faith came from a rejection of the authority of God, leading to idolatry. The source of evil in man is greed. They both condemned an idolatric and immoral character of ancient culture. Chrysologus saw the root of dissolution in sensual lust, whilst Salvian sought the causes in covetousness of the eyes and the dishonesty of desires.
Both authors saw prevention of sin differently. A proper use of earthly goods was the answer to greed for Chrysologus, whilst Salvian saw the need to reject temptation and live owning only bare essentials. Chrysologus suggested Catholics should avoid shows not to allow obscenity. Salvian was more radical, he forbade participation in shows, seeing them as acts of Satan. Both authors recommended chastity or faithfulness in marriage as a counter-measure against dissolution.

The sins mentioned by Chrysologus only (jealousy, envy, hypocrisy) were typical of the congregation of the Church and made people drift away from God. To prevent this situation, he suggested strictly avoiding all sin. Salvian described the immorality of masses, condemned their hatred, stupidity, arrogance and made catalogues of sins, making a statement about the moral decay of the entire Church. He saw the solution in individual ascetism.

**Virtues**

There is a description of virtues in Chrysologus’ pastoral teaching only. Virtues are gifts bringing us closer to God. As God’s instructions, they are subject to the rules of faith in the Church. Achieving such goals requires persistence. Salvian does not reflect on virtues but both authors agree that they lead to merciful stance.

According to both authors, practicing detailed virtues is based on faith, which depends on our internal contact with God. Chrysologus concentrated on deeds encouraging faith and acts weakening it whereas, Salvian portrayed a jurisdictional vision of faith which should be confirmed good deeds and applying to all God’s commandments. What the two authors undoubtedly share, is their hope; a reward for a good and virtuous life. Chrysologus stressed the universal truth about the resurrection of the body, whereas, Salvian concentrated on eternal reward for individual service. According to both authors, mercy leads to an eternal life: assures salvation (Chrysologus) and frees from damnation (Salvian). Whilst for Chrysologus, mercy comes of God’s will, for Salvian it is a general rule, both God’s will and human will. For both authors, love is a divine quality and Lord’s commandment. Chrysologus sees it as a typical feature of people who are loved and who are merciful, whilst for Salvian it is a divine quality as well as,
a feature of earthly parents. Chastity as a restricted virtue (by mortifying) leads to God. Salvian stressed the legalistic aspect of chastity: practicing it prevented sexual abuse.

The one virtue mentioned by Chrysologus only is human justice as a virtue of proper relationship between people. Whereas, Salvian’s triad of virtues (freedom, external peace, wisdom) recommended to all people. From a historical point of view, this seems to be a recommendation for all Christians already living under Germanic reign or expecting a Barbarian invasion.
6. Attitude to material goods

Both clergymen deal with topics connected with the right to ownership, both took a stance on wealth and the religious requirement of alms. For Peter Chrysologus a man is meant for a life with God, therefore in the prospect of coming to God the value of material goods is relative. The possibility of owning and using worldly goods comes from God, therefore as a power granted by God and not legislated by people it is limited by its source and duration. However, Salvian stresses that all worldly goods come from God, they are meant for all people and not only for the chosen few. It is therefore necessary for people to acknowledge the fact that goods are God’s gift and wealth should be used accordingly. The Bishop of Ravenna warns the congregation that growing wealthy, understood as acquiring material goods can lead them to greed. He stresses that it is our Lord’s wish to win favours which lead us to Heaven. Wealth coupled up with greed burdens the soul of the wealthy, destroys interpersonal bonds and morality. It leads to distancing from God and to various forms of idolatry. For Salvian wealth itself is not wrong but it is subject to degradation from moral point of view if the way it is acquired is wrong. Salvian stresses that the aim behind acquiring wealth should be winning God’s favour through generosity. Otherwise God will treat acquiring wealth as pure greed. For Chrysologus alms is an act of human mercy, as an act useful to other human beings it is a continuation of God’s action. Salvian teaches that alms is important only from religious point of view and shows mercy. Giving alms stops one from craving wealth for wealth itself, its egotistic acquiring, lack of faith and godlessness. This is the reason why all people of faith are called on to show practical and useful mercy.
6.1. The right to ownership

For Chrysologus matter is created, temporal and therefore limited in its existence. A believer must have a proper hierarchy in relation to matter: God first, then his works. The Bishop of Ravenna introduced a general rule concerning material goods: they should serve man, not dominate him. In earthly life one can only temporarily manage material goods, guided by the virtues of faith, goodness, justice and mercy. Having recognized that all material goods originate from God and the fact that they were intended for all people, Salvian called for a need for all people to acknowledge these rights. He encouraged a proper use of earthly material goods in the spirit of faith, honesty and mercy.

6.1.1. Peter Chrysologus

Theologically, Peter Chrysologus justifies the right to ownership through the Biblical concept of matter, which he perceives as created by God and thus completely dependent on the Almighty.\(^1\) He makes it particularly clear in his Sermo 46, which includes a comment on Psalm 95 (94). In it, 

---

the Bishop of Ravenna explicitly states that matter itself is not eternal, but created, thus is not connected with the beginning of the world. The only source of being of anything is God, who created everything, both the spiritual and material, out of nothing (ex nihilo). God is not perceived as a demiurge – an explorer, who barely shapes the material universe but as the sole Creator of everything: “His is the sea and he created it.” Therefore you will not be led to believe that the sea was searched for, found and not created by God: “his is the sea and he created it.” Where are those who claim that God shaped the world out of matter and mainly out of water? Our God is in Heaven and on Earth not as an explorer but as a creator who as a creator of matter made everything out of nothing.\(^2\)

In the above text Chrysologus rejected both the concept of divine naturalism\(^3\) of Thales of Miletus, who thought that water\(^4\) is the principle of all things, as well as, the gnostic dualism of early Christian heresies: the Marcionites, the Valentinians, the followers of Apelles, but foremost the heresy of the gnostic Hermogenes.\(^5\)

---


\(^4\) Thales of Miletus associated the world with water. The remaining Milesians associated it with other substances; Anaximander with the so called apeiron (an abstract boundlessness, something infinite or unlimited), Anaximenes – with air. For Heraclitus of Ephesus, fire was the archetypal form of matter. But it was not perceived as the primeval substance as understood by the Milesians (’arche’). Fire was the source of natural phenomena for Heraclitus, but it was neither unspecified nor indefinite. It was perceived as a part of the world equal to the sea or earth and as one of the three obvious elements of the world. The (a)ether was a pure cosmic fire for Heraclitus. To read more about the Milesians or Heraclitus see: G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, M. Schofield, *Filozofia przedokresjecka. Studium krytyczne z wybranymi tekstami*, tłum. J. Lang, Poznań 1999, p. 88–167 (Milesians), 185–214 (Heraclitus of Ephesus); compare also G. Reale, *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, t. 1, op. cit., p. 75–102.

\(^5\) Theophilus of Antioch was the first to protest against dualistic views of Hermogenes. Around the year 205, Tertullian wrote his treatise opposing the views of Hermogenes: *Adversus Hermogenem*: SCh 439, ed. F. Chapot, Paris 1999, p. 12. Under the dualistic influence of gnosis, Hermogenes came to a conclusion that God created the world from matter, which had
Matter as something created and temporary has its obvious limitations resulting from its dependency on God. Because of this, man in his attitude to matter must first of all be directed by faith in God and respect the hierarchy resulting from it: first of all God, then His works. Only the Creator can possess all, because only He gives and takes existence to all beings. With the prospect of Heaven, the value of material things is relative as one can take none of the worldly, material wealth with him after death. The only true value of the believer is God and heavenly goods. Chrysologus stressed that this is the teaching of Christ himself by referring to Luke 12:32–33. In his comment to this extract from the Bible, the Bishop of Ravenna pointed that man should not overestimate the value of material goods, the goods should serve and not dominate over us. Man preferring worldly goods over spiritual ones forgets his human calling for eternity with God and by doing so becomes depressed and discouraged. If he cares for material wealth only, symbolized by gold and silver, certain-existed earlier and thus he rejected God’s creation of the world from nothing. Evil appeared in space and by such also in the human being and not through irresponsible deeds. He also put forward the idea that an element of God’s Soul was also material, thus making God himself somehow burdened with evil. To read more about Hermogenes’ heresy and Christian polemics with his views see: A. Quacquarelli, *L’Adversus Hermogenem di Tertulliano*, “Rassegna di Scienze Filosofiche” 4 (1951), p. 61–69 i 5 (1952), 39–54; J. H. Waszink, *Observations on Tertullian’s Treatise against Hermogenes*, “Vigiliae Christianae” 9 (1955), p. 129–147; F. Bolgiani, *Sullo scritto perduto di Teofilo d’Antiochia “Contro Ermogene”*, [in:] *Paradoxi Politiea. Studi patristici in onore di G. Lazzati*, a cura di R. Cantalamessa, L. F. Pizzolato, Milano 1979, p. 77–118; F. Chapot, *L’hérésie d’Hermogène. Fragments et commentaire*, “Recherches augustiniennes” 30 (1997), p. 3–111; F. Chapot, *Commentaire*, SCh 439, p. 207–434.

6 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 46, 5: OSPC 1, 322; compare Ps 95 (94):4.
7 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 22, 3: OSPC 1, 180.
8 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 22, 3: OSPC 1, 178; compare Lk 12:33.
9 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 22, 1–2: OSPC 1, 178; compare Lk 12:32–33.
11 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 22, 2: OSPC 1, 178.
12 ‘Gold and silver’, these are typical terms used in the works of Latin Fathers. These precious metals were the synonym of money. Patristic writings were usually more precise, whereas, Greek ones were more general and for example St. Gregory of Nazianus does not mention gold even though he wrote about gold several times. To read more about financial management from a patristic perspective see the following articles: R. Boekaert, *Geld*, [in:] ed, A. Hiersemann, RACH IX, Stuttgart 1976, p. 797–907; Ch. Pietri,
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...ty and peace is no longer part of his life.\textsuperscript{13} But a man who fulfills Christ’s wish to give goods and alms to others, is not only obedient to God but can exercise the right to Heaven by proper transformation of worldly goods into heavenly ones.\textsuperscript{14}

Like most Fathers,\textsuperscript{15} Chrysologus specifies the limitations of ownership resulting from Epiphany. The right to own and to manage your own goods in our earthly life comes from God. As a power given by God and not legislated by people, its source (from God) and duration (until death) is clearly stated. Any power granted to any creature is granted by God, thus there is not one that does not come from God.\textsuperscript{16} Man on Earth, no matter the scale of power he has (example: king – \textit{rex}; governor of province – \textit{provinciarum rector}, one ruling the city – \textit{urbium rector}, army commander – \textit{dux}, a soldier – \textit{miles}, as well as, a judge – \textit{iudex}) will give God an

\begin{itemize}
\item Evérgetisme et richesses ecclésiastiques dans l’Italie du IV\textsuperscript{e} à la fin du V\textsuperscript{e} s., (l’exemple romain), “Ktema” 3 (1978), p. 317–337; P. Gruszka, Złoto u Grzegorza z Nazjanzu, Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, „Historia” 7 (1978), p. 91–100; J. Jundzill, \textit{Pieni\mkern-\thickmuskip2mu\mkern-\thickmuskip-

\textsuperscript{13} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 22, 3: OSPC 1, 178.
\textsuperscript{14} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 22, 2: OSPC 1, 178.
\textsuperscript{16} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 5: OSPC 1, 202; compare Rom 13:1.
account of his service and the power he exercised.\textsuperscript{17} Thus everyone, even the landlord\textsuperscript{18} should remember that he is only a temporary administrator and not an absolute ruler of the land he had been granted.\textsuperscript{19} In family life a believing father (head of the family – pater familias) should bear in mind that he is solely the administrator not the owner and thus should be virtuous and good and just towards household members.\textsuperscript{20}

Administering goods is not a sole right of a given few but all people on Earth are administrators of their own goods, but this administration is always temporary.\textsuperscript{21} Chrysologus stresses that using goods is a service (\textit{ministerium}), but a passing, earthly one (\textit{temporariae}), therefore no one should think that he has acquired anything forever. A mortal human being only acquires a temporary, not an eternal right to ownership. He should, here on Earth share with others and the criteria should be love.\textsuperscript{22}

Pagans are always dishonest administrators of earthly goods as they have rejected God and have devoted themselves to the worship of money.\textsuperscript{23} A pagan fails to notice the hierarchy of ownership recommended in the Bible as he is devoted to earthly wealth. Wealth becomes an idol. The goods themselves have been wasted (\textit{dissipate}) by treating them in an idolatrous way. An advocate of worldly goods will have to give God an account of how he managed the goods (\textit{naturalis boni}).\textsuperscript{24} A pagan who does not respect divine revelation, does not take into consideration individual responsibility for his deeds or the fact that we are only temporarily and provisionally responsible for our earthly goods or the changing world itself.\textsuperscript{25} As a priest, Chrysologus suggests giving up material goods to God, not surrendering to the worship of wealth, instead using it to the benefit of others.\textsuperscript{26}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{17} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 5: OSPC 1, 202. 204.
\item\textsuperscript{18} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 6: OSPC 1, 204.
\item\textsuperscript{19} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 125, 4: OSPC 3, 10. Chrysologus makes an allusion to the Biblical vision of God granting man the world, compare Gen 1:28.
\item\textsuperscript{20} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 6: OSPC 1, 204.
\item\textsuperscript{21} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 125, 11: OSPC 3, 14; compare Lk 16:1–9.
\item\textsuperscript{22} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 162, 3: OSPC 3, 264; compare Lk 12:13.
\item\textsuperscript{23} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 126, 5: OSPC 3, 20; compare Lk 15:11–32; 16:9.
\item\textsuperscript{24} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 126, 6: OSPC 3, 20, 22.
\item\textsuperscript{25} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 126, 6: OSPC 3, 22; compare 1 Cor 7:31; Lk 15:17.
\item\textsuperscript{26} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 126, 6: OSPC 3, 22.
\end{itemize}
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...es that not only for pagans but also for Christians ‘dough’ is a ‘cruel master’ (*saeculum dominum*), he warns that idolatric ‘dough’ once led to selling Christ and now it seems to dominate in the earthly lives of people. The true value of the Church are no worldly goods but poor people.

6.1.2. Salvian of Marseilles

Salvian admits that all worldly goods always come from God and are meant for everybody and not just for the chosen few. Therefore, Salvian finds it necessary to acknowledge this gift from God. It is necessary to use this wealth accordingly, with absolute devotion to God: “Acknowledging God’s presence and using God’s gifts decently means showing full honour to the Benefactor, through proper use of the wealth he had given us. Examples coming from earthly life seem reliable here. Let us say that someone has generously offered someone else his goods. If this person forgets his benefactor and tries to cheat him by trying to steal these goods, he will be judged as dishonest and ungrateful. What is more, one might say that by being ungrateful towards a man who was benevolent and generous, and who had enriched him by allowing use of the goods, he wished to deprive his benefactor.”

---

27 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 126, 6: OSPC 3, 22.
28 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 80, 8: OSPC 2, 138.
31 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* I, 24: SCh 176, 156.
32 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* I, 24: “Hoc enim est agnoscere munus dei et diuinis beneficiis bene uti, ut datis suis illum honores a quo data ipsa acceperis. Quod quidem etiam humanarum rerum exempla docent. Si enim usus rerum aliquarum cuipiam homini alterius hominis beneficio ac largitate tribuat, isque inmemor illius a quo fructum rerum indeptus est, auertere ab eo ipso proprietatetm praestitae rei atque alienare conetur, nonne ingratisimus omnium atque infidelissimus iudicetur, qui obligus scilicet hominis beneficii ac liberalissimi spoliare illum iure dominii sui uelit qui eum ipsum usus possessione ditaerit?”: SCh 176, 156.
Man should always be faithful and thankful to God as his first Benefactor by putting all material things in His hands. Referring to 1 Timothy 6:17–18, Salvian comes to a conclusion that “various goods have been granted by God, so that their owners could become rich by doing good deeds.”

Not forgetting this basic use of anything Salvian stresses that all things owned by man, have not been granted for eternal use, but man is only a temporary user of these things (precarii possessors). Man dies independently of his will and leaves behind everything which had been his wealth, therefore he should use his wealth fairly, without deception, especially towards God as the real donor.

All material property at the man’s disposal is God’s gift. Therefore all people are God’s debtors. God grants goods for a given period of time. The fact that people are sinful creatures brings forth several restrictions such as mortality and covetousness. Growing wealthy during earthly life is restricted by the temporary nature of material things – they are owned by man only in his mortal life, when they can still be multiplied. For this reason Salvian encourages the faithful to give all owned goods to God (Book of Proverbs 3:9 and Sirach 4:8 – in the Vulgate only).

Human covetousness hampers proper use of goods. A man who believes in God should not crave material goods, he is obliged to do everything to...

---


35 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 26: “Denique egredientes e mundo isto, uelimimus nolimus, hic cuncta relinquimus”: SCh 176, 156, 158.

36 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 26: SCh 176, 158.

37 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 27: SCh 176, 158.

 dismiss all forms of covetousness. Salvian refers to the 1st Letter to the Corinthians 29–31 and stresses that St. Paul sensibly (moderatus sit) and in a spirit of perfection (unam perfectionem universa) encourages moderation among Christians in this matter. According to Salvian, one of the reasons for introducing these restrictions was to break free from the Jewish obedience to law, its mentality and on the other hand to point to Christians a rigorous but universal interpretation of what is allowed. Salvian pointed to the fact that God granted man material wealth, so that he could make proper use of it, to feel glad fulfilling good deeds and to earn happiness in Heaven in return for their generosity on Earth.

Inheriting material wealth was another important issue for the faithful. Salvian suggested seeing it in terms of religious duties and the needs of the Church. He did not cite himself as an authority but relied on the Holy Bible, the book in which the faithful will find all solutions. He noted that that owners of material things should follow the example of other devout, wealthy people described in the Old Testament (acquiring material wealth but respecting the Laws and obedient to God).

Salvian called for a gradual renouncement of material goods, shown in the Holy Bible. In the Old Testament, there are two types of good, devout owners: the Old Testament men of means before and after the introduction of the Law. The third approach to ownership is encouraging to give up wealth (the learning of the New Testament). In Salvian’s opinion, the bigger the sacrifice, the bigger the excellence before God. Therefore everybody was allowed to acquire wealth before the introduction of the Law in Israel, there were no restrictions in this matter. People were free to acquire wealth.

---

40 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 21: SCh 176, 200.
41 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 21: “non inlicita solum intercidendo sed etiam licita coartando”: SCh 176, 200.
42 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 30: SCh 176, 160; compare 1 Tim 6:17–19.
44 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 15: SCh 176, 196.
45 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 15: SCh 176, 196.
46 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 16: SCh 176, 196. 198.
Together with the introduction of the Law, what was and what was not allowed was established for example live justly and do not covet.47 The saints of the time acquired wealth according to what was and what was not allowed.48 Everything was first and foremost subordinated to God and in line with His Law. Wealth was treated as an addition to and not as an aim of life.49 Both the saints of the Old Testament and the saints of the New Testament were ready to give up their wealth in the name of God.50 Their ascetic deeds and religious work were an indication of the sacrifices described in the New Testament. Salvian was particularly fond of piety and mercy of Tobias, the sexual abstinence of Anna the Prophetess and the justice of Nathaniel.51 As compared to the Law, the imperatives of the Gospel were more rigorous and restrictive. This was meant to encourage a perfection and zealousness towards God among people.52

6.2. Wealth

Peter Chrysologus perceived growing wealthy as an accumulation of material goods. A person constantly accumulating wealth is threatened by greed. Therefore he warned against the risks arising from greedily gathered wealth (it burdens the soul, destroys interpersonal bonds and morality, distances from God and leads to idolatry). Chrysologus appealed to wealthy Christians to show mercy towards those in need and he called for holiness of life on earth.

Salvian defined wealth as an abundance of material goods. Affluence can only be bad through improper acquiring or use of goods. He warned in this context against greed leading the wealthy towards constant lack of
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faith, idolatrous treatment of goods themselves and excessive arrogance towards God and people. The writer urged wealthy Christians to be actively merciful, to be guided in life by the virtue of justice and to practice an ascetic attitude towards worldly goods.

6.2.1. Wealth according to Saint Peter Chrysologus

The bishop of Ravenna warns the congregation that growing wealthy understood as acquiring material goods can lead them to greed.53 He reminds them of Matthew 6:19–2054 and stresses that our Lord driven by love55 wishes his pupils to gain values leading to Heaven.56 Collecting goods on earth can result in craving for worldly goods only. Therefore the faithful should resist the temptation of greed and the desire to own. It is useful to see the needs of the poor because active mercy towards the poor ensures heaven (tuta transuectio).57 The promise of a real treasure made in Matthew 6:20 should be an encouragement for the wealthy to be actively merciful.


54 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 6: OSPC 1, 88. 90.

55 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 6: OSPC 1, 88. 90, “De caritate consilium tam prouidum”.

56 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 6: OSPC 1, 8; compare Mt 6:17–18.

57 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 6: “Qui ergo uult tinea, rubiginem, fures sua ponit, exponit quae sua sunt, non reponit. Sicut de uestimento tinea, rubigo de metallo, de necessitate fur nascitur, ita de diuitiis auaritia, cupiditas de quaestu, de habendo habendi ardor adquiritur. Qui ergo uult auaritiam uincere, calcare cupiditatem, ardorem quaestus extinguere, diuitias proroget, non reponat. Praemittamus, fratres, thesauros nostros in caelum. Sunt uectores pauperes, qui possunt sinu suo quae nostra sunt ad superna portare. Nemo de personis dubitet baiulorum; tuta est ista, tuta transuectio, per quam nostra ad deum deo fideiussore portantur”: OSPC 1, 90.
6.2.1.1. The threats coming from wealth.

It burdens the soul of the rich

Chrysologus also noticed other threats connected with owning goods. He thought that it could burden the soul of the man of means. In *Sermo* 29 which refers to Mark 2:14 Chrysologus remembers the tax collector Levi, the son of Alphaeus, sitting in the tax chamber. What he stressed was the immoral way in which he acquired wealth and his greed. Wealth and greed shocks the mind and burdens the body and soul of the greedy man as it paralysis our internal power and destroys feelings. The aspirations of the greedy man, even his big aspirations become down to earth and he inevitably has earthly worries.

It ruins interpersonal bonds and morality

Owning gold and greed leads to an even further wish to acquire more wealth and destroys human manners and the nature of man. Wealth gradually suppresses sensitivity towards the suffering of the poor and in the end leads to hard-heartedness. Chrysologus points out another merciless man of means, this time from the parable of Luke 16:19–31. In the entire history of salvation one can recall situations where the lust for gold and envy led to fraud and fighting between the patriarchs themselves for example two brothers selling Joseph to the Barbarians. By destroying inner peace and then influencing moral behavior, wealth leads to idolatry. The Jews behavior during Moses’ time, who rejected God because of their wealth and chose the golden calf as their god, thus allowing idolatry according to Chrysologus. The Bishop of Ravenna had a similar view of Judas selling Christ out for money.

---

58 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 29, 1: OSPC 1, 220; compare Mk 2:14.
59 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 30, 1: OSPC 1, 256.
60 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 29, 1: OSPC 1, 220.
61 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 29, 3: “Intuere quid auro grauius, quod cum mores hominum perdit, perdit et naturam”: OSPC 1, 222.
64 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 29, 3: “Aurum Iudaicum populum sic suo captuauit aspectu, uinxit illecebris, specie perdecepit, ut hoc esse deum crederent, et deum uerum, deum tot beneficiis cognitum denegarent. Sic conuertit homines in iumenta, ut uituli caput caput suum
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Chrysologus was negative about wealth acquired solely for egotistic reasons. A wealthy person could share excess wealth with those in need. If he does not do this, his wealth deteriorates and the suffering of those left without care dawns on God. Economic injustice is a result of bad laws and improper country structure which results in excessive fiscal exploitation of citizens. This situation was typical in the declining years of the Western Roman Empire.

Making profit through usury was a fatal consequence of the constant desire to own more. This is something which the Bishop of Ravenna condemned as it rips material goods off any value in terms of eternal life. It does not serve a divine purpose as it does not multiply man’s goodness, but destroys it. Usury causes moral degradation of the wealthy and the downfall of their humanity. The result is hatred and a rejection of God’s summons for conversion and reconciliation, as well as, an exploitation of the poor asking for justice.

**Distancing from God, idolatry**
Thoughtless senseless acquisition of wealth arising from greed leads to a gradual downfall of the human dignity of the man of means. Chrysologus refers to the evangelical Prodigal Son (Lk 15:11–32), who moves away from God. At the same time his humiliation reaches its apogee when he is in mud with the pigs, The Bishop of Ravenna reminds those who have become rich in a dishonest way, that they will be assessed by God, who will do them justice.

---

65 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 137, 9: OSPC 3, 76; Lk 3:11; Is 66:24; Mt 25:42. 43.
67 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 28, 3: “Vrebat uidentes quod usura, quae uastat terram, tollebat ad caelum; et hanc, quam detestantur homines, diuinitus aduocabat”: OSPC 1, 216; compare Mt 9:10–11.
68 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 1, 3: OSPC 1, 50; in particular compare Lk 15:12–16.
Owning goods, symbolized by gold, usually turns into some form of idolatry. This usually burdens the soul of the man and he risks an accusation from God. Based on the story of the vile man of means (Lk 15:11–32), Chrysologus shows the evil behavior of the rich towards the needy. Such despicable people trust themselves and their wealth too much and fail to notice others. With time their behavior towards God becomes ungrateful and cruel and evil towards people. From a theological point of view, this negative opinion of the man of means concerns not only his egotistical attitude to others, but also the way he used his wealth. Material goods accumulated only for the purpose of increasing wealth become useless to others. Chrysologus describes this bluntly; he became a guardian of other people’s things as he did not wish to pay using his own goods.

Egotism and godlessness of the vile man of means makes him lose his internal peace and quiet (misericordiae pacem perdiderat et quietem), which usually comes from doing good deeds, the vile man was never accustomed to. The godless man of means, gradually loses the sense of life and gives in to the devil. The stupidity and short-sightedness of the man of means overwhelmed by the need to multiply wealth, is symbolized by his closing the gates of the granary and not allowing the poor access. By refusing to help others, he caused numerous human tragedies and by not offering help, he brought upon himself a sentence of condemnation. All the man’s deeds were acts of his body and not his heart, thus God called him stupid: the one who chose to run away from light and mercy, who walked in darkness and greed and therefore led himself into dungeons.

The man of means who mistreated his neighbours and opposed mercy, will stand ‘empty-handed and helpless’ during Final Judgement as he

70 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 1: OSPC 2, 298; compare Lk 12:16–20.
72 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 2: OSPC 2, 298.
73 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 2: "ut esset alienorum custus, qui esse suorum noluit prorogator": OSPC 2, 298.
74 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 3: OSPC 2, 298; compare Lk 12:16–17.
75 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 4: OSPC 2, 198; compare Lk 12:17.
76 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 5: OSPC 2, 300; compare Lk 12:18.
77 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 5: OSPC 2, 300; compare Lk 12:18.
78 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 5: OSPC 2, 300; compare Lk 12:17–20.
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had not done any good for his neighbours. What is more, his hands in Limbo are not only empty but also tied – he cannot use them, he cannot help himself as he had done no good in his lifetime. According to Chrysologus every pitiless man of means is a fool during Final Judgement and an egotistic and ruthless attitude to wealth is a sign of stupidity. Because of their trust in God, mercy and the way they use wealth, the poor will be saved and the ruthless and godless will be condemned.

Chrysologus neither praises nor condemns poverty. But he judges man’s moral behavior, his attitude to ownership from an evangelical point of view. Paradoxically, it was poverty that led the evangelical poor man to wisdom and his patient acceptance of pain led him to a life in virtue. In case of ruthless man of means, the affluent lifestyle caused arrogance and spiritual blindness. Therefore, the strict and arrogant men of means have no spiritual gems in eternity as they had only valued material wealth throughout their life. The ruthless wealthy are the poorest and most helpless because by depriving the needy, they had deprived themselves of happiness in eternity. The reason for God rejecting the man of means does not lie in the wealth as such, but in the cruel and egotistic use of wealth: if the man who hides his goods and does not offer them to others who need them is guilty, than what sort of punishment does the man who jealously guards his goods deserve?

---

79 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 104, 7: OSPC 2, 300; Chrysologus used the Vetus Itala, Ps 76 (75):6; the present day translation of the original Hebrew text contains a different version of this excerpt: Ps 76 (75):6.
80 This is where the dead are before Final Judgement. According to Chrysologus, the dead remain in the tartarus – limbo. By descending into the limbo and then rising from the dead, the Messiah lead the people to Heaven, but their bodies were not granted the honour of the glory of Christ. After the resurrection of Christ the souls descend into limbo where everybody (the just and unjust ones) are sentences. Compare: J. Speigl, Petrus Chrysologus über die Auferstehung der Toten, op. cit., p. 140–153.
81 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 122, 6: OSPC 2, 410; compare Lk 16:24; Job 29:15.
82 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 121, 2: OSPC 2, 398 (compare Lk 16:19–22); Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 122, 5: OSPC 2, 408.
83 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 124, 2: OSPC 2, 422; compare Lk 16:19–21.
84 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 122, 6: OSPC 2, 410; Lk 16:24.
85 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 123, 4: “Si tantum criminosis qui sua claudit, qui non largitur accepta, quam poenalis qui nunc in suis incubat, aliena perudit!”: OSPC 2, 412. 414.
Chrysologus does not condemn wealth as such. In such case one would have to condemn each honest and God-fearing man of means – the patriarchs and wise men of the Old Testament (Abraham, Noah, Egyptian Joseph, Job, David etc.). He does not criticize wealth but brands evil, a ruthless use of wealth – purely for egotistic reasons. The wealthy keeping things to themselves, those not sharing with others, will be condemned for not showing mercy. In Heaven there is no room for earthly criteria, instead there is an order of mercy.

6.2.1.2. Reprimands concerning the rich
For centuries there has been tension in society between the rich and the poor. This tension can be directed properly because the wealthy can be merciful towards the poor. A Biblical example of such behavior is the story of Jesus (Lk 16:19–31) about Lazarus and the ruthless man of means. The inhuman man of means (inhumani diuitis) is rejected by God as on Earth he had treated everybody in an inhuman way. Being “wealthy, he did not care to share that with the man in need and did not deserve for the poor to share his suffering with him and did not receive the gentleness of water as he had refused the poor bread, who was panting with exertion.”

---

86 To read more on the subject of lack of criticism of wealth as such (typical of monasticism) but not prevalent in the writings of Chrysologus, as well as, the negative assessment of ruthless use of wealth see: “Per foramen acus”. Il cristianesimo antico di fronte alla pericope evangelica del “giovane ricco”, a cura di B. Maggioni, L. F. Pizzolato, Milano 1986.
87 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 121, 4: OSPC 2, 400; compare Mt 25:35.
88 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 124, 8: OSPC 2, 426; compare Lk 16:24.
89 There are two versions of the name of the evangelical poor beggar. The name Lazarus is derived from the translations of the Bible into Latin (the so called Vetus Latinae before Heraclitus). In one of the texts (Vetus Itala) both Lazarus and Eleazarus were used interchangeably as was the case in all manuscripts connected with Sermo LXVI. Alexander Olivar, the publisher of Chrysologus works gave both versions of the name Lazarus (in CChSL 24 A, 393–398 as well as OSPC 2, 32–38).
90 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 66: OSPC 2, 32–38.
91 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 66, 1: OSPC 2, 32.
92 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 66, 1: “quia diues qui participem pauperem in bonis prae sentitus adire contempsit, in futuris malis compatientem pauperem non meruit inuenire, nec ardens aquae refrigerium percepit, aestuanti pauperi fame panis refrigerium qui negauit”: OSPC 2, 32.
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On the other hand we have Abraham, a merciful and saintly man of means, sensitive to the needs of his neighbours and merciful to those in need. As opposed to the bad, wealthy man, Abraham is miles different.

“He sees Abraham in the background.” Only the one who had not been hostile to the poor sees him. He sees Abraham who was rich but free from lack of pity. Abraham was rich, but he was rich in human kindness more than in anything else; while your richness was human indifference rather than wealth itself; Abraham was a foreigner, but was a joint-citizen to guests; even though you owned palaces, you did not give them to the poor. The Lord was Abraham’s guest, whereas you had refused a single poor man, you lost the drop of rest.93

The rich can only show mercy on Earth, there is no room for mercy in Hell and no hope for forgiveness94 therefore Chrysologus encourages them to follow Abraham’s example. He advises them to learn to distinguish the time during their earthly life to do good, to pray to God at the right time as after death it is too late to improve anything.95

Christ is wealthy in a proper way, he is rich in his divinity and human perfection, but like every Messiah, poor in material things. Therefore, he is an example for everybody to follow;96 if a wealthy man wishes to be really wealthy, he should follow God’s example and should be merciful towards the needy.97 The only real earthly wealth, is wealth acquired in the spirit of piety. The wealthy should follow the example of good, merciful men of means (from the Old Testament) – Abraham, David or Job, and avoid the ruthlessness of the anonymous man of means criticized in the

94 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 66, 3: “In tormentis quae spes ueniae? Et in hora sententiae tempus indulgentiae quis requirit?”: OSPC 2, 32. 34.
96 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 125, 3: OSPC 3, 10.
Bible. Zacchaeus is one such sensible man of means. By giving up his wealth as alms to the poor, he became Christ’s pupil, rich in his mercy. As an act of mercy, wealth given up to the poor results in eternal life.

6.2.2. Wealth according to Salvian of Marseilles

Worldly wealth is the abundance of material goods acquired in various ways. Material goods themselves are not evil but they are subject to degradation from moral point of view if acquired or used inappropriately. Material things are not the reason behind punishment, instead the wealthy people who have made them the reason for pain; they did not want to use their goods judiciously but transformed them into suffering.

What is more, if the wealthy man does not take into consideration, the passing and the vanity of worldly goods, and at the same time rejects the greatness of heavenly things, then his sin is subject to religious sanctions and has eschatological consequences. Unlike Chrysologus, Salvian does not analyze in detail matters connected with wealth from moral or religious point of view. But he points to one vice which is usually connected

---


99 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 54, 7–9: OSPC 1, 368–370; compare Lk 19:8–9.

100 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 7, 6: OSPC 1, 88. 90; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 25, 2–3: OSPC 1, 196. 198; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 54, 7: OSPC 1, 368. 370.


103 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 47: “Cogitantes scilicet et praesentium rerum breuitatem et futurum aeternitatem, quam paruum istud, quam grande illud; cogitantes quoque futurum iudicem et tremendi iudicii graues exitus, ardentem in medio populum circumstantium ulalem perennium lacrimarum, quam non solum introiri atque tolerari inestimabile ac summum malum, sed etiam uideri ac timeri pars mali summi sit”: SCh 176, 220.
with wealth, that is greed. He then looks at the matter as a whole from religious point of view – the constant lack of faith brings about (out of his own choice) an eschatological rejection during the Final Judgement.

During their worldly life, the wealthy men have one cardinal vice – greed which sometimes makes them treat material goods in an idolatrous way. Salvian makes this judgement based in his own opinion but also on The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, in which St. Paul warns against insatiable greed which leads to idolatry.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 60: “auaritia idolatriae famula”: SCh 176, 182; compare Col 3:5.} The sin of the wealthy is always conscious, their intention is to constantly gain wealth even during the moment of death and they have an arrogant hope of salvation but not through their own achievements or good deeds but thanks to material wealth.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 41: “Non bonis itaque spebus innititur qui ad hoc tantum peccat in uita, ut peccatorum molem redimat in morte; et ideo se euasurum putat non quia bonus sed quia diues sit”: SCh 176, 168.} In Salvian’s opinion this is an illusory attempt of the rich to bring God down to a corrupted judge, as if God ever demanded any pay to absolve sins.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 42: “Quasi uero deus non uitam hominum sed pecuniam, atque a cunctis malorum redimendorum spe male agentibus accipere solos pro criminiibus nummos uelit, et corruptorum iudicum more argentum exigat, ut pecata uendat”: SCh 176, 168.} The rich, constantly corrupted by the earthly mentality of corrupting others through money, buying and selling, try to apply the same system to their relation with God. They want to treat Him like other people, buy something using money. From a religious point of view, their problem is that they do not listen to God’s recommendations and abandon their sins. Even when they give alms, it is not out of an internal need to help but because of an illusory hope that their payments buy them salvation.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 43: SCh 176, 168. 170.}

An unlawful acquisition of material goods entirely by a small group of people can sometimes be supported by the country’s ill financial system which can be manifested by introducing new taxes without providing the reasons for them,\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 30: SCh 220. 334.} excessive enforcement of taxes,\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 5, 17: SCh 220, 322. 324.} financial tyranny.
ny of tax collectors, and by creating a reprehensible system of dependency of the poor on the rich. Salvian noticed, however, that this faulty system was created by the rich only. Wealth acquired through greed led the wealthy to earthly riches but drew them away from active mercy making their material wellbeing the reason of their immorality.

Salvian accuses the rich of the fact that their motivation in acquiring wealth is greed and lack of faith. These features deprive them of the certainty of eternal life. The sin of greed leads them to arrogance and they forget Christ’s teaching concerning the need for punishment for their wrongdoing in eternal life. By rejecting God and by fighting religion, the rich create an obstacle on their way to salvation. By acquiring earthly goods only, they have an illusion of their earthly mightiness. Ownership is an illusion of stability, not an act of kindness. For this reason, Salvian is in favour of strict interpretation of Matthew 13:22 and calls material goods a delusion (fallaces...diuitias).

Do not allow anyone in the world think that wealth increases faith and does not harm it. Wealth is an obstacle, not of help, a burden and not support. Religion is not strengthened through riches, but destroyed by owning, by use of money. The Lord says: Earthly worries and the delusion of wealth, appease words and they become fruitless. He rightly described wealth as delusion. In fact, we call them goods, we see them this way. But the term we use to describe earthly goods, gives us an illusion because those goods are the source of endless suffering in future life.

114 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 4, 24: SCh 220, 250.
The wealthy do not trust God as they trust ephemeral earthly goods more, than they trust eternal God. They live in hatred for themselves, because by trusting the riches only, they sentence themselves to eternal banishment from Heaven. Hatred for themselves, makes the wealthy not notice the temporariness of their wealth, nor their mortality or the authority of the Word (Mt 10:28). They forget that they are only creatures, they act against reason, nature and admonitions of our Saviour. They prefer earthly life over eternal life. In a spirit of lack of faith and in opposition to God, they unjustly refuse their children who are clergy, the right to inherit the family's fortune and only allow them a temporary use of it. Such behavior of the rich, ones who do not believe in God, is a patent violation of Roman law and restricts the freedom of some of their children over other children. Refusing the children who are clergy, the right to full inheritance, is an obvious expression of aversion to God. Allowing them the use of the property only is refusing them inheritance in general. Salvian describes such attitude as lack of religiousness, practically paganism and an expression of hatred for God. Should the rich wish to act in the spirit of faith, they ought to remember that they only temporarily own goods and only manage them on in earthly life on behalf of God. They should not experience excessive pride because they manage material things. They should respect generosity to towards their neighbours and an obligation to pay.

Salvian reminds us that collecting goods should not be treated as a way of gaining God's favours as God treats man's accumulation of riches as greed and leads to irreversible tragedy as the wealthy man loses the

---

118 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 73: Sch 176, 236. 237.
119 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 73: Sch 176, 238.
120 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 29 Sch 176, 260.
123 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 28: Sch 176, 158. 160; the Biblical text in the above version is to be found only in the Vulgate: Eccl 4:8: “Declina pauperi a urem tuam et redde debitum tuum et responde pacifica in mansuetudine.”
chance of eternal life.\textsuperscript{125} Owning earthly riches can lead to idolatry, greed. Admonitions (Job 5:1–4), warning the rich against improper use of goods and an encouragement to reform should always accompany the rich.\textsuperscript{126} Salvian summons the rich to bear in mind that they will die one day and man is meant for eternal life and not for passing mortal life.\textsuperscript{127} If earthly riches are only temporary and God’s wisdom – eternal,\textsuperscript{128} then the wealthy man should resign from a life of luxury which leads him to oblivion and wealth ends in madness and damnation.\textsuperscript{129} He must come to his senses and start helping others.\textsuperscript{130} Salvian bases his teaching on the temporariness of goods on the words of Christ (Mt 25:25–30).\textsuperscript{131}

The poor (the one in need) is God’s banker. By giving alms, the rich man places it in a wallet which never runs out of money.\textsuperscript{132} Thus the wealthy man should acquire real wealth for God, according to norms of justice and careful to avoid greed\textsuperscript{133} and by bearing in mind that the law revealed in the Bible is mercy which is parallel to giving up material goods.\textsuperscript{134} For this reason Salvian encourages Christians to convert to God’s logic. He reminds

\textsuperscript{125} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 31: SCh 176, 160; Salvian used the Vulgate, thus the differences between the Hieronimus’ version and modern day translations from original languages.

\textsuperscript{126} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 33–34: SCh 176, 162. 164; compare Job 5:1–4.

\textsuperscript{127} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 68: SCh 176, 234; compare Wis 6:21.

\textsuperscript{128} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 69: SCh 176, 234.

\textsuperscript{129} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 70: SCh 176, 236.

\textsuperscript{130} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 4: “Cum enim nummularii saluatoris pauperes et egeni recte intellegantur, quia pecunia, quae talibus dispensatur, augeret, cum usuris absque dubio deo redditur quidquid egentibus erogatur. Vnde et alibi apertius ipse dominus distribuere diuitias opes mundi et facere sibi suffices qui non utterescant, iubet; sed et in uase electionis suae idcirco locupletibus diuinitias a domino dari indicat ut bono opere ditescant”: SCh 176, 242. Compare Lk 12:33; 1 Tim 6:17–18.

\textsuperscript{131} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 16–17: SCh 176, 196. 198.

\textsuperscript{132} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 2, 18–22: SCh 176, 198–202.
them of the instructions concerning wealth in the Bible and admonishes
the clergy unjustly acquiring wealth\textsuperscript{135} or what is even more surprising –
nuns acquiring wealth.\textsuperscript{136} He encourages all those who have dedicated their
life to God to use their earthly riches in an evangelical way and to bear in
mind that everything comes to an end.\textsuperscript{137} Salvian summons all Catholics
to own material goods, but in a spirit of Christian asceticism\textsuperscript{138} by being
able to give up their riches for God\textsuperscript{139} and through the spirit of mercy to
those in need, with whom Christ always identifies.\textsuperscript{140}

6.3. Almsgiving

Saint Peter Chrysologus’ teachings about the Christian meaning of alms-
giving is part of broader teaching about Christian mercy. Offering a
person in need alms for religious reasons is an answer to God’s call for mer-
cy. Each member of the Congregation is called to give alms accordingly
to his means. From religious point of view almsgiving results in absolv-
ing sins of the person offering alms. Mercy is a proof of the conversion
of the sinner and his partnership with God. Chrysologus encourages the
idea of holy trade. Those offering alms to the poor in their earthly life, will
be rewarded by God. Those offering alms should always remember that
it should be hidden, honest, sincere and should first of all appeal to God.

Salvian has consideration for the Final Judgement and this is his mo-
tivation behind almsgiving. During Final Judgement benefactors will be
rewarded with eternal life and the greedy will be punished with damnation.
According to Salvian almsgiving requires an appropriate attitude of
humbleness towards God. Material help should be given to those in need
in a spirit of mercy. Alms should be offered solely out of one’s goods, never

\textsuperscript{135} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 4, 24–33: SCh 176, 326–332.
\textsuperscript{136} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 4, 34–38: SCh 176, 332–334.
\textsuperscript{137} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 66: SCh 176, 232.
\textsuperscript{139} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 4, 15: SCh 176, 320.
\textsuperscript{140} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 4, 22: “Et ideo, quantum ad pietatem illius perti-
net, plus quam ceteri eget; omnis enim egestuosus pro se tantum et in se eget, solus tantum-
modo Christus est, qui in omnium pauperum uniuersitate mendicet”: SCh 176, 324.
someone else’s ones. Since the reward for almsgiving is eternal life, everyone should offer things to those in need.

6.3.1. Peter Chrysologus

The Bishop of Ravenna shows the importance of Christian understanding of almsgiving, as a specific manifestation of mercy. Alms given to the person in need is an sign of conversion of the benefactor. For God what the donor does has the power of absolving sins. Therefore Chrysologus is in favour of offering alms to the poor in a spirit of faith and according to God’s will in order to expect a reward in Heaven from the Holy Father (the concept of holy trade). When discussing almsgiving Chrysologus stresses the modesty of the donor and fights against hypocrisy. A believer should see God in the person in need, therefore the offerer should be kind, stable, and generous in his offering.

6.3.1.1. The Christian meaning of alms

According to Chrysologus alms offered out of religious incentive is a result of sensitivity to privation of another human being and is shown by giving material help. Alms itself is an indication of human mercy. God expects man to show mercy, which should be the foremost motivation. Otherwise almsgiving is useless, just like any other religious act such as fasting or ascetism would be useless.

---


142 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo 7*, 6: “Et quia agricolae fecimus mentionem, sciat ille sustinerse se laborem cassum, se nil habiturum, qui premens ieiunii aratum, et abscondens gulae gramina, atque eradicans luxuriae sentes, misericordiae semina nulla iactauerit. Hoc dominus aperi uoluit, qui de ieiunio docens mox ista subiecit: Nolite thesaurizore uobis thesauros
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Active mercy is not a pointless tribute to God. It is useful to man and is a continuation of God’s operation, through the hands of the merciful man.\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 8, 5: “Misericordiam uolo. Homo, petit deus, sed tibi, non sibi. Misericordiam uolo. Humanam misericordiam petit, ut largiatur divinam”: OSPC 1, 96 compare Hos 6:6; Ps 36 (35):6.} Alms as an act of human kindness is the responsibility of every man, not only the rich one. Everyone can offer someone something within their capabilities, be helpful, even if he is short of something himself and gives despite suffering privations.\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 8, 6: “Misericordia et peccatores liberat, et restituit sanctos; quia nisi adfuisset misericordia, et Davi in adulterat, amisit prophetiam; et Petrus cum negat, apostolici ordinis perdiderat principatum; et Paulus cum blasphemat, remanerat persecutor. Fatetur hoc Paulus, cum dicit: Quia fui blasphemus et persecutor et injurius, sed misericordiam consecutus sum. Fratres, per misericordias pauperum misericordiam comparemus, ut possimus esse de poena liberi, de salute securi. Beati, inquit, misericordes, quia ipsi misericordiam consequentur. Gratis misericordiam sperat ibi, qui hic non fecerit misericordiam. Qui facit misericordiam, currit ad praemium; qui non facit misericordiam, decurrat ad poenam”: OSPC 1, 98, compare 2 Kings 11:14; Mt 5:7; 26:69–75; 1 Tim 1:13.}

6.3.1.2. The religious value of alms
Almsgiving as an indication of mercy towards thy neighbor results in an absolution of sins of the merciful sinner by God. This truth of faith is visible according to Chrysologus in the history of salvation. The converted sinner, even one that had sinned greatly, but showed mercy, was absolved by God and was hallowed like David, Peter or Paul. But each sinner who does not acknowledge his sins and shows no mercy, cuts himself off from mercy.\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 14, 5: OSPC 1, 132; compare Ps 41 (40):2.} In eternity, God frees the generous almsgiver from evil and the poor people he had helped are his defenders.\footnote{Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 26, 7: OSPC 1, 204.}

Alms is an invaluable way of healing the sinner and freeing him from immorality resulting from making profit through usury. Chrysologus notices that the one who makes profit through usury and then gives alms, heals the wounds he had caused through his sin. By showing active mercy, he heals his own soul. The healing process takes place through God and
The Pastors of the 5th Century. A Comparative Study…

Christ into one, but the reforming sinner, who had once been a usurer, should cooperate with Him: “They do not need a doctor, those who are healthy, he says but the ones who are weak. It is for this reason that Christ went to Matthew: to heal the wounds of greed, to heal the rotten usury. By going there, he said, try to understand what it means: it is mercy they wish for, not sacrifice. This is a longing for mercy because Matthew gives away what he had earned through poverty but he paid his fine, using the means through which he had done wrong. I have not come to summon the just ones but the sinners. By saying this, he does not reject the just ones but excludes the unjust ones, who had claimed to be just. By joining the just ones, Christ wishes to eliminate their sins because he does not wish to be among sinners what brings the dead life again is acknowledging the fact that the greedy one has become generous. The reason Christ chooses Matthew is not a question of money but of virtue. Thus Matthew has become impoverished on here on earth, only to become rich in Heaven.”

Active alms, giving away things to the poor is the proper answer to God’s teaching. God forgives the repenting sinners, ones who undergo an internal transformation. Giving alms is a man’s real effort, but it is also his cooperation with God. It means that the man has listened to God and His teaching intently and has followed the Holy Scripture. Offering alms as an answer to God’s teaching becomes an ultimate Christian virtue and not only a spontaneous, occasional form of kindness. Therefore, what is almost impossible in human terms, becomes reality when God acknowledges the fact that a man who had once been greedy like the Matthew, the tax collector, becomes generous and virtuous.


148 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 28, 5.
6.3.1.3. The concept of “holy trade”
Practicing alms understood as virtue is an act of religious prudence. It is a conscious turning away from the evil of greed and therefore testifies a true Christian repentance.\textsuperscript{149} Charity coming from our love for God is a result of our prudential effort to earn eternal life. God appreciates the fact that we offer our wealth to meet the needs of the poor.\textsuperscript{150} Christ’s statement on evangelical poverty (Lk 12:33) is an additional encouragement, therefore Chrysologus encourages the wealthy to practice alms in the name of mercy. Christ’s words guarantee heaven: “\textit{Sell what you own and give alms}. If you are convinced that you will live, that you will reign; if you believe that you will be rich in Heavenly Kingdom, where your place is, where you will reign, then those goods which are yours are there already, ahead of you; use bad riches by way of mercy, transform human goods into God’s goods. The poor was summoned to carry what you leave behind. The poor are those who carry your burdens and they carry them happily, as they are loaded but free. He says \textit{sell, what you have and give alms}. Offer yourself a full purse, an endless treasure in Heaven where there is no thief and no moth can destroy it. Offer yourself a full purse that does not deteriorate. Notice that the Father wants to make His children rich and not poor. Offer yourself a full purse that does not deteriorate. In a new way, what is more in a Heavenly way, the one who hears Him sells and by selling – buys, by losing – gains. The one who say offer yourself a full purse that does not deteriorate wishes the money to continue, the purse to be full and the collected goods to be eternal.”\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{149} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 29, 1: “Hoc est quod apostolus dixit: \textit{Radix omnium malorum est auaritia}. Est commutatio sane una, si homo prudens illum mittat ad caelum, quod mittatur ab illo ut stultus in tartarum”: OSPC 1, 220, compare 1 Tim 6:10.

\textsuperscript{150} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 29, 1: “Mittat per manum pauperis, quia quicquid propter deum pauperi dederit, hoc totum ad deum sine dilatione transmittit”: OSPC 1, 220.

\textsuperscript{151} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 25, 2: “Vendite quae possidetis et date elemosynam. Si uicturos uos, si regnaturos, si uos iam diuities esse creditis in supernis, ubi futuri, quo migraturi, ubi regnatnri estis, uos illa, quae uestra sunt, iam praecedant; opes miseras misericordia computate; quae humana sunt, in diuina convirtite. Et ne cui forsitain deeset euectio ad portanda illa, quae dimittitis, angariatus est pauper; ferunt paupers onera uestra, et uolentes ferunt, quia tali non deprimuntur pondere, sed levantur. Vendite, ait, quae possideitis, et date elemosynam. Facite uobis sacculos qui non ueterescunt, thesaurum non deficiemtem in caelis, ubi fur non adpropiat, neque tinea corrumpit. Facite uobis sacculos, qui non
By referring to Christ’s words (Lk 12:33), Peter Chrysologus encouraged the rich who were able to support their neighbours to indulge in this holy trade. He said: sell your earthly goods, give the money to the poor – those in need, in this way you will get a treasure – your eternal life. The cashier’s office, where Heavenly goods are collected and multiplied is in God’s hands, in Heaven. The poor bring it to God, those poor people who are not burdened with wealth, but obligated to act as a form of transport and bring alms to Heaven (angariatus est pauper – Sermo 25, 2; uectores paupers; tuta est ista, tuta transuectio – Sermo 7, 6).152 Fulfilling sacrum commercium is done entirely because of faith and trust in God.153

Chrysologus encouraged greedy wealthy people to give alms as thanks to faith they can plead to be allowed eternal life. But such behavior of the rich should be accompanied by faith and trust in God as alms – offered to God but in the hands of the poor, will be rewarded by God, who is man’s Collector and Debtor (executor et debitor).154 However, Chrysologus notices rather sadly, that wealthy people make transactions with God on purpose, as they are afraid of losing their earthly businesses and they do not bear in mind the benefits promised in Heaven. For this reason, the Bishop

ueterescent. Videtis quia pater iste ditare uult filios, non nudare. Facite uobis sacculos, qui non ueterescunt. Nouo modo, immo caelesti modo, qui hunc audit, uendendo comparat, recondit erogando; dum amittit, adquirit. Quam cupit pecuniam perdurare, perpetuare sacculos diuitiarum, condita permanere, qui dicit: Facite uobis sacculos, et sacculos, qui non ueterescunt!": OSPC 1, 196. 198; compare Lk 12:33.

152 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 6: „Sunt uectores pauperes, qui possunt sinu suo quae nostra sunt ad superna portare. Nemo de personis dubitet baiulorum; tuta est ista, tuta transuectio, per quam nostra ad deum deo fideiussore portantur”: OSPC 1, 90.

153 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 14, 8: OSPC 1, 134, compare Ps 41 (40):5.

tries to encourage the rich to trust God, give alms and their good deeds will become acts of faith and will be rewarded by God.\textsuperscript{155}

Offering one's goods to one's neighbours (relatives, neighbours, those in need) is a sign of being part of Heavenly Kingdom already here on earth. This is proof of being conscientious to the Lord's advice (\textit{prouidentia dominus, consilio tali}) concerning selling and giving away goods because of Heavenly Kingdom (Lk 12:33).\textsuperscript{156} Chrysologus appeals to people to trust God as He is faithful to the promises He makes. Offering Him your own goods which are meagre and perishable (\textit{uilia et caduca}), placing them in Heaven is the way to achieve eternal happiness.\textsuperscript{157}

6.3.1.4. Practicing alms
Offering alms, as an act of mercy, should be done discreetly. As a positive thing, it should neither be noisy nor ostentatious.\textsuperscript{158} Alms, even given in public should not be an act of hypocrisy or to gain something. It is not done to win plaudits but it is meant to appeal to God.\textsuperscript{159} The donor who believes in God, should see God in the person in need. Only in this way his human intentions and his attitude to the poor man, become proper. If he sees God in the poor man, he also wishes for God to witness his kindness and not other people.\textsuperscript{160} The symbol of charity and proper giving of alms (Mt 6:3–4)\textsuperscript{161}

\textsuperscript{155} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 25, 3.

\textsuperscript{156} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 23, 4: “Est consuetudinis, est animi felicis, ut adscitus ad regnum, quod fuit proprium, quod priuaturn, mox parentibus, mox propinquis, ciibus indigentibus liberaliter prorogare, ne sit mendicus animo, qui censu functus est et honore. Tali ergo prouidentia dominus, consilio tali, uilia et caduca iubet ut uendamus, ut largiamur, ut donemus, qui in caelesti regno omnia quae in caelo et quae in terra sunt possidebimus.”: OSPC 1, 188; compare Lk 12:33.

\textsuperscript{157} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 23, 5: “Vendite quae possidetis, mox adiecit, Facite uobis sacculos, et sacculos qui non ueterescent, thesaurum non deficientem in caelis. Iterum contristatus es, quia quod habes, in caelis cogeris collocare. Rogo, crede deo tuo, qui seruo credis, et magis deo quam homini commoda. Sed si times ne quid inde praesumat, ne quid dispergat pietas latoris, signa fidei anulo sacculos tuos, ut tali custode dormias tu securus, quia ubi ille est, ibi locus nullus est furi. Non poterit tibi tuam pecuniam denegare, qui tibi omnia sua contulit, qui te regni sui et honore ditauit et gloria”: OSPC 1, 188.

\textsuperscript{158} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 9, 3: OSPC 1, 102; compare Mt 6:2.

\textsuperscript{159} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 9, 4: OSPC 1, 102.

\textsuperscript{160} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 9, 4: OSPC 1, 102.

\textsuperscript{161} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 9, 5: OSPC 1, 104; compare Mt 6:3–4.
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is the right side of the human body. It is in this part of the human body in which most ancient authors saw as the cradle of virtues and achievements.\textsuperscript{162}

For God to accept alms, it must be an honest act to help the neighbor.\textsuperscript{163} It should be done in the spirit of reconstitution of goods, which anyhow belong to them. For Chrysologus Zacchaeus’ conduct (Lk 19:1–10), who offered half of his worldly goods to the poor was a Christian example of reconstitution for Chrysologus. Zacchaeus gave those whom he had cheated financially, four times as much.\textsuperscript{164} For alms to be complete, it must be accompanied by other virtues, especially fasting undertaken for religious reasons. When the two virtues coexist, they become more intense, more sacred, as they are free of covetousness.\textsuperscript{165}

Active alms and kindness can be simple in form, for example offering workers a meal after work.\textsuperscript{166} This is why Chrysologus encourages the faithful to be constantly generous for those in need. He encourages people to do it now, in this current life as after death it will be impossible to offer our wealth as alms.\textsuperscript{167} He reminds us that by stretching his hand and asking for bread, Christ identifies with the needy poor.\textsuperscript{168} Alms is particularly necessary during times of natural disasters and wars.\textsuperscript{169} What Chrysologus probably had in mind was the invasion of the Huns under Attila the Hun on the Western Empire in the years 446–447, and the accompanying disasters (prison camps and the plague).\textsuperscript{170} Both in extreme situations, as well

\textsuperscript{162} In the opinion of both authors, the left hand side was always perceived as weaker and therefore it was considered the heart of human weaknesses and faults. To read more on the subject see: F. J. Dölger, \textit{Zu den Zeremonien der Messliturgie – Dextro pede, “Antike und Christentum”} 1 (1929), p. 236–240.

\textsuperscript{163} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 54, 8: OSPC 1, 370; compare Lk 19:9.

\textsuperscript{164} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 54, 9: OSPC 1, 370; compare Lk 19:9.

\textsuperscript{165} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 8, 2: OSPC 1, 94. 96; compare also: Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 41, 3–4: OSPC 1, 292. 294; Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 42, 1–6: OSPC 1, 296–300.

\textsuperscript{166} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 170, 8: OSPC 3, 282. R. Benicicetti (OSPC 3, n. 8, 283) notices that giving workers dinner after they have finished their work is still common practice in Emilia Romania and is called ‘bandéga’ (perhaps from the Latin \textit{benedictio}).

\textsuperscript{167} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 170, 8: OSPC 3, 284; compare Ps 49 (48):18; Ps 76 (75):6; Job 27:19; Sir 11:18–19; Lk 12:20.

\textsuperscript{168} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 176, 3: OSPC 3, 310.

\textsuperscript{169} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 103, 7: OSPC 2, 296.

\textsuperscript{170} According to A. Olivar, \textit{Los sermones}, 236, what is probably meant is Attila’s invasion of Northern Italy between 446–447. There was no other plague at any other time.
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as, times of peace, a Christian as a person meant for eternity,\textsuperscript{171} should not overestimate the value of worldly goods, which should be offered as charity.\textsuperscript{172} God accepts in his Kingdom the repenting sinners but does not allow those he accepts to continue being sinners.\textsuperscript{173}

6.3.2. Salvian of Marseilles

Salvian stresses the religious dimension of alms, arising from the Bible: desire for goods and greed leads to lack of faith and lack of mercy and to condemnation during the Final Judgement. He encourages conduct which will be rewarded by God during Final Judgement – to give alms to the poor. Offering alms is often the final treatment for the repenting sinner, who can no longer atone for his sins. Salvian encourages all Christians to accept God as their only savior and to accept ones weaknesses and practice alms as a manifestation of faith and mercy.

6.3.2.1. Justification of almsgiving

Salvian justifies the need for alms by the Final Judgement. Those using their wealth properly will be rewarded accordingly, and the greedy ones and egotists will be punished. Alms is only important from a religious point of view and proves kindness. On the basis of the Holy Scripture and his own observation, Salvian comes to a conclusion that craving for wealth for wealth itself is egotistic and leads to lack of faith among the wealthy.\textsuperscript{174} He notices a lack of need to repent among the wealthy, their lack of faith in in the rise from the dead and Final Judgement makes them lacking in mercy.\textsuperscript{175} Whereas, the man who listens raptly to the word of God (Ps 112 (111):9; Lk 12:33; Mt 19:21) is merciful and deserves to be called a man of faith.\textsuperscript{176}

\begin{thebibliography}{10}
\bibitem{171} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 25, 2: OSPC 1, 196, compare Lk 12:33.
\bibitem{172} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 22, 2: OSPC 1, 178, compare Lk 12:33.
\bibitem{173} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 162, 2–3: OSPC 3, 266; compare Lk 15:1–2.
\bibitem{174} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 36: Sch 176, 164, compare Rom 7:7; Ex 20:17.
\bibitem{175} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 79: Sch 176, 296.
\bibitem{176} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 90: Sch 176, 304.
\end{thebibliography}
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The rich usually do not repent and do not give alms because they do not use their wealth properly\textsuperscript{177} and they do not believe in God.\textsuperscript{178} They lose themselves more and more, in the works of the flash.\textsuperscript{179} They behave like the evangelical wealthy man (Lk 16:19–31) who continues to multiply his wealth in a greedy manner.\textsuperscript{180} They do nothing during their lifetime to reconcile with God, they constantly forget about Him, they do not help others and do not support those in need.\textsuperscript{181} By doing so they sentence themselves to rejection during the Final Judgement.\textsuperscript{182}

In this view, only a man who has renounced worldly goods, is worthy of God.\textsuperscript{183} If a man had not performed penance and not done good during his lifetime, he can offer alms even at the end of his life. Contrition is his only remedy.\textsuperscript{184} Alms soothes a man’s sins\textsuperscript{185} and although it seems hardly likely for a man of means who had done wrong all of his life to reform as he nears the end of it, God gives him a chance to repent. He can abandon sin and show his transformation through alms which soothes sin.\textsuperscript{186} Such behavior was not common though. Salvian made a bitter comment on this:

“One rarely meets holy and other important personages who, as we may say about one of them, have washed their sins through money given as alms.”\textsuperscript{187}

\textsuperscript{177} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 50: SCh 176, 276. 278.
\textsuperscript{179} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 51: SCh 176, 278.
\textsuperscript{180} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 52–53: SCh 176, 278.
\textsuperscript{181} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 54–55: SCh 176, 278. 280.
\textsuperscript{182} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 56: SCh 176, 280. 282.
\textsuperscript{183} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 37: “Durus existimetur, si aliquid tale habuit, quale hic apostolus praedicuit; ut non addamus illud domini nostri dictum quo omnes penitus indignos se esse dixit qui non renuntiassent omnibus quae possiderent”: SCh 176, 166.
\textsuperscript{184} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 38: SCh 176, 166.
\textsuperscript{185} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 39: SCh 176, 166; compare Sir 3:30.
\textsuperscript{186} Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 40: SCh 176, 166. 170.
\textsuperscript{187} Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 7, 14: “Exceptis tamen perpaucis ferme sanctis atque insignibus uiris, qui, ut quidam de numero ipsorum ait, sparis redemerunt crimina nummis”: SCh 220, 438. 440. Salvian probably refers to St. Paulinus of Nola, who as the senator sold his ancestral wealth scattered all over the Roman Empire in the West and together with his wife Therasia began a monastic life, first in Spain and later in Roman Italy. The statement ‘sparis redemerunt crimina nummis’ is Salvian’s travesty of a poem written by Paulinus of Nola to Sulpicius Severus. In this poem, Paulinus compares himself to his own friend Martin of Tours: Paulinus of Nola, Epistula 32, 3: ‘Iste docet fusis redimens sua crimina nummis, Villor ut sit res quam sua cuique salus’: CSEL 29 bis, G. Hartel (first edition), M. Kamptner (second
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Salvian reminded people that the encouragement for charity and giving away one’s wealth to the poor to inherit Heaven, does not come from people but from Christ himself as He is the warranty for the man who does so.\(^{188}\) The prize given in return for worldly goods which slip away is an eternal life. Offering our wealth to God is an expression of human piety.\(^{189}\) Salvian stressed that God rewards people with eternal life in return for earthly goods sacrificed. He rewards people a hundred times over, and one must remember that a hundred times over in eternity is infinitely more than on earth.\(^{190}\)

6.3.2.2. The practice of alms
A sinner offering alms, who is aware that only God can forgive people their sins, should accept his own weakness and the need for internal transformation. For this reason alms should be given in the spirit of mercy, humility to God, faith in Him and prayer.

Even a man who gives away all his wealth, should have the conviction that he is still God’s debtor.\(^{191}\) Everybody is a sinner so when a man gives away his goods, he should not think that he has compensated God for his offens-es in abundance, as the consequences of these actions still exist.\(^{192}\) What is more, there is no relative fee for absolution of sins and even more so for salvation.\(^{193}\) The sinner can assure God that he has undergone an internal transformation and he has put his life in His hands through good deeds.\(^{194}\) These include charity in the name of faith, which is accompanied by prayer and which should be a sacrifice to God, which is an act of free will.\(^{195}\)

---


\(^{189}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 74: SCh 176, 294; compare Mt 19:29.

\(^{190}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 75: SCh 197, 294.

\(^{191}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 55: SCh 176, 178.

\(^{192}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 55: SCh 176, 178.

\(^{193}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 56: SCh 176, 178.


\(^{195}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 55: “Immo nihil, si non cum fide, immo nihil, si non cum ambitu, immo nihil, si non cum prece, immo nihil, si non hoc animo ut hoc ipsum inter praecipua beneficia dei reputet quod animum offerendi dedit, et plus sibi in his quae deo relinquat praestari aestimet, quam in illis quae prius habuit”: SCh 176, 178.
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Alms can only be given of the things which the sinner owns. No one should offer goods which are not his.\textsuperscript{196} One should remain a humble servant, as one cannot offer sacrifice to God and remain conceited.\textsuperscript{197} Acts of mercy are always a way of conciliating, especially towards the end of life, when other penitential actions are not possible. Offering our worldly goods to God\textsuperscript{198} can be a certain way of securing eternity. The reward for mercy is eternal life.\textsuperscript{199} Therefore, all people of faith, all members of society: husbands and wives,\textsuperscript{200} widows,\textsuperscript{201} virgins,\textsuperscript{202} clergymen,\textsuperscript{203} as well as, monks\textsuperscript{204} are summoned to show mercy.

6.4. Summary

The Right to Ownership
Both authors saw the right to ownership entirely from a religious point of view. Chrysologus view was shaped by the Biblical concept of matter as created by God \textit{ex nihilo}, temporarily and therefore restricted. By making such an assumption, the only permanent good for the Christian is God and Heavenly goods. Our human power to own material goods is limited to managing and using these goods on earth. Therefore, as a clergyman, he encouraged the faithful to give up their material goods to God, to use their material goods with the intention to do good and not to allow the cult of wealth.

\textsuperscript{196} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 58: “Et ideo propheta: peccata inquit, tua in misericordia redime, hoc est: ‘Aurum da indigentibus, quia non potest regnum dare; facultatem distribue, quia potestatem non uales prorogare’. Ac per hoc uidetur iussisse ut totum daret, quem hoc solum non iussit distribuere quod non poterat erogare”: SCh 176, 180. Salvian, who used the Vulgate (Dan 4:24: \textit{Quam ob rem, rex, consilium meum placeat tibi, et peccata tua el- eemosynis redime, et iniquitates tuas misericordii pauperum: forsitan ignoscet delictis tuis}) deals with a text which is considered an interpolation by Hieronimus. Modern day translations have a similar text (for example BT) but it differs from the Hieronimus’ one (BT, Dan 4:24).

\textsuperscript{197} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 54; SCh 176, 176.

\textsuperscript{198} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 1; SCh 176, 186.

\textsuperscript{199} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 3, 70; SCh 176, 292; compare Mt 10:42.

\textsuperscript{200} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 28–29; SCh 176, 206. 208.

\textsuperscript{201} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 26–27; SCh 176, 206.

\textsuperscript{202} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 30–36; SCh 176, 208–212.

\textsuperscript{203} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 37–41; SCh 176, 212–216.

\textsuperscript{204} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 42; SCh 176, 216.
For Salvian of Marseilles, the Godly origin of all material things, defined their purpose – for the good of all people. Salvian did not concentrate on the essence and origin and matter but more than Chrysologus, stressed the practical aspect of using goods. The Christian should put his possessions in God’s hands and be faithful and grateful to Him. As a temporary user of the wealth granted for his lifetime only, he should be guided by mercy in managing his fortune in order to limit his greed. The issue of inheritance should be dealt with as part of religious duties and the Church’s needs. Salvian believed in an ascetic interpretation of the Bible. The Bible gradually encourages to give up material goods, its culmination being the evangelical advice of poverty.

**Wealth**
Both writers sought the threat coming from wealth in the fact that it leads the affluent to greed and improper use of goods. Chrysologus had a pastoral attitude to the matter of wealth: the use of goods should be subordinated to morality and mercy. By referring to Matthew 6:19–20, he taught that the faithful should always oppose the temptation of greed. This should be expressed by good deeds towards the needy. Greed burdens the conscience of the rich (Mk 2:14), destroys the relationship with his neighbours and his morality (Lk 16:19–31) and finally, distances him from God, causing idolatry (Lk 15:11–32). The inhumane man of means will stand in front of God during the Final Judgement and it will turn out, he is helpless and cannot show any acts of mercy. For this reason, Chrysologus constantly encouraged to use material goods for the good of others and to show mercy.

Salvian found that ways of obtaining and using wealth may be bad but wealth itself is morally neutral. Greed which is a result of growing rich leads people living on earth to hatred of God and one’s neighbours and finally to lack of faith. This in turn results in damnation during the Final Judgement. Salvian thus reminded wealthy Christians that the aim of accumulating wealth on earth is winning God’s favours by showing generosity to the poor.

**Almsgiving**
Both writers saw this matter solely from religious point of view. According to Chrysologus almsgiving is an indication of the virtue of mercy and practicing it is a sign of conversion. Instead, Salvian demanded that it should
be a natural consequence of the virtue of faith. For Chrysologus noticing the needs of another person and the wish to find a solution should be the motivation behind almsgiving. God appreciates the religious value of almsgiving as an act of mercy and absolves the sins of the one who had combated greed and offered his own goods to the poor as a sign of redemption. By referring to Luke 12:33, Chrysologus encouraged the faithful to perform ‘sacred trade.’ He asked them to waive payment from the poor in order to gain a treasure in Heaven and inherit eternal life through mercy. Alms should be treated as a religious virtue, and as an act of true help for one’s neighbor it should be modest, concealed and known first of all to God.

Salvian takes into account religious reasons of almsgiving, referring to the fact that on Judgement Day, everyone will know if they had shown mercy. For him lack of mercy was characteristic of people who owned riches and became victims of the worship of wealth. This lead to a degeneration of faith and responsibility in front of God. Salvian noticed their characteristic lack of willingness to reform. He reminded them that Christ had guaranteed an eternal prize for those who practiced charity giving. He taught that alms should be given out of your own property and the one offering it must adopt an attitude of faith showing one’s insignificance in relation to God and should be accompanied by prayer and fasting. He assured that the offering of mercy practiced in this way is a guarantee of eternity.
Both authors mentioned various aspects of Christian spirituality, which could be grouped into four thematic areas: conversion of the mind, penance, monasticism and religious practices. In the opinion of Chrysologus, the conversion of the mind should make man subordinated to God. Monasticism, as a special form of Christian asceticism undertaken to gain heavenly kingdom had not been discussed by the Bishop of Ravenna. Chrysologus discussed the laws of prayer, selected types of prayer (prayer for plea, the Holy Communion – common prayer). The prayer itself for the Bishop of Ravenna is a religious practice, a practice through which we trustfully put our earthly matters and our heavenly future solely in the hands of God. Only Chrysologus noticed the importance of fasting and mentioned it in his teaching. In his thematic sermons, as well as other sermons, the Bishop of Ravenna encouraged fasting. He saw fasting as a religious practice, occurring alongside mercy and other religious practices. He found reason for Lent, he saw fasting as a form of life (John the Baptist), he saw fasting as a continuation of Christ's life and noticed the spiritual value of fasting as well as the risks for the given person.

The most important thing for Salvian is making up for losses, compensation and penance for one's sins. This is a conscious subordination to God in hope for forgiveness of sins. Penance for Salvian of Marseilles is a spiritual and ascetic phenomenon, manifested by making up for our sins. Salvian acknowledged the importance of monasticism as an ascetic and penitential state resulting from an eager service to God. It is manifested by resigning from not only good and acceptable things but first of all by rejecting what is evil and unacceptable for Christians. Salvian describes the prayer of pleading,
which he saw as an act of trust in God. Salvian recommends a striving for holiness, which he sees as a life based on the Gospel.

7.1. The conversion of the mind

For Chrysologus man as such (his soul and body) is brought to life by God. He is destined to repent in order to live with God. Man should oppose Devil, he should use free will and wishes and all his natural traits (his looks, speech, cognition, understanding and judgement) on his way to God. His inspiration should come from God and the Bible. For Chrysologus, evangelical repentance is a constant revival of the mind and life with Christ. Whereas, Salvian teaches the importance of paying for our sins through a life of harshness for the sinner. It is necessary to accept God's norms and to reject sinful acts. Self-sacrificing mercy is also a form of compensation, especially when accompanied by piety and offering gifts to God as the sole owner of everything.

Chrysologus reaches a conclusion, that by turning to God, man regains dignity: repentance through a profession of faith in God, confirmed by Baptism. A man expiated by Jesus Christ through Baptism becomes an image of Christ. The baptism itself is the beginning of divinization of man. Salvian sees human dignity as a conscious subordination to God and a thoughtful and decent life.

7.1.1. The spirituality of repentance

Comprehending and pastoral clarification of the meaning of Christian conversion in the 4th and 5th century is still influenced by the theology of the New Testament. Conversion is understood as a positive transformation of the human being in his relations to God. It is a change of thought and action resulting from faith in the Gospel, in accordance with “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has come near; repent, and believe in the good news”. The evangelical transformation (‘metanoia’) is a positive transformation of the mind, growing fond of faith which is subject to God’s Revelation, both in terms of thought and goodwill, as well as, conforming to certain customs and moral conduct. The transformation means submitting

---

1 Mk 1:15; compare Mt 4:17; 18, 3; and also: Mt 11:20 plus parallel texts: Lk 13:3. 5; 19:40; 23:28.
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to God, but not according to Law but according to the Gospel.² In this meaning of the converted Christians are a 'soul' of the world.³ Christian conversion stresses the fact that conversion is not an external transformation of one god into another as was the case in the Greek or Roman times.⁴ The so called philosophical conversion and a certain type of proselytism made common by ancient Judaism are a reminder of Christian conversion of the 2nd and 3rd century. Starting from the 4th century, we see a new form of Christian conversion that is a clear diversion from pagan customs and mentality. The teaching of Christian priests, especially after Galerius’ edict of toleration in 311 and Constantine’s edict is influenced by a rather formal conversion of pagans to Christianity. Those pagans were usually still living very much in the world of pagan gods. From the 4th century we see entire Germanic tribes slowly transforming to Christianity – in the Arian form. Their main motivation is neither internal conversion nor favourable circumstances (as was the case in Roman mentality of the 4th century). The opinion of the Germanic ruler was decisive in this matter, both among the Goths of the 4th century, as well as, the Franks of the 5th century.⁵

Peter Chrysologus

The Bishop of Ravenna saw human nature as a complex matter made up of body and soul.⁶ He stressed the role of soul as the element sustaining

⁶ Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 12, 3: “corpus, mentis domicilium, animae uas, murum spiritus, uirtutum scholam, dei templum”: OSPC 1, 118. Chrysologus describes man as a being consisting of the heavenly element (the soul) and earthly one (the body) in Sermo 148, 2: OSPC 3, 152. 154.
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life.\textsuperscript{7} God created human nature, but by acting against God, man has sinned and acted against the nature of creation which brought about death.\textsuperscript{8} The body is seen as the weaker element and it is subject to temporary suffering. It is aided by the mercy of God, so even the body’s earthly weakness lead to kindness: “The Lord will help them when they are sick” (‘Good News Bible’). The Prophet shows all suffering resulting from human weakness. “The Lord will help them when they are sick.” What is this sickness if not our body containing the soul. The soul suffers as it wishes to gain heaven but it is oppressed by the body. \textit{In your illness you have turned your bed upside down.} A just man does not turn his bed upside down, only the fallen man is ill. Thus, it is the body that tosses and turns, the body is tossed in adversities. Our Lord turns our bed the right way up when He changes our situation from bad to good.\textsuperscript{9}

The incarnation of God, making him God and man is a special way of showing concern for the desperate and suffering body. Whereas, active alms towards the poor is an extension of God’s care.\textsuperscript{10} Chrysologus compares the human body to a roof spread over the human soul: the body is this roof, which covers the soul, it hides the soul, conceals this dwelling in

\textsuperscript{7} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 8, 2: “Acne multa, quod animae corpus est, ieiunio largitas hoc habetur: sicut enim mortificat corpus a corpore anima cum recedit, ita mors est ieiunii largitatis abscessus”: OSPC 1, 96.

\textsuperscript{8} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 111, 5: “Deus naturam ita facerat, ut homines crearet ad uitam, quae tamen dum nolens morti generat, illi se peccato fatetur obnoxiam, cuius poenae deseruit inuita”: OSPC 2, 340; compare Rom 5:12.

\textsuperscript{9} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 14, 7: “Dominus adiuvet eum super lectum doloris eius. Exsequitur propheta omnes aerumnas fragilitatis humanae. Dominus autem adiuvet eum super lectum doloris eius. Quis est lectus doloris nostri, nisi corpus nostrum, in quo anima iacet, et iacet dolens, et dolet quod caelum repetere cupiens premittur corporis terra. Vniuersum stratum eius uersasti in infirmitate eius. Iustum non uersat in stratum, sed in strato uersatur infirmus. Caro ergo est quae uersatur et uersat; ipsa est ergo quae aduersis uoluitur, in prosperis uersat. Dominus ergo uersat stratum nostrum, quando nobis aduersa uerit in prospera”: OSPC 1, 134; compare Ps 41 (40):4. In \textit{Vetus Itala} the text of Ps 40 has a slightly different from modern translations towards the end (4b). It resembles the Vulgate. The text of Ps 40:4 (\textit{Vetus Itala} version or the Vulgate) allows an alegoric interpretation. This is not possible in case of modern translations. Compare: Ps 41 (40):4: BT\textsuperscript{4}; the Vulgate: \textit{Dominus opem ferat illi super lectum doloris eius; universum stratum eius versasti in infirmitate eius.}

\textsuperscript{10} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 176, 1–3: OSPC 3, 310.
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the heart, separates the freedom of the mind from the heavenly vision [...] the roof of our body.\(^{11}\)

Even though the soul is superior to our sinful and mortal body, paradoxically, it is the body which is favoured by man.\(^{12}\) The sustaining element of the soul is God in the form of Jesus Christ.\(^{13}\) When the soul drifts away from God, it is penetrated by lack of faith, vile behavior, fault, guilty conscience, futility and unfaithfulness.\(^{14}\) By taking the form of human being, God accepted the futility and mortality of the human body to enable the human being through its spiritual and bodily nature to become God’s child.\(^{15}\) In order to be able to accept the gift of being God’s foster child and a life with God,\(^{16}\) man should submit to the incentive of the Holy

\(^{11}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 102, 6: “hoc tectum corpus est, quod tegit animam, quod operit spiritus, quod cordis domicilium uelat, quod libertatem mentis a caelesti uisione secludit. [...] tectum nostri coropris”: OSPC 3, 286. 288; compare Lk 7:6.

\(^{12}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 102, 2: “Si dominatur anima, corpus seruit; et homini nil corpore pretiosus. [...] Corpus ex infirmitate natum, quidquid uiuit, infirmatur ad mortem. Ergo centurio rogabat, ut Christus solus mortali corpori largiendo uitam perpetem subueniret”: OSPC 2, 284; compare Lk 7:2–3.

\(^{13}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 19, 5: “Quod est anima corpori, hoc est animae Christi. Sine anima corpus non uiuit; non uiuit anima sine Christo”: OSPC 1, 162.

\(^{14}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 19, 5: “Recende anima mox corpori fetor, corruptio, putredo, uermis, cinis, horror et omnia uisu detestanda succedunt; discedente deo confestim uenit in anima perfidia fetor, corruption criminum, uitorum putredo, conscientiae uermis, uanitatum cinis, infidelitatis horror, et fit in corporis sepulchro uiuo funus animae iam sepultae”: OSPC 1, 162. 164.

\(^{15}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 68, 1: “Conditio mortalis, terrena compagno, limosa substantia, adpensa uitea ac mortis, incerto labore adrita, consumpta poenis, putredini, puluere subiecta natura capere non ualeat, aestimare non sufficit, fucare non audet, credere pertimescit quod hodie se cogituir confiteri. [...] Consideraui, inquit, opera tua et expaui. Adoptatum se tunc stupuit in filium, quando perdiderat ipsius fiduciam servitutis”: OSPC 2, 46. Compare Ha 3, 2a. Chrysologus used the *Vetus Itala* version. This translation differs from modern translations (Ha 3, 2 in *Vetus Itala* it is more like the Vulgate version: *Domine, audiui auditum tuum et timui, consideraui opera tua et expaui*; than modern versions, for example (BT\(^{4}\)).

\(^{16}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 68, 2: “Audi Paulum dicentem: *Misit deus spiritum filii sui in corda nostra clamantem abba, pater!* Quod cum auditum ad interna transmitteret, tantum se meruisse mirabatur, et interna tota hominis pauebant. [...] Quatinus ipse idemque homo sursum per gratiam iam leuatius, iacebat subitus pristinam per naturam, nec uirtutem caelestem uirtus poterat sustinere terrena. [...] quid caro faceret, cum descendit deus in carnem carni gratiam conlaturus? Venit pater, quia homo deum, seruus dominum non ferebat. [...]”: OSPC 2, 48; compare Ga 4, 6.
Spirit. A true Christian therefore, should like a faithful soldier praying to Christ, for Christ to lead him.17

The force drawing man away from God is the temptation of devil, the ancient refugee (antiquus refuga)18 and the double sin of man (of the prapar-ents and one’s own).19 By referring to the Epistle to the Romans I2:1 and the Book of Wisdom 9:15, Chrysologus points out that the body should clear itself from sin until it becomes infused with spirituality (ut corpus ad prig-inem animae conscendat).20 The soul, being more subtle, should not come down to the body, but the “body should accompany the soul to Heaven and the soul should not accompany the body to Earth.”21The soul inspired by God, together with the body infused with spirituality should become one and be a pleasant offering to God.22

To bond with God, man should use at his own will23 all his natural resources (appearance, speech, cognition, reasoning and judgement)24 and succumb to inspiration from God, written in the teachings of the Torah25

18 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 52, 2: “Antiquus refuga, ubi dominum terris repperit aduenisse, obstruit aures hominis, uinxit linguam, et, obseratis humani sensus foribus, speluncae sue latebram pectus fecit et parauit humanum, aestimans quod illuc auditus uerbi, uirtus diuini nominis non ueniret”: OSPC 1, 356. 358; compare Rv 12, 9; 2 Thes 2, 3.
19 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 111, 8: “quia grauius praeuaricatores quam peccatores; et non tantum parentis uitio, sed suo iam lapsos fascinore saeua deuorauit”: OSPC 2, 342.
20 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 109, 1: OSPC 2, 326.
21 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 109, 1: “corpus animam comitetur ad caelum, non anima corpus sequatur ad terram”: OSPC 2, 326.
23 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 3: “Cognitorem pectoris non uoce petit iste, sed uoto; quia a deo bona, mala uero portat prima uoluntas in nobis”: OSPC 1, 72.
24 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 3: “Habitus, sermo, scientia, ratio, iudicium, quae hominem prae ceteris animantibus in terrena habitatione contingunt”: OSPC 1, 74.
25 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 3: “seniori quinque legis libros duinuitus inscribendos, per quo substantia inpar merito, numero par esset; humanum teneret ista ordinem, duinuo illa subsisteret instituto”: OSPC 1, 74.
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but first of all in the Gospel, which serves mercy and is a form of freedom from sin.26 Through his words, God summons people to reform and in the life of a Christian this means applying to the ten commandments.27

By commenting selected excerpts from the St. Paul’s Letter to the Romans (especially 1–12), Chrysologus comes to several practical, pastoral conclusions concerning Christian redemption and life. A Christian whose body and soul (‘entire man’) subdues to God by choosing future goods, gradually forgets about temporary and material goods.28 This frees man from the bondage of sin and gives eternal happiness.29 One should reject behavior according to external norms,30 full of vanity, faults and sins.31

---


27 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 168, 3–4: OSPC 3, 272. 274; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 156, 2: “Absit! Sic sentit mundus, sic gentiles intellegunt, sic fallit species lectionis. Ceterum sermo euangelicus non humana loquitur, sed diuina; non usitata, sed noua; non arte fallentia, sed auctoritate firmata; a deo uenientia, non a fato; non collecta numeris, sed virtutibus adquirita”: OSPC 3, 196; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 156, 2: “Absit! Sic sentit mundus, sic gentiles intellegunt, sic fallit species lectionis. Ceterum sermo euangelicus non humana loquitur, sed diuina; non usitata, sed noua; non arte fallentia, sed auctoritate firmata; a deo uenientia, non a fato; non collecta numeris, sed uirtutibus adquirita”: OSPC 3, 196; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 169, 2: “quam diuinum spiret et redolet sensum, quam adtollat ad caelum mentis intellectum, quam collocet in supernis, quam cogat superni cordis accendere lucernam, et instar euangelicae mulieris per dominicae lectionis obscura dragmam quaerere scientiae salutaris”: OSPC 3, 272; compare Lk 15:4–10.

28 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 114, 6: OSPC 2, 360.


Chrysologus understands evangelical redemption as a constant renewal of the mind and life according to rules set by Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{32}

7.1.2. The spirituality of fulfilment

**Salvian of Marseilles**

What Salvian stressed, was not so much the concept of transformation and constant conversion to God, but compensation, atonement in hope of forgiveness.\textsuperscript{33} The process of expiating one’s sins and making up for these sins through harshness of life is possible when the sinner is healthy and is capable of undertaking these duties. The sinful body is summoned by the soul, which is a strict censor of our downfalls.\textsuperscript{34} Salvian does not see the com-


\textsuperscript{33} Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 49: “Quando lugebit qui dies lugendi perdedit? Quando satisfaciet qui tempus satisfactionis amisit? […]. ut mollitiem uidelicet praeteritae uoluptatis praesentium asperitatum dura compense et reatum longarum deliciarum officio patrocinantis injuriaes”: SCh 176, 174. Salvian’s texts describe the spirituality of internal compensation of a Christian through his good deeds. This is a common spiritual stance but it has nothing to do with the so called ‘second atonement’ and therefore has no reference to the Medieval theories of St. Anzelm (died in 1109). According to him, compensation is a necessary element of sacramental atonement, in which expressing your sins is one of the requirements of sacramental atnemement in its scholastic, not patristic meaning. For Salvian compensation is a gradual cleaning oneself of sin and coming to mercy through penitential deeds, whereas, for Anzelm, compensation means reparation of the consequences of sin with reference to God, one’s neighbours and ourseves. Compensation in the scholastic meaning of the word is connected with cleaning oneself of sins. Its aim is to to get rid off all traces of sin, having received the sacramental atonement, help overcome moral imperfections and become immune to the future. To read more about the subject of Catholic compensation see: W. Zawadzki, *Zadośćuczynienie*, [in:] *Leksykon duchowości katolickiej*, red. M. Chmielewski, Lublin–Kraków 2002, p. 931.

\textsuperscript{34} Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 50: “Crucibus denique diuersarum aerumarum reum in suo corpore hominem iudex fidei seueritas subjugabit, ut indulgentiam scilicet
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plexity of body and soul, he sees this unity as something obvious but he stresses the different ways of freeing ourselves from sin.

It is necessary to accept God’s norms and to reject any sinful behavior. It is also necessary to reject the Devil’s temptations which only lead to damnation. It is necessary not to despair because of sin but to turn to God instead. One of the most basic acts of Christian fulfillment for sins is fasting and alms.

Salvian encourages the sinner, who is not able to fulfill for his sins, to show mercy to the poor. This is effective and an equivalent of punishment for the sinner. Mercy acts as fulfillment when we remember that we are offering goods to God himself as the sole owner of everything. Alms is a form of compensation for sin. When it is the sign of piety of the sinner, God appreciates the usefulness of this act and our internal resolution.
7.1.3. The dignity of humanness

The subject of human dignity was well known in classical philosophy. In his *Le concept de dignité humanie* J.-M. Breuvart\(^{41}\) states that Protagoras thought that it was Zeus who offered people dignity. Earlier, he had given them intelligence, sense of honour and an awareness of law. The Stoics were even closer to the Biblical concept of human dignity that people have the same nature thanks Pneuma, embracing and offering a breath of life to the entire universe. In the opinion of Cicero, human dignity expressed itself in mindedness and lawfulness.\(^{42}\) As a bearer of soul and its participation in divinity, everyone is entitled to it. Cicero sees the source of goodness and greatness of man and the reason he differs from the animal kingdom in human dignity (compare M. T. Cicero, *De Republica* 1, 43–53). Cicero also talks about the true, unchanging and eternal law of obligation, conformable with nature, stressing the dignity of human actions.\(^{43}\) What is

\[\text{luctu; } 53. \text{ aliter quippe oblata non prosunt, quia non pretio sed affectu placent. Nec enim animus dantis datis sed animo commendantur data, nec pecunia fidem insinuat sed pecuniam fides. Ac per hoc qui prodesse sibi uult quae deo offert, hoc modo offerat. Neque enim homo deo praestat beneficium in quae dederit, sed deus in homini quae acceperit, quia etiam quod homo habet dei ac domini sui munus est; ac per hoc in quae offeruntur ab homine, homo non suum reddit, dominus suum recipit”: SCh 176, 176.}


\(^{42}\) Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Officiis* 1, 106: “And if we will only bear in mind the superiority and dignity of our nature, we shall realize how wrong it is to abandon ourselves to excess and to live in luxury and voluptuousness, and how right it is to live in thrift, self-denial, simplicity, and sobriety”, ed. W. Miller, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3AText%3A2.007.01.0048%3Abook%3D1%3ASection%3D106).

\(^{43}\) Marcus Tullius Cicero, *De Republica* 3, 22, 33: “There is a true law, a right reason, conformable to nature, universal, unchangeable, eternal, whose commands urge us to duty, and whose prohibitions restrain us from evil. Whether it enjoins or forbids, the good respect its injunctions, and the wicked treat them with indifference. This law cannot be contradicted by any other law, and is not liable either to derogation or abrogation. Neither the senate nor the people can give us any dispensation for not obeying this universal law of justice. It needs no other expositor and interpreter than our own conscience. It is not one thing at Rome and another at Athens; one thing today and another tomorrow; but in all times and nations this universal law must for ever reign, eternal and imperishable. It is the sovereign master and emperor of all beings. God himself is its author, its promulgator, its enforcer. He who obeys it not, flies from himself, and does violence to the very nature of man. For his crime he must endure the severest penalties hereafter, even if he avoid the usual misfortunes of the present...
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interesting, the last quote from Cicero is used by the Catechism of the Catholic Church (CCC) in the canons of moral law. F. J. Mazur states that the Biblical concept of dignity has its basis (although the very notion of ‘dignity’ is missing there) in the description of the creation of man in the image and likeness of God (Gen 1:26–27). Man is dignified: as a being created, similar to God in his prudence, freedom of will and ability to rule the world (compare also: Gen 9:6; Ps 8:5–7) and born to immortality (Gen 2:22). The incarnation of God and redemption of God in the mystery of Jesus Christ further elevates the dignity of God’s image in man. The Fathers of the Church would continue the concept of human dignity, commenting those extracts of the Bible which refer to the creation of man in the image and likeness of God, as well as, those on the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ and His expiation of mankind.

Peter Chrysologus

Every human being is important to God from the moment of conception, when this life comes into being for God. The human being has been given the dignity of a God’s creature and is God’s administrator on Earth.

---


46 To read more about given patristic concepts of human dignity, read: Godność chrześcijańska w nauczaniu Ojców Kościoła, red. F. Drączkowski, J. Pałucki, Lublin 1996, p. 3–186.

47 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 69, 6: “Prudens aestimet quid possit notura diuinna, si tantum potest per deum humana conceptio”: OSPC 2, 58.

48 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 70, 3: “Hinc est quod iam sunt deo sibi adhuc non sunt, quoniam electi estis ante constitutionem mundi”: OSPC 2, 60; compare Eph 1:4. Compare also Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 72, 3: OSPC 2, 74. 76; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 87, 5–6: OSPC 2, 186. 188; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 88, 4: OSPC 2, 192. 194; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 91, 7: OSPC 2, 216; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 143, 10: “aut quando deus non in utero plasmator est hominnis”: OSPC 3, 120; compare Job 10:8. 10–12; Ps 139 (138)5; Jr 15.

49 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 125, 4: “Quem nisi hominem, cui ad colendum mundi tota fuerat commissa possessio”: OSPC 3, 10; compare also Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 148, 2: OSPC 3, 152. 154; compare Gen 1:26; 2:7.
Man should replenish the earth, and subdue, but having rejected evil and arrogance.\textsuperscript{50} The dignity of the human being (\textit{humanum}), offered by God was lost through Adam’s sin, committed at the instigation of the Devil.\textsuperscript{51}

The human being regains the dignity of creation through faith in God, which he testifies during Baptism, showing his faith in the Trinitarian formula. What is more, thanks to the value of faith (\textit{fides}) and the will to believe (\textit{credulitas}), his dignity is restored. He is entitled to it not only as a creature but as a heavenly descendant (\textit{caelestem subolem}).\textsuperscript{52} For this reason Chrysologus compares baptism in Church to a re-birth, which becomes a constant revival (\textit{renati sunt permanendo}). The baptized human being is transformed by the Holy Spirit to resemble the Creator (\textit{reformati ad nostril imaginem creatoris}).\textsuperscript{53}

The transformation of man is possible because he is part of God’s plan, beginning with the creation of man and finally his salvation. For this reason, Chrysologus understands human dignity, not only from a Christological point of view.\textsuperscript{54} In \textit{Sermo 117}, we see clear features of Soteriology.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{50} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 44}, 3–4: OSPC 1, 308, 310. \textit{Sermo 44} is a sermon on the subject of Ps 1. One can notice a certain connection between Chrysologus and Origen, \textit{Philocalia} 2, 1: SCh 302, 240; there 2, 3: SCh 302, 244. To read more about the exegesis of Psalms read: G. G. Scimè, \textit{L’esegesi di san Pietro Crisologo su i Salmi}, PUL, Roma 1992.

\textsuperscript{51} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 27}, 2: “Et a diabolo sunt illa, quae fallunt specie, quae pretendunt bona, cum mala inferant, sicud illud ad Adam, cum nobis humana abstulit, dum divina promittit”: OSPC 1, 208; compare Gen 3:5.

\textsuperscript{52} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 71}, 2: “Quid ualeat fides, credulitas quid possit, sit quanta confessio, hodie monstratur in uobis. Ecce trinitatis trina confessio in caelestem subolem de terrena uos sustulit seruitute”: OSPC 2, 66.

\textsuperscript{53} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 117}, 4: OSPC 2, 376; compare 1 Cor 15:48.

\textsuperscript{54} W. Turek (\textit{Patrystyczne i klasyczne aspekty koncepcji godności}, op. cit., p. 19–20) sees \textit{Sermo 117}, 1–2 (Chrysologus) entirely from a Christological point of view. In his comment on \textit{Sermo 117} in CCC 359 he reaches a conclusion that “the Christological aspect of human dignity is further strengthened by another patristic quote (from Chrysologus), there 19, as well as, another quote coming from Chrysologus, in which he notices a clear influence of St. Paul. Chrysologus refers to the Christological aspect of the human dignity concept, that is the importance of what Jesus Christ has done for humanity, ibidem, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{55} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo 117}, 1–2: “1. Duos homines beatus apostolus hodie retulit humano generi dedisse principium, Adam uidelicet et Christum. Duos homines pares corpore, sed merito disparaes; conpange membrorum tota uritate persimiles, sed ipso sui principio tota dissimiles uritate. Factus, inquit, \textit{primus homo Adam in animam uiuientem, nouissimus Adam in spiritum uiuiicantem.} Ille primus ab isto nouissimo factus est, a quo est et animam consecutus, ut uiueret. Hic est ipso se figuratus auctore, qui uitam non expectaret ab altero,”
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Chrysologus shows the redemption of man through the economic concept of the Holy Trinity.\textsuperscript{56} Christ is perceived as the one who together with his Father was the co-creator. As God, He gives man His identity and atones for man. Those who are baptized are a picture of Christ and the baptism begins the process of \textit{promouetur in deum}.\textsuperscript{57}

Chrysologus stresses the significance of the change of thinking of Christians (1 Cor 15:45–50): from the moment of baptism, they should avoid covetousness and resist temptation, act according to \textit{caelestia aspirare}, strive towards holiness in order to gain the virtues of innocence, simplicity, gentleness, patience, mercy and harmony.\textsuperscript{58} With the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the body becomes more spiritual (1 Cor 15:50) and it becomes indestructible as sinfulness disappears and man lives for God and his earthly punishment comes to an end.\textsuperscript{59}

7.1.4. Salvian of Marseilles

Salvian of Marseilles does not concentrate on the issue of human dignity and only two passages of his works concern this matter. In his

\begin{quote}
\textit{sed ipse uiam solus omnibus largiurus. Ille uillissimo plasmatur ex limo, ex utero pretioso uirginis hic procedit. In illo terra mutatur in carnem, in isto caro promouetur in deum. Et quid plura? Hic est Adam, qui suam tunc in illo, cum fingeret, imaginem conlocavit. Hinc est quod eius personam suscipit, nomen recipit, ne sibi quod ad suam fecerat imaginem deperiret. 2. Primus Adam, nouissimus Adam: ille primus habet initium, hic nouissimus non habet finem, quia hic nouissimus uere ipse est primus, ipso dicente: \textit{Ego primus et ego nouissimus}': OSPC 2, 373; compare 1 Cor 15:45–47; Is 44:6; Ps 85 (84):13; Ps 67 (66):7; Ps 132 (131):11.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{56} R. Benericetti, OSPC 3, no. 1, 374; compare Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 65, 5: OSPC 2, 36.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{57} To read more about the subject of incarnation and divinization connected with the Church and divinization as the beginning of the unification with God (according to Greek and Latin writers) see: A. Eckmann, \textit{Przebóstwienie człowieka w pismach wczesnochrześcijańskich}, Lublin 2003, p. 149–236.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{58} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 177, 5: OSPC 2, 376; compare 1 Cor 15:49.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{59} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 117, 6: \textit{‘Hoc autem dico, fratres, quia caro et sanguis regnum dei possidere non possunt. Quemadmodum carnis resurrectio praedicatur, quia ibi caro possidetur ab spiritu, non caro spiritum possidebit, sicut ex sequentibus elucescit: Neque corruptio incorruptionem possidebit. Vides quia non caro deperit, sed corruptio non homo, sed culpa; non persona, sed crimen, ut homo in deum coram deo uiues finem se delictorum tandem gaudeat consecutum’: OSPC 2, 378; St. Irenaeus spoke about ‘the body controlled by the soul’ in relation to resurrection in \textit{Adversus haereses} 5, 9, 4: SCH 153, 116–122.
\end{quote}
opinion, human dignity, experienced consciously is subject to God. The following texts (the Vulgate or Veteres latinae) Sirach 39:10; the Book of Wisdom 12:13. 15; 8 are a testimony to the fact that man was granted his dignity by God. He should thus be subordinate to God and lead a thoughtful and settled life. If man follows the above rules, he is subject to God’s wisdom and can experience the dignity of a God’s creature. But people’s dignity often depends on their status and for this reason when someone else’s dignity is offended, they demand punishment according to status.

7.1.5. The theory of religious cognition.

Solely the description by Chrysologus

The power of cognition (cognito, scienta, sapientia) should in the opinion of Chrysologus channel man to the good coming from God. Getting to know good and coming to God should lead to a better understanding of Him. But man, even if his willpower wins, can make bad mor-

---

60 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 2, 8: “Sed si illud, ut supra iam diximus, magis quaeris, quod ad omnes homines, non quod ad solos pertinet Christianos, ecce euidenter dicit volumn sacrum cuncta cotidie nutu diuinitatis regi et incessabiliter a deo omnia gubernari. Ipse enim, inquit, diligit consilium et disciplinam. Nec est enim alius deus, cuius cura est de omnibus. Cum sis ergo, inquit, iustus, iusie Omnia disponis… et cum magna reuerentia disponis nos. Ecce habes iugiter disponentem deum, iugiter gubernantem, quamuis in isto scripturae loco non gubernatio tantum sacra sed etiam dignitas declaretur humana”: SCh 220, 164; compare Sir 39:10; Wis 12:13; Wis 12:15. 18. Salvian probably used the Vulgate (or Veteres Latinae). The first Biblical text, that is. Sir 39, can be found in the Vulgate only: “et ipse diriget consilium eius, et disciplinam, et in absconditis suis consiliabitur” (compare: BT4: Sir 39:10).

61 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 6, 53: “Semper enim per dignitatem iniuriam perferentis crescit culpa facientis, quia necesse est, quanto maior est persona eius qui contumeliam patitur, tanto maior sit noxa eius qui facit”: SCh 220, 396. 398.

62 Christian theology of the 4th and 5th century tried to explain the religious truths against the theological and philosophical concepts of the pre-Christian world. Most Fathers of the Church and writers of that time described the reality with reference to faith. Therefore, they justified the other cognitive acts through faith, whereas, the aim of cognition was seen as attaining happiness in God. Religious cognition was thus theological cognition based on Revelation and personal experience, and being a kind of philosophical cognition. Compare: A. H. Armstrong, R. A. Markus, Christian faith and Greek philosophy, London 1960; H. A. Wolfson, The philosophy of the Church Fathers,
al decisions. His ability to learn is part of a natural order, differentiates him from other creatures and allows human order on earth, whereas, God’s order can be observed in the Bible. God’s laws are easy to identify (scire et nescire facile praestit lex diuina) as opposed to the laborious learning of man.

Getting to know God’s law, gives man a perception of the devil and his work, the origin of evil, blame, fault crime, the struggle of the body, the conflict of soul, life’s commotion and death itself. Knowledge of natural laws and the laws of Revelation enables man to prepare himself for the things to come and strengthens his actions. Human zealousness in understanding God’s law and, something we should pray for as we get


63 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 3: “Cognitorem pectoris non uoce petit iste, sed uoto; quia a deo bona, mala uero portat prima uluntas in nobis”: OSPC 1, 72.
64 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 3: “Habitus, sermo, scientia, ratio, iudicium, quae hominem prae ceteris animantibus in terrena habitacione contingunt. Haec est, iuxta apostolum, lex naturae. […] humanum teneret ista ordinem”: OSPC 1, 74; compare Rom 2:14–15.
65 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 5, 3: “seniori quinque legis libros diuinitus inscribens […] diuino illa subsisteret instituto”: OSPC 1, 74.
66 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 11, 1: OSPC 1, 112.
67 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 11, 1: “Vnde malum, culpa unde, uitiorem uis unde, unde criminum furor, unde corporum bella, unde conflictus animorum, unde uiae tempestas tanta, unde mortis naufragium tam crудele nesciret homo, nisi dei lex diabolum prodidisset”: OSPC 1, 112.
68 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 72 bis 3: “Animum scita parant, confirmant nuntiata, moment expectata, et reddunt per omnia fortiores”: OSPC 2, 82; compare Mt 20:18–19.
to know the Bible, allows man a reasonable knowledge of the divine (ad scientiae divinae quantum possimus claritem).  

Our earthly ability to learn is disturbed by the corporeal nature of man and his sinfulness. We do not get to know God's laws as a result of our achievements but because of grace which allows man a better understanding of such matters as resurrection of Christ and knowledge of the God as our Father. Grace depends on our individual experience but simple people receive the necessary divine grace to understand salvation.

Morality shapes man. By getting to know God, man wants to be like Him. In his comment to the prayer Our Father (Mt 6:9–13), Chrysologus expresses the notion that as man gets to know God, he recognizes his heavenly origin (tibi esse genus e caelo) and alters his behavior in such a way that satisfies God, it becomes a life of virtues and not vices. Having ac-

70 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 126, 11: “Deus autem scientiae et inluminationis inluminet corda uestra, et totam scientiae suae plenitudinem in uestrae mentis infundat archanum”: OSPC 3, 24; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 81, 5: „quia depressae carnis pondere cogitationes humanae ad altum dei mysterium conantur ascendere, et conantibus in ipsis franguntur, ruunt, deponuntur ad terram, nisi ille iuuerit, qui donat homini cogitare divina”: OSPC 2, 144; compare also Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 49, 1: OSPC 1, 338.
71 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 79, 5: “Frattes, qui causas capere dominicae nativitatis potestis? Qui pensare pondus sufficit dominicae resurrectionis? Estimare resurrectionis Christi negotium qui meretur? Ista cogitare, capere, aestimare, sapere, nisi qui ab ipso deo acceperit, non ualebit”: OSPC 2, 130; compare also Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 74, 1: OSPC 2, 98.
72 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 68, 3: OSPC 2, 48; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 69, 3: OSPC 2, 56; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 71, 2–4: OSPC 2, 66, 68.
73 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 62, 8: OSPC 1, 420, 422; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 62 bis, 4: OSPC 1, 426.
74 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 20, 1: “Ecclesiasticae lectiones sic diuino dispensatur archano, ut et peritis scientiam conferant altiorem, et simplicibus salutaris intelligentiae gratiam largiantur”: OSPC 1, 166; compare also Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 52, 1: OSPC 1, 356.
75 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 67, 3: “Sed intellege tibi esse genus e caelo, cuius pater habentur in caelo, et age ut sanctae uiendo sancto respondas patri. Dei filium ille se probat qui uitiis non obscuratur humanis, qui diuinis uirtutibus elucscit”: OSPC 2, 40, 42.
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cepted God as Father and having learnt his heavenly origin (*caelestis nature*), man’s life begins to correspond with his faith.76

7.1.6. Sense of responsibility. A description of Salvian only

Unlike Peter Chrysologus, Salvian does not provide a clever attitude to religiousness. A sense of responsibility of the Christian towards his neighbours is a form of repentance. Salvian stretches this lawful attitude towards religiousness to all aspects of the Christian’s life.

The biggest responsibility of parents is to love their children. This love should not only result from a natural instinct to love one’s offspring but also be subject to Christian morality. In case of the relationship between parents and children, Christian parents should see the wellbeing of their children as the most important matter, above all other matters, except God, whom they should love and cherish above everything else.77 By observing the relationship between Father and Son – they should submit their parenthood to Christ.78 For this reason, they should teach their children to trust God and bring them up under discipline and with respect for God’s commandments.79

It is the responsibility of consecrated widows (Tim 5:5–6) to put their trust in God, prayer80 and sexual asceticism and mercy. A woman who

---

76 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 72, 3: “Qui ergo se tanti patris filium confitetur et credit, respondeat uita generi, moribus patri, et mente atque actu adserat quo caelestem consecutus est per naturam”: OSPC 2, 76; compare also Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 67, 4: OSPC 2, 42.

77 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 16: “Non solum enim amandos dicimus filios sed praecipue ac super omnia amandos, nec quicquam his omnino anteponendum nisi deum solum. Nam et hoc est praecipue amare, illum filiiis anteponere quem non expediat omnino postponere”: SCh 176, 150; compare Mt 10:37; Lk 14:26–27; Pwp 33, 9; he expresses a similar view in other texts, compare Salvian of Marseilles *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 19–20: SCh 176, 252. 254; Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 3, 55–56: SCh 176, 280. 282.

78 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 16: “Neque enim est ullus melior filiorum amor, quam quem ille dociut qui ipsos filios dedit. Neque possunt pignora melius amari quam si in eo ipso, a quo data sunt, amentur”: SCh 176, 150.

79 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 1, 17: SCh 176, 150; compare Ps 78 (77):7; Eph 6:4.

80 Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 26: “Et ideo dicit: quae uere uidua est, desolata sperat in domino, docens scilicet parum esse, si non sit uidua deliciosa, non diues, nisi fuerit deo adhaerens, nisi orationi dedicata, nisi a cunctis mundi inlecebris desolata et per haec omnia uere uidua”: SCh 176, 206; compare 1 Tim 1:5–6.
declares herself a consecrated widow but enjoys all the pleasures of this world, lives in contradiction to her promises.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 25: "Quae uere uidua est, desolata sperat in domino, instat orationibus nocte ac die; nam quae in delictis agit, uiuens mortua est. Vno eodemque praecessit duas apostolorum formas uiduitatis expressit, unam uerum mortis: in deliciis mortem posuit. Ergo absque dubio diuitem esse non uult quam deliciosam esse non patitur, quia omnis fructus diuitiarum in usu est positus deliciarum; alioqui remoto usu deliciarum causa omne non relinquuntur": SCh 176, 204, 206.} The women who are Church widows should follow the ‘rules for widows.’\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 27: "Haec ergo uiduuitatis est regula": SCh 176, 206.}

One of the responsibilities of the virgins (\textit{legem deuotionis}) is sexual asceticism and active mercy, which confirms their virginity dedicated to God.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 30: "Transeamus ad sacras uirgines, quibus legem deuotionis saluator ipse praecepit exemplo scilicet. […] Quo dicto euidentissimae docuit quanti pretii iudicarit largam misericordiam, sine qua dixit nec integritatem quidem ipsam uirgini profuturam": SCh 176, 208; compare Mt 25:1–13.} In an allegoric parable on wise and stupid maids (Mt 25:1–13), Salvian compares wise maids to those who combine their virginity with mercy. Therefore, Christian virgins should not accumulate wealth and should not put trust in earthly riches.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 31–33: SCh 176, 210.} Their spiritual prudence should be expressed by showing mercy to their neighbours.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 35–36: SCh 176, 212.}

Evangelical poverty, understood as giving up ownership, offering your wealth to God is the responsibility of people dedicating their life to God.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 24: “unde intellegat omnes religiosi non satis se deo reddere, etiamsi uniuersas dederint facultates, quia licet sua cuncta dispensent, ipsos se tamen debent”: SCh 176, 204.} By resigning from owning things, a person living a monastic life (\textit{religious}), is affiliated with Christ, not with matter (Rom 8:35). He is a debtor of Christ’s salvation. By practicing poverty he dedicates his life to God. He makes a sacrifice of everything – his own personality, not only material things but also through difficulties, sadness, persecution, hunger, wounds, restrictions, bloodshed and finally death itself.\footnote{Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 24: “Non apostolus solam pecuniam nec solas deberi a nobis diuitias deo dicit, sed tribulationem, angustiam, famem, gladium, passionem, effusionem sanguinis, animae exhalationem, mortem denique omni poenarum genere conditam”: SCh 176, 224; compare Rom 8:35.}
Part II: A comparison of chosen pastoral problems...

It is the responsibility of clergymen with minor holy orders, as well as, hierarchical clergy (ministris et sacerdotibus) to obey religious norms which other people are subject to. But they should strive for an even bigger evangelical perfection. As clergy, they are obliged to give a proper example to others, in their dignity and piety.\(^8^8\) Clergymen should be the masters of perfection and encourage others to live according to the New Testament.\(^8^9\) This is a reference to the Old Testament, which put restrictions on the Levites, concerning the management of crops, vineyards and land.\(^9^0\)

In the opinion of Salvian, in the New Testament, Jesus Christ imposed an even more rigorous obligation on clergymen. It was not voluntary (as in the case of the young man – Mt 19:21) but obligatory (non ut ceteris voluntarium, sed imperatium oficium perfectionis indicit)\(^9^1\) to give up ownership in order to gain evangelical perfection (Mt 10:9–10).\(^9^2\) Thus, they were subject to an even stricter ban on ownership, acquiring wealth or even owning a means of transport.\(^9^3\) They should live in a spirit of sacri-

---

\(^8^8\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 37: “Superest de ministris et sacerdotibus quiddam dicere, licet superflue forte aliqua dicantur! Quidquid enim de aliis omnibus dictum est, magis absque dubio ad eos pertinet, qui exemplo esse omnibus debent et quos utique tanto antistare ceteris oportet deuotione, quanto antistant omnibus dignitate”: SCh 176, 212. 214.

\(^8^9\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 38: “ac tam perfectam deus uiuendi regulam dedit, quanto utique esse illos perfectiores iubet a quibus omnes docendi sunt ut possint esse perfecti, et quos tam magni esse exempli in omnibus deus sui voluit ut eos ad singularem uiuendi normam non nouae tantum sed etiam antiquae legis seueritate constringeret”: SCh 176, 214.

\(^9^0\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 38: “Nam licet decretum uetus largam cunctis ampliandarum opum dederit facultatem, omnes tamen leuitas et sacerdotes intra certum habendi limitem coartauit, quos scilicet neque segetem neque uineam neque ullum omnio fundum habere permisit”: SCh 176, 214; compare Num 18:23; Deut 18:1. 26, 12–13; Josh 18:7; Ne 10:38–40.


fice without the right to own anything. Should they expect offices, worldly goods or cheat inheritors, they would give a bad example.\(^{94}\)

7.2. Penance

For Chrysologus penance is an inner act, directing man to God clearing him of sin, a divine grace, a bond with God. The possibility of penance is an act of God’s kindness towards man, as it clears him of sins. Penance is always effective because of its role as a sanctifying grace. It is not man that sanctifies himself but God accepts and sanctifies the sinners who return to him, those doing penance. Thus for Chrysologus, penitence is a grace of forgiveness and bond with God. As a good Father, God constantly encourages people to undergo a transformation and to bond with Him, but not through places of religious cult but through the heart. For Salvian, penance is a spiritual stance, compensation for sins and as an expiation for sins, it should be proportional to the weight of the sin. True, honest repentance which brings an expiation of sins is done through acts of mercy towards those in need. Penitence is also perceived by Salvian as an ascetic struggle with adversities.

7.2.1. The concept of penance. Peter Chrysologus

When discussing penance, Chrysologus saw this as an internal act, a returning of the sinner to God. There is no reference to the so called second penance. The Bishop of Ravenna defined penance as God’s grace that clears man and hallows the heart. For Chrysologus, penance understood in this way was also a grace of forgiveness of the merciful God.

---

\(^{94}\) Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad Ecclesiam* 2, 41: “Et post haec parum est successoribus eorum, id est leuitis ac sacerdotibus, tanta diuinaram rerum administratrici fungentibus, si ipsi tantum diuites fuerint, nisi etiam heredes diuites delinquant. Erubescamus, quaeo, hac infidelitate. Sufficiat nobis quod uidemur usque ad uitae terminus deum spernere: cur id agimus ut contemptum ipsius etiam post mortem extendamus?”: Sch 176, 216.
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7.2.1.1. Penance as an internal act

In the opinion of the Bishop of Ravenna, penance is an internal act, its model example being the Prodigal Son returning to his father (Lk 15:11–32). In his discussion on penance, Peter Chrysologus does not refer to the so called second penance, the one-time penance after baptism (*poenitentia secunda*), and does not attempt to make penance part of Church sacraments.

7.2.1.2. Penance as God’s grace purifying man

Penance is strictly connected with man’s sinfulness and his faults. It does not mean full grace but a temporary return to God. Chrysologus says that

---


the sinner undergoes purification from the moment he makes a decision to return to God and the purification it entails.⁹⁷ Thus, penance is a long process of purification from darkness, sinfulness, confusion caused by sin.⁹⁸ Thanks to His grace, God encourages man to undertake penance. He also initiates the process of purification of the intellect, darkened by sins.⁹⁹

Chrysologus encouraged the faithful not to be hypocritical, not to pretend regret and not to concentrate on the symptoms of suffering, as crying and lamenting can be bought with money.¹⁰⁰ He gives John the Baptist as an example as a role model of redemption, whose life was full of suffering (duris satisfactionis), uncomfortable clothing made of camel hair which was a sign of hard work and complete dedication to God.¹⁰¹

The so called good scoundrel (Lk 32:40–43) is an example of the effectiveness of penance. He admits his sin to God at the moment of death, he is absolved for his wrongdoings and enters Heavenly Kingdom.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 3, 2: “Cum autem esset longe. Quomodo longe est qui uenit? Quia nondum peruenit iste qui uenit. Venit ad poenitentiam sed nondum peruenit ad gratiam; uenit ad domum patris, sed nondum peruenit ad gloriam pristini uel habitus uel honoris”: OSPC 1, 60; compare Lk 15:20.


⁹⁹ Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 3, 2: “Nox sepelit hesternum lumen; peccata sensum, animum, membra confundunt. Nisi ergo caelestis pater redeuntis filii radiasset in uultu, et totam confusionis caliginem respectus sui lumine sustulisset, num quam diuini uultus uidisset iste filius claritatem”: OSPC 1, 60; compare Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 1, 5: OSPC 1, 50, 52; Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 2, 1: OSPC 1, 54.

¹⁰⁰ Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 19, 5: “Numquid tales piaculum de pietate non faciunt, qui ad luctum musicam, ad funera suorum extranea lamenta conducunt? Vbi vero planctus non est, ibi est empta et mercennaria cantilena”: OSPC 1, 164; compare Mt 8:19–23.

¹⁰¹ Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 167, 8: “labori duro, addixit magno ponderi, extremae tradidit seruituti”: OSPC 3, 264; compare Mt 3:4.
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7.2.1.3. Penance as a grace of forgiveness and closeness of God

The sinner undertaking penance is aware of God’s forgiveness and this strengthens his will to repent.

7.2.2. The concept of penance. Salvian of Marseilles

Salvian considered penance as compensation for sins and as a way of weathering adversities. He stressed the importance of punishment proportional to the weight of the sin. For him, penance meant an internal repentance and a change of heart. For this reason, all obstacles on the way to repentance should be overcome in the spirit of faith.
7.2.2.1. Penance as compensation for sins  
Salvian had a jurisdictional vision of penance as an expiation of sins and thus the punishment should be proportional to the weight of the committed sins.

But penance understood in this way is still a spiritual, ascetic and not sacramental occurrence. This is due to his concept of dedicating one’s own life to God, without referring to poententia secunda. Salvian of Marseilles understood penance in a Biblical way: as an act of mercy towards another person. In his comment to Daniel 4:24, he considers the concept of assessing, which in case of sins means paying for what we want to rehabilitate. Because man is never able to pay an adequate price for his sins, the only right form of compensation is mercy towards our neighbours.105

Salvian stressed that from a man’s point of view, what is important in case of penance is actions (crying, pleading, modest clothing, loneliness) as well as, an internal change for the better (acknowledging one’s guilt, humbleness, regret for committed evil, a change of heart).106 But the most important thing is admitting one’s sins to God and trusting His mercy,107 accepting one’s sinfulnes108 and a humble acceptance of God’s verdict.109 For penance to be effective, it must mean an internal trans-

---


109 Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 2, 26: “Et bene pro conscientia bonae causae non tam suffragium domini quam iudicium deprecatur, quia bonae causae optimum semper suffragium tribuetur, si cum iustitia iudicetur”: SCh 220, 180; compare Salvian of Marseilles, De Gubernatione Dei 2, 25.
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formation and a change of heart. Otherwise, these actions will just be a formal, external act without importance for God. A sign of true atonement through penance which leads to expiation of sins, is mercy towards those in need. Penance at the end of one’s life when one is no longer able to cope with its demands, should be replaced with generous alms towards the poor.

7.2.2.2. Penance as a way of weathering adversities
A man striving for happiness should act according to the basic rule of making his thoughts and wishes as one (ex sententia sua atque ex uoto agunt). When he encounters suffering, God grants him the mercy of supporting him in his endurance (2 Cor 12:9–10).

7.3. Monasticism

In his sermons, the Bishop of Ravenna did not mention monasticism as a form of Christian asceticism. But Salvian of Marseilles did mention

---

112 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 49–51: SCH 176, 174. 176; compare Tob 12:8; Dan 4:24.
113 Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 1, 63: SCH 176, 184; Salvian of Marseilles, Ad Ecclesiam 3, 13: SCH 176, 248.
different forms of monasticism in the 5th century, he discussed the meaning of monasticism and the relationship between asceticism and mercy.

7.3.1. Peter Chrysologus

In his sermons, Peter Chrysologus does not express his views on monasticism as a form of Christian asceticism. What is interesting is the fact, that he did not refer to poverty, chastity and obedience. In particular, he did not treat obedience as a monastic virtue. He treated poverty and chastity as general Christian values and not just specific for monasticism. Only


116 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 28, 1–2: OSPC 1, 214. 216. Poverty is understood by Chrysologus as a virtue of renouncing earthly reality. This was also typical of some pagan philosophers. As Chrysologus said in Sermo 28, 1: "Qui tendit ad philosophiam, totum quod in rebus est ante contempnit"; OSPC 1, 214. In the New Testament poverty was typical of the following Apostles (Peter, Andrew, Jacob and John, as well as, Matthew). This virtue was helpful in telling the Word of God and encouraging various sacrifices. Chrysologus makes no reference to the virtue of poverty in monasticism in this excerpt on poverty as a virtue.

117 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7 bis, 1: OSPC 1, 92 (fasting as a virtue of abstinence from food is connected with chastity – the virtue calming the energy of the body. There is no reference here to chastity as a monastic virtue (ex professione); Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 22, 4: OSPC 1, 180 (the virtue of chastity is a special sign of all Christians as it stops the urges of
once, did he mention chastity as a special way of making a sacrifice to God, when he referred to the baptism of an eunuch, the Ethiopian queen’s treasurer (the Acts of the Apostles 8, 25–40). He said that the eunuch who was castrated by force by the queen’s people, accepted his ‘state’ during his own baptism as a spiritual gift of purity for the King of Heaven.118

Thus Chrysologus mentioned the chastity offered to the Eternal King, initiated by baptism and a transformation from physical mutilation to a spiritual sacrifice for God. However, it is difficult on the basis of this quote, to say whether chastity was treated as a specific and formal monastic vow. What Chrysologus probably had in mind in Sermo 56, 2 was a sacramental transformation through baptism.

7.3.2. Salvian of Marseilles

Salvian of Marseilles mentioned the monasteries and monks of those times. He referred to situations in which people devoted their life to God. He discussed the meaning of Christian monasticism and made references to monastic asceticism. The most desirable form of asceticism for monks is mercy.

7.3.2.1. The meaning of monasticism

Salvian incidentally mentions monasteries and monks in his works. He asks the 5th century monks in Lerins to accept his relative119 and also tritely mentions the hatred of 5th century Africans for monastic life in the Roman Africa.120 He refers to some forms of life dedicated to God, that is consecrated widows and virgins, white marriages vowing chastity, monks

the body of those awaiting Christ, with no particular reference to monastic chastity); Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 24, 2: OSPC 1, 190. 200 (a call for chastity which allows to control the urges of the body so that it does not fall into disgrace. For Chrysologus this is a general Christian virtue. Also in Sermo 24, 2 there is no reference to the virtue of chastity undertaken as a monastic sense.

118 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 56, 2: “Eunuchus etiam generatur in uia, ut quem castrau-erat humana temeritas ad hominis seruitutem, et intra regis aulam intra caelestis aulam gloriæ, ad eateri regis promoueret et transferret obsequium. Beatus iste, cui datum est ut palatii infulas non amitteret, sed mutaret!”: OSPC 1, 378; compare Ac 8, 25–40.

119 Salvian of Marseilles, Epistola 1, 10–11: SCh 176, 80. 82.
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and clergymen.\textsuperscript{121} He also mentions eremites near Carthage, who come from Egyptian monasteries, Jerusalem or any other ‘sacred remote monasteries of the desert’.\textsuperscript{122}

Salvian explained that his need to show his love for God and respect for Christ, made him and his spouse take the decision to resign from marriage and live in chastity and holiness.\textsuperscript{123} He stresses that this form of ascetic life in a monastery in Lerins as a converse was ‘their little conversion’\textsuperscript{124} – and the decision was dictated by religious zealousness. In his opinion ascetic life requires not only a resignation from things which are decent and allowed, such as marital sex but also a resignation from anything that is bad or not allowed for Christians.\textsuperscript{125} People should appreciate those who lead a virtuous life. However, in Salvian’s opinion, in those times, this form of ascetic life was not appreciated by wealthy people.\textsuperscript{126}

For Salvian, monastic life was a specific form of Christian atonement. The monks and converses called for a long-lasting (till the end of one’s life) period of expiation for one’s sins. This way of ascetic life could not be undertaken at the end of life, when sacrificing your sexuality was no longer possible.\textsuperscript{127} What was important for Salvian from a spiritual point of view, was penance for sins and formally dedicating one’s life to God in this specific form of life. Apart from chastity, it was necessary to give up one’s material goods and distribute them among the poor (this was seen as offering

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{121} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam}, 2, 14: “uidua […] uirgo integritatem professa et inpolluti corporis sanctitate deuota? Quid, si coniugium sine opere coniugali, negans se ipsum sibi, et habens se quasi non habens? Quid, si monachus ab incunabulis deo militans? Quid, si clericus sacri ministerii seruitutem fidelis seruitute consummans?”: SCh 176, 196.
  \item \textsuperscript{122} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei}, 8, 22: “Et si quando aliquis dei seruus aut de Aegyptiorum coenobiis aut de sacris Hierusalem locis aut de sanctis heremi uenerandisque secretis ad urbem illam officio diuini operis accessit”: SCh 220, 524.
  \item \textsuperscript{123} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Epistola}, 4, 12: “Inuitauit me ad religionem, inuitauit ad castitatem. […] Huc accessit etiam reuerentia Christi et affectus: honeste me facere credidi quicquid dei amore fecissem”: SCh 176, 94.
  \item \textsuperscript{124} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Epistola}, 4, 6: “conuersinculam nostram”: SCh 176, 90.
  \item \textsuperscript{125} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Epistola} 5: SCh 176, 107–110; Salwian z Marsylii, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei}, 5, 55: SCh 220, 352.
  \item \textsuperscript{126} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam}, 3, 35–36: SCh 176, 264. 266.
  \item \textsuperscript{127} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam}, 1, 49: “Sed quomodo ei exomologesis diuturna optiulabitur in extremis sito?”: SCh 176, 174.
\end{itemize}
them to God).\textsuperscript{128} Giving up ownership at your own freewill meant it was not the material goods that were important but God who is the aim of life for all those leading an ascetic life. If they give up their belongings before Final Judgement, then no one will ask them to pay for the use of worldly goods during mortal life.\textsuperscript{129}

7.3.2.2. Asceticism and mercy
Salvian and his wife Palladia and their daughter Auspiciola resided in a monastery in Lerins but they were not monks in the strict meaning of the word.\textsuperscript{130} For seven years they lived together – as a family in a community of monks, in a way which was more monk like than family like. When discussing forms of religiousness, Salvian stressed the importance of a free choice when choosing a form of life and the need to accept asceticism. “Religious people are happier than others, as they have what they want and also they could not possibly have anything better than they already do.” Thus hardship, fasting, poverty, low social rank and illness are not a burden for those who do not see it this way, but they are a burden for those who do not want to accept them. It is a well-known truth that the way we perceive the situation – as difficult or not – depends on our nature. Thus, there is no easy thing that could become difficult for a man with bad temper and there is nothing difficult that would seem easy to the one who accepts things easily.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{128} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 28: “Hoc est dicere: si deuotus es, da quasi tuum, si indeuotus, redde quasi non tuum. Bene itaque posuit et dandi uoluntatem et soluendi necessitatem”: SCh 176, 158. 160.


\textsuperscript{130} C. Vogel (\textit{La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule, dès orgines à la fin du VII siècle}, Paris 1952) analysed statements made by ascetics and monks of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} century and stressed that practicing atonement as a way of life was a sign of concern for the soul (\textit{cura animarum}), there, 68–77. For those who conversed in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century, it meant a change of the way of life (\textit{habitus; mutato prius saeculari habitu}; that is internal conversion), secret compensation for sins (\textit{secreta satisfactio}), but not becoming formally a monk (\textit{confesso religionis studio}), ibidem, p. 133–134 (especially pages: 30, 133).

\textsuperscript{131} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 1, 9: “Religiosi autem hoc cunctis beatiiores sunt quia et habent quae ulunt et meliora quam quae habent omnino habere non possunt. Labor itaque et ieiunium et paupertas et humilitas et infirmitas non
What the body wishes is always different to what the soul wishes (Gal 5:17), thus the ascetic man choses the soul and his body is weaker than his mental power.\textsuperscript{132} If we wish to be united with God, we must accept the rules of the Gospel, we must overcome weaknesses and bear suffering on our path to Christian perfection\textsuperscript{133} and Christian morality.\textsuperscript{134} All Christians, including monks, must bear in mind Christ’s words (Mt 24:31–46) that what counts during Final Judgement is not asceticism, fasting and physical mortification, but mercy towards other people.\textsuperscript{135}

7.4. Devotional practices

Peter Chrysologus discussed the basic devotional practices (prayer, fasting and mercy). They should appear altogether and should never be separated. Prayer ought to be continual, patient and trusting, short and based on Our Father. Our prayer, our pleas should be dignified, devout. We should ask for virtues bringing peace. The effectiveness of common prayer depends on faith and the number of participants and the level of holiness and decency of those who pray.

For Salvian of Marseilles, the basic devotional practice is prayer understood as a trustful begging to God. The best example of this is, a complete devotion to God is the evangelical widow (Mk 12:41–44), who offers her entire belongings to God. Such a trustful stance, here on earth, results in a prolonging of existence in the form of an eternal life. Entrusting God with all our worldly matters is also a way of expressing our trust in Him.

\textsuperscript{132} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 1, 15–16: SCh 220, 116; compare 1 Cor 9:27; Gal 5:17.


\textsuperscript{134} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 3, 60: SCh 220, 230.

\textsuperscript{135} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 4, 30–33: SCh 176, 330. 332.
7.4.1. Peter Chrysologus

When discussing devotional practices, the Bishop of Ravenna looks at the laws of Christian prayer, the temptations hindering prayer. He discusses the begging prayer and Holy Communion understood as prayer of the whole communion.

7.4.1.1. The laws of prayer

Chrysologus understands the Biblical triad of religious practices, that is prayer, fasting and mercy. Their function is to make the faithful remain in their faith, piety and their virtues. They should always appear together and can never be separated. The Christian should always pray to God, he should be patient and as a patient pupil, he should await His decision. Christian prayer should be short. Chrysologus stressed that this is the recommendation of Jesus Christ himself. Christ passed the prayer Our Father to the apostles as an example of all Christian prayers. The Christian’s prayer should be short as God wants to quickly grant him what he asks for.

There are temptations which stand in the way of prayer. When commenting the sentence ‘and do not lead us into temptation (from Our Father)’ he said that life is one big struggle against temptation (compare Job 7:1).

---

137 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 43, 2: “Haec nemo rescindat: nesciunt separari. Horum qui unum non habet, nullum habet; ista qui simul non habet, nihil habet”: OSPC 1, 302.
139 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 67, 1: “Christus breuiter orare docuit, qui cito uult postulata praestare”: OSPC 2, 40. Sermi 67–72. R. Benericetti, OSPC 2, no. 1, 40, notices that these cautions were part ‘traditio orationis dominicae’, that is the learning and explanation of the prayer Our Father to catechumen. ‘traditio orationis dominicae’ was identical to ‘traditio’ of symbols. The teaching was explained just before the ceremony of baptism and learned by heart by those aspiring to Christianity. ‘traditio orationis dominicae’ also existed in the church in Aquileia (Chromatius of Aquileia, Sermo 40: SCCh 164), éd. J. Lemarié, Paris 1971, p. 224–228, and later also in the church of Rome. To read more about this see: V. Saxer, Les rites d’initiation chrétienne du IIe au IVe siècle. Esquisse historique et signification d’après leur principaux témoins, Spoleto 1988; F. Cavallotto, Il catechumenato antico. Diventare cristiani secondo i Padri, Bologna 1996.
We pray not be left alone with our judgements and decisions but we ask that He introduces some restrictions just like a good Father stops His children from doing silly things. What is more, in the opinion of Chrysologus, these words are a plea to God to have certainty of faith, internal strength coming from God as our guide to salvation so as not to be driven from proper interpretation of faith.  

7.4.1.2. The begging prayer
Chrysologus sees *Our Father* as a model prayer. He defined the characteristics of an imploring prayer. In order to be successful, such a prayer should be directed to God, as a so called sacred plea. Everything can be its basis but we must remember that we should only ask for things which are respectful, godly, virtues leading to harmony. One who believes in Gold, should not ask for anything evil, revolting, unworthy, godless, earthly. We should never ask for consent for temptation, for things we would not be proud of.  

As a donor of good things (*Elargitor*) God only listens to pleas which are directed in the above manner.

7.4.1.3. Common prayer – the Holy Communion
Chrysologus stressed the importance of common prayer, especially in the context of Holy Communion prayer. He refers to the words of Christ

---

140 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo 67*, 9: “Et ne inducas nos in temptationem. Quia in hoc saeculo non relinquit, sed in omni actum paterna nos pietate constringat, et in uita hominis temptationi inquit, est uita hominis. Rogamus ergo ut nos arbitrio nostro non relinquat, sed in omni actum paterna nos pietate constringat, et in uita hominis temptationi constringat”: OSPC 2, 44; compare Mt 6:13; Job 7:1 (the Vulgate): *militia est uita hominis super terram*; Chrysologus version: *temptatio est uita hominis super terram*. Perhaps Chrysologus used Job’s text, some version of *Veteres Latinæ* or simply quoted an excerpt from Job 7:1, changing its content by changing *militia* to *temptatio*. This version seemed more phonetically appropriate.

141 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo 132*, 3: “Audistis quantum possit et praeculeat sanctae petitiones ad sensus: non dixit illud aut illud, sed totum se promittit, quicquid unitas postulationis concupierit praestaturum, cum dicit: De omni re quacumque petierint, fiet illis, salua tamen ea cautela et reuerentia, ut a deo quae digna sunt postuletur; qui enim mala a deo postulat, deum mali iudicat et sentit auctorem; et quia illia et indigna precatur, praestantis potestatem et potentiam degener petitor ignorat. Non ergo impia, sed pia; non terrena, sed caelestia; non inlecebris, sed uirtuti congrua; non digna odiis, sed apta concordiae”: OSPC 3, 54; compare Mt 18:19.

Part II: A comparison of chosen pastoral problems…

(Mt 18:19–20) who promises to give the two or three people who ask Him something, what they ask for.\textsuperscript{143} The effectiveness of such prayer depends on the faith of those who pray, but also on the number of people who pray. The more people who gather in the name of the Lord, the more effective it is.\textsuperscript{144} The level of holiness and decency of those who pray is another factor influencing effectiveness (Ps 111 (110):1): the bigger, the prayer is more effective.\textsuperscript{145}

The biggest weakness of common prayer is lack of individual zealness connected with the fact that most people have other things to do during the time of church prayers. This is a sign of ignoring Christ’s orders and an aversion for Him. As a result, this divides the whole Church.\textsuperscript{146} In the opinion of Chrysologus, the lack of eagerness to participate in Eucharistic prayer is a result of religious ignorance or spiritual laziness.\textsuperscript{147} But no matter the reason, it always results in breaking up the unity of the Church and deprives Christians of the healthy spirit of prayer and honour.\textsuperscript{148} For this reason, Chrysologus encouraged perseverance and participation in the Holy Communion, as well as, unity while awaiting for the Lord to come again.\textsuperscript{149}

\textsuperscript{143} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 132, 4: “si duobus uel tribus compositis medium se futurum, et omnia se promittit quae postulatus fuerit praestaturum?”: OSPC 3, 56.

\textsuperscript{144} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 132, 4: “Quid non dat plurimis?”: OSPC 3, 56.


\textsuperscript{146} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 132, 4: “Sed non nulli sub specie fidei contemptus sui excusare nituntur igniium, ut neglecto uenerandi coitus et congregationis amore illud se tempus orationis deputare confingat, quod domesticis dederint et impenderint curis, et dum propriis desideriis mancipantur, diuina contempnunt et dispiciunt instituta. Isti sunt qui corpus Christi dissipant, membra dispergunt, nec ad decorem suum patiuntur formam dominici habitus peruenire, quam propheta cum uidisset in spiritu, sic canebat: \textit{Speciosus forma prae filiis hominum}”: OSPC 3, 56; compare Mt 18:19–20; Ps 45 (44):3.

\textsuperscript{147} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 132, 5: “Hoc ergo interest inter congregationis plenitudinem gloriosam et separationis praesumptam de ignorantia aut neglegentia uanitatem”: OSPC 3, 56.

\textsuperscript{148} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 132, 5: “quod in salute et honore integri corporis species est unitas membrorum, et in separatione uscerum est foeda, letalis, horrenda pernicies”: OSPC 3, 56.

\textsuperscript{149} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 132, 6: “Quisquis ille sese putat esse aliquid, tali institutus exemplo maneant in ecclesia, ut sit aliquid; alioquin, ubi defuerit illi, sibi esse mox desinit. Quod qui plenius nosse desiderat, apostoli de corpore Christi loquentis perlegat instituta, quia nos illa
7.4.2. Salvian of Marseilles. Plea to God – trust in God

The basic religious practice for Christians is prayer, understood as a trustful pleading to God. In the opinion of Salvian, such prayer is a sign of the hope one has in God. The evangelical widow (Mt 12:41–44) is an example of such approach.\(^{150}\)

Such a stance proves the wish for eternal life, boundless trust in God and faith in God. The positive effect of the ‘rule of life of the widows’ is both faith in God, as well as, a trust in God through good deeds. Trust in God here on earth, leads to an eternal existence and God is the guarantor of this.

Our prayer here on earth for things in Heaven, for God’s mercy towards those who believe in Him is proof of Christian awaiting for eternity, theological hope in God and not in any human concept as man and his thinking is unable to do anything in eternity.\(^{151}\) The only guarantor for the faithful, hoping for future wealth, is God, who encourages us to trust Him and to pray.\(^{152}\)

Entrusting God with our worldly matters is also proof of our trust in Him.\(^{153}\)
Salvian encourages thanksgiving to God through liturgy and honour but he also asks people to do good and to improve morals. This is a new way of behaving as our sacrifice to God (nouae conversionis hostias immolamus).

7.4.3. The spirituality of entrusting God and deserving. Peter Chrysologus

Thus prayer is a religious practice which by entrusting God with our worldly matters and Heavenly future is proof that man exists in God only. Chrysologus encourages morning prayer. Through prayer and a good life, man gains Heaven. Man gains Heaven through a good life on earth, from the moment he decides to live according to God’s rules.

Chrysologus refers to Psalm 6:2 and says that man should put trust not in the deeds that he does (quia non confidebat de mertis) but God’s mercy first of all.
7.4.4. Salvian of Marseilles. The spirituality of gaining heaven through holiness

In the opinion of Salvian of Marseilles, the life proposed by the gospel consists of noticing the spiritual value of man and his virtues. In Mt 6:19–21, there are two different models of human life; some people seek worldly goods and have many goods, others care for Heavenly values and by doing so, they gain Heaven.\textsuperscript{159} To receive the reward, one must live an active life. Man does not earn his own salvation but his good deeds are proof of the trust he has in God in fulfilling that wish.\textsuperscript{160}

Salvian reminds us of the words of the Psalmist (Ps 34 (33):17–18), that God always appreciates good people and looks after them because he wants them to be saved. He also sees the bad ones and is going to punish and destroy them.\textsuperscript{161} An acceptance of the Gospel is proof of an internal confirmation of the rightness of God’s rules.\textsuperscript{162} Thus, striving for Christian

\textsuperscript{159} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 1, 9: “Non utique. Et ideo effectus spiritualium rerum atque uirtutes uis sacrae locutionis expressit; scilicet ut, quia cupiditati et auaritiae terrena atque tartarea, misericordiae autem ac largitati caelestia ac sempiterna debeatur; idcirco diuersitas terreni et caelestis thesauri posita est ut qui cupiditati et auaritiae thesaurizarent in inferno se opes locare cognoscerent, qui uero misericordiae et humanitati caelestes thesaurus praeparare gauderent. Loca itaque thesaurorum de meritis thesaurizantium nominavit; ibi enim dicuntur esse iam thesauri, ubi sunt thesaurizantes futuri”: SCh 176, 144.

\textsuperscript{160} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{Ad Ecclesiam} 2, 54: “Sed esto illas quas supra diximus poenas non timeamus rei: numquid etiam praemium sperare possimus non merentes? Et ideo si opes non damus ob peccatorum redemptionem, demus saltim ad emendam beatitudinem; si non damus ne damnemur, demus saltim ut muneremur; quia etiamsi praeterita mala non sint quae oporteat sanctos redimere, sunt tamen perennia bona quae magni debeant comparare: etiamsi poena non sit quae timeatur, est tamen regnum quod ambiatur; ac per hoc, etiamsi non habent sancti quae redimant, habent tamen quae emanat. Nisi forte aliquis damnum in emptione uereat, uidelicet ne plus commodet quam recipiat, ne grandia faeneranti parua reddantur, ne largitionem redhibito non repenest, et data semel pretii magnitudine pecunia periclitetur emptoris, ac si magnum quid domino commendarit in terra, non habeat Christus forsitans unde ei soluat in caelo”: SCh 176, 224.

\textsuperscript{161} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 2, 5: SCh 220, 162.

\textsuperscript{162} Salvian of Marseilles, \textit{De Gubernatione Dei} 4, 1: “ac per hoc totum in id reuoluitur, ut qui Christiani nominis opus non agit, Christianus non esse uideatur; nomen enim sine actu atque officio suo nihil est”: SCh 220, 232.
holiness means living a life in which faith complies with deeds.\textsuperscript{163} Salvian recommends basing our life on the Gospel.\textsuperscript{164}

7.5. Fasting

In his sermons on fasting (5 thematic sermons plus a few other), Chrysologus encourages fasting as a form of atonement, aiding man in his conversion to God. Each Christian lent is a material and spiritual reaction to sin, a form of subordination to Christ’s will. Abstinence is the first step against vices. But for the treatment to work well, the sinner must perform acts of mercy. Fasting should always be accompanied by prayer and mercy. Conjoined devout practices are one prayer, which take on a triple form. The concept of the forty days of fasting during Lent is taken from (Mt 4:2) a religious abstinence from foods and the example of Jesus Christ himself and his forty days of fasting. John the Baptist propagated fasting as a way of life. Fasting was a continuation of Christ’s work, a way of overcoming weaknesses of hunger and the temptation of the devil. Fasting leads to spiritual purification. The biggest risks for those who fast are hypocrisy, lack of mercy, religious ostentatiousness, showing sadness, rigorism as well as, being lenient about it. Salvian of Marseilles does not have his own teaching concerning fasting. He just makes a few remarks connected with fasting as a religious practice.


7.5.1. Sermons encouraging fasting

There are five sermons delivered by Chrysologus, dedicated solely to Christian fasting.\footnote{165} These were published in the critical edition of his works. They were delivered at the beginning of or during Lent. In those sermons, Chrysologus explained the practice of fasting as a form of penance, encouraging man’s constant conversion to God.\footnote{166} He touched this topic in his

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
other thematic sermons (mainly *Sermo* 51\textsuperscript{167} and *Sermo* 139\textsuperscript{168} in which we can see the traces of the Roman ‘fasting of the seventh month’).\textsuperscript{169}

7.5.2. Spiritual fasting

In *Sermo* 41, Chrysologus defined fasting as a spiritual-material reaction of the ill body to sin. Fasting thwarts spiritual weaknesses, just like starving oneself helps overcome poor digestion.\textsuperscript{170} But to make the spiritual treatment effective, the ill person, that is the sinner should submit to Christ and the fasting should be undertaken reasonably.\textsuperscript{171} Fasting performed as a religious act, strengthens our inner self as the weakness of

\textsuperscript{167} Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 51: “Nunc ubi aerem temperies mitigauit autumpni, dominicum iubente domino reuocamur ad uerbum”: OSPC 1, 350.

\textsuperscript{168} Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 139, 7: “Septimus numerus, cum per menses properat, septimi mensis festa consecrat tota nobis ieiunii sancitate”: OSPC 3, 88.

\textsuperscript{169} Fasting connected with *Quattuor temporum*, in the 5th century also called *ieiunium primi, quarti, septimi, decimi mensis* (counting March as the first), was an ascetic and liturgical celebration, typical of the Roman Church. At the beginning of each of the four seasons, the Roman Church suggested a special time of fasting and prayer (usually three days – Wednesday, Friday and Saturday). Ever since the 8th century it became known as *Tempora*. Peter Chrysologus was one of the first to mention *Tempora Septembris* (fasting of the seventh month). This confirms the practice of fasting (*Quattuor temporum*) in the Church of Ravenna and a great influence of Roman liturgy on the 5th century liturgy of Ravenna. To read more about the subject see: A. Chavasse, *Les Quatre-Temps*, [in:] *L’Église en prière: introduction à la liturgie*, éds. A. G. Martimort, R. Béraudy, B. Botte, Paris 1965, p. 758–765; A. Chavasse, *Le sermon 3 de S. Leon et la date de la célébration des Quatretemps de septembre*, RSR 44 (1970), p. 77–84; F. Sottocornola, *L’anno liturgico*, op. cit., p. 493–442; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, vol. 2: *L’anno liturgico*, Milano 1998\textsuperscript{3}, p. 41–47.

\textsuperscript{170} Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 41, 1: "Bella gentium legimus superasse quamplurimos, quos tamen pugnas carnis legitimus non uicisse; et audiuius eos dedisse delictis pectora, qui dorsa hostibus non dederunt. Pro dolor! Victores gentium uitiorum captius, nationum dominos turpi seruiisse criminibus seruiisse, et inter saeuienses gladios, et inter eneuaed lenocin- ia corruiisse, regnis fuisse terrori, ludibrio uius uinduirium, uacueseus inuro, qui iacere effuso san- guine nescierunt, unde est? Vnde? Quia hoc non est ratio, sed languor; non uita, sed febris; frenesis, non natura. Namque quotiens ciborum cruditas uitalia deicit, infirmat stomachum, corrumpit sanguinem, uitatiam humores, succendit colera, extremum febris gignit incendium, totiens aeger mentem perdit, amittit sensum, fertur desideriii, contrarii urgetur, salutaria respuit, quaerit noxia, fugit curam": OSPC 1, 290.

\textsuperscript{171} Peter Chrysologus *Sermo* 41, 1: “Tunc medici studiose parant abstinentiae remedia sub- uenire, ut sanet abstinentia, quod uoracitas sauciatur. Et si pro temporali cura aegri medicis
human being pushes man towards weaknesses and passions (Compare he Epistle to the Romans 7, 18) and these destroy free will. Fasting prevents internal weakness, pulls man away from faults and death and leads towards virtues and life. But a man who sticks to weaknesses and passions, becomes internally weak and decides to do things which are not necessary.

Abstinence, characteristic of fasting is the first step to overcoming weaknesses. But for the remedy of spiritual fasting to work properly, the sinner must perform acts of mercy. Fasting combined with acts of mercy, intensifies the will of the one who fasts and has bigger value for...
God – the one that forgives sins of those who perform mercy. As a religious act, it prevents human ignorance and spiritual laziness.\textsuperscript{175}

Fasting combined with mercy is the Christian’s answer to the need for mercy.\textsuperscript{176} Perceived in this way, it is not only asceticism but through mercy, it becomes a religious act. For this reason, Chrysologus encouraged this form of fasting: when I am fasting, let my meal which I do not eat, be given to the one who is hungry because God grants his Kingdom in return for love (alms) given to the poor.\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{175} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 41, 3: "Ieiunium sanat uulnera peccatorum, sed cicatrices uulnerum sine misericordia non emundat. Audi dominum dicentem: \textit{Date elemosynam, et tunc erunt uobis omnia munda}. Ieiunii singularis cultus euellit uiiitia, eradicat criminia, ad fructus bonos agrum parat et mentis et corporis, sed nisi misericordia iecerit pietatis semen, ieiunantis… Ieiunium est sanctitatis hostia, sacrificium castitatis, sed sine misericordia incenso ad diuinum non potest odorem suauitatis ascendere. Quod anima est corpori, hoc misericordiam constat esse ieiunio. Quando ieiunium ex misericordia uiuit, tunc uiuificat ieiunantem. Ieiunium, uirtutum nauis, portat quaestum uitae, lucrurn salutis aductat; sed qui intrat carnis pelagos, scindit uitorum fluctus, inter scopulos criminarum transit, praeterit litora passionum, nisi cito portum pietatis intrauerit, exercere uirtutes non potest, lucrurn non potest habere uirtutum. Qui stare nouit in huius uitae lubrico, qui se intelleget carnis uiam transire perlapsum, qui se sentit incursionibus ignorantiae, neglegentiae casibus sui, sic ieiunium teneat, ut misericordiam non relinquat. Ieiunium nobis aperit caelum, mensa Christi nostrum in prandium, auferit nobis divinum regnum; sed nisi tunc ieiunans uirtutem nostrarum patrona causarum, qui de innocentia constare non possumus, securi de uenia non erimus, dicente domino: \textit{Iudicium sine misericordia illi qui non fecerit misericordiam}": OSPC 1, 292; compare Lk 11:41; Job 2:13.


\textsuperscript{177} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 41, 4: "Deus regnum suum fragmento panis uendit: quis excusare poterit non ementem, quem tanta uilitas uenditionis accusat? Fratres, prandium nostrum sit pauperis caena, ut mensa Christi nostrum partetur in prandium, promittente ipso cum dicit: \textit{Manducabitis in mensa mea et in regno meo}. Fratres, sint deliciae pauperum nostra ieiunia, ut temporale ieiunium nostrum in aeternas possit nobis delicias inmutari. Homo, dando pauperi da tibi, quia quod pauperi non dederis, habebit alter; tu solum quod pauperi dederis, hoc habeabis": OSPC 1, 294; compare Lk 22:30.
7.5.3. Fasting Combined with Mercy

In *Sermo* 42, Chrysologus stressed that for the fasting to be valid for God, it must be combined with acts of mercy. Otherwise, it is not sufficient and lacks spiritual value.\(^{178}\) Fasting without mercy is spiritually fruitless, it can be compared to a plot of land not sewn with seeds which does not bear fruit\(^ {179}\) or a palace without a king.\(^ {180}\) For Chrysologus, fasting as a sacrifice undertaken for God, is one of religious virtues. As a religious virtue, it is connected with the virtues of innocence, chastity, helpfulness, proper behavior, zealousness, holiness and thus gains bigger importance. But when it is not connected with mercy, it does not lead to glory and honour and does not guarantee a reward. There is no credit for it in the eyes of God and prayer loses its trust.\(^ {181}\)

But, fasting combined with mercy, as a religious act has value for God, even though mercy is shown only towards the poor, this means following the Bible as in the case of Psalm 111:9; Psalm 125:5 or 2 Corinthians 9:6–7.\(^ {182}\) Both fasting or any other virtue is incomplete if it is not connected with mercy.\(^ {183}\) Christian virtues are complimentary and they should appear together, but what brings them together is mercy. Christ will judge man depending on how much mercy each man has shown.\(^ {184}\) For this reason, Chrysologus encourages the faithful to combine fasting with mercy as “nothing will poison us on earth as long as mercy is our patron in Heaven.”\(^ {185}\)

\(^{178}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 1: “Sed quia ieiunium sine misericordia deficit, ieiunium sine pietate ieiunat”: OSPC 1, 296.

\(^{179}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 2: “Est ager cultus sine semine sine miseratione ieiunans”: OSPC 1, 296.

\(^{180}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 2: “Quod est sine rege aula regis, hoc est sine largitate ieiunium”: OSPC 1, 296. In opinion of R. Benericetti, OSPC 1, no. 3, 297, Peter Chrysologus made an allusion to the magnificent Imperial Palace in Ravenna.

\(^{181}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 3: “sed sine misericordia gloriaret non habet, merced caret, palmam non tenet, perdit fiduciam supplicandi, impetrandi meritum non capessit”: OSPC 1, 296; compare: Prov 21:13.

\(^{182}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 3: OSPC 1, 298.

\(^{183}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 6: “Probatum est ergo tibi non ieiunium solum, sed omnes sine misericordia nutare uirtutes”: OSPC 1, 300.

\(^{184}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 6: OSPC 1, 296; compare Mt 25:35–40.

\(^{185}\) Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 42, 6: “Nihil nos nocebit in terra, si nobis in caelo misericordia sit patrona”: OSPC 1, 296.
7.5.4. The complementary character of religious practices

In the opinion of Chrysologus, fasting should be combined with prayer and mercy and one should concentrate on mercy. These practices should not appear separately as they are all part of one faith and practicing them jointly deepens our piety and virtuousness.

‘The one who prays, should fast and the one who fasts, should show mercy. The one who wants to be heard, should also listen to the one who asks. See footnote.

Chrysologus has no objections to call it God’s intercession, prayer which has triple form. Christ will forgive those sinners who pray, give alms and offer mercy. Religious practices give man a proper aim, extinguish faults and liven virtues. One who does not follow at least one religious practice, does not practice them at all.
The Pastors of the 5th Century. A Comparative Study…

7.5.5. Lent

The forty day Christian Lent has Biblical grounds even though it has only been practiced since the Universal Church.193 Chrysologus found justification for the forty day Lent in Matthew 4:2.194 He also referred to Jesus Christ who would also fast for forty days.195 This was formal motivation, which was supposed to help the faithful discover the ascetic reasons for fasting, such as mortifying the body, getting rid of faults and spiritual inspiration of the senses.196

The Bishop of Ravenna used allegorical explanations of number forty in reference to the Bible, to show the spiritual meaning of the forty day Lent. In his opinion, number forty symbolized the period of bearing hardships and freeing oneself (see footnote)197 Chrysologus compared such forty day period of fasting, understood as a time of purification to the forty days of rain during the flood. Lent clears a man of his weaknesses and sins just like the flood cleared the earth of vile behavior.198 It was also compared to the forty days of eating manna (modern day semolina). The forty day fast brings

194 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 11, 4: OSPC 1, 114; compare Mt 4:2; compare also Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 1–3: OSPC 3, 254, 256.
197 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 7: “Quia sacratus numerus iste suspicit iniquitates, ut deleat; capitisuitates, ut absolutat, ingreditur; uincula patitur, ut relaxet”: OSPC 3, 258.
198 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 3: “qaradraginta diebus et noctibus expiaturus terram caelestis imber effunditur”: OSPC 3, 254; compare: Gen 6:5–6; 7:12; Chrysologus sees purification of humankind from evil and bad temper as by God’s flood as harbinger of Christian baptism, which is God’s act only. Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 3: “gauderet tali baptismate se renatum, scieretque quod est non se naturae, sed auctoris suis gratiae iam debere, ipsamque nostri baptismatis formam terra, nostra corporis origo, praebatur, ut aquae ante natos homines producebat ad mortem, hos ad uitam perduceret iam renatos”: OSPC 3, 254, 256.

Chrysologus is probably the earliest witness of the Roman liturgical tradition of Holy Saturday, the so called *Benedictio Fontis*. To read more about the subject see: F. Lanzoni, *La “Benedictio Fontis” e i sermoni di san Pier Crisologo*, “Rassegna Gregoriana” 7 (1908), p. 425–429;
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spiritual purification and leads to a rebirth in the waters of baptism and to salvation just like Israel was fed by God in the desert for forty years.199 The forty day fast, as an arduous period of spiritual preparation and moral rebirth was compared to the exploration of Kanaan by Israeli troops.200 Lent understood as arduous preparation of the body to meet Heaven was described in the forty day crossing of Elias until he reached Horeb.201 Also Ezekiel would lie on the right hand side for forty days. This symbolized coming face to face with the offences of Judah’s generation, for future liberation.202

For Chrysologus, the allegorical concept of the forty day Lent was a forecast of the real meaning of fasting, revealed by Jesus Christ. By fasting forty days, the Messiah fulfilled and explained the work of the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament (begun, not clear),203 “to strengthen what was weak, to finish what had been started and to confirm what had been established in the commandments”.204 But the most important thing was that Christ would fast himself, giving Christians a good example and summoning them to fast and not look for reasons to fast.205

7.5.6. Fasting as a way of life – John the Baptist

Christ encouraged to reform through mercy. For Chrysologus, John the Baptist was such person,206 an evangelical master of penance and an

---

199 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 4: OSPC 3, 256; compare Ex 16:13–35.
203 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 8: “Hinc est ergo quod dominus, auctor a saeculis in hoc numero absconditi sacramenti, intrat ipsum numerum dierum quadraginta ieiunii, ut quod adumbrauerat in famulis, ipsa per se iam ueritate facta, et coepta pericicet”: OSPC 3, 258; compare Mt 4:2.
204 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 8: “firmaret tenera, inchoata suppleret, et quae praecptis instituerat, roboraret exemplo”: OSPC 3, 258.
205 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 166, 8: “ Verae deuotionis est, fidelissimae seruitutis est, quid fieri uelit, non quare uelit dominator, inquirere”: OSPC 3, 258.
example of proper fasting. 207 For John the Baptist, words and actions were one thing and as such, he was an example of someone who had God’s wisdom combined with virtue. 208 For John the Baptist, penance, as a way of life was a way of serving God and not the ephemeral world or the devil. 209 His penitential clothing, made of heavy camel hair 210 and his penitential food (locust and forest honey), 211 emphasized John Baptist’s effort and the authenticity of his penance. 212 The appearance of John the Baptist is the harbinger of life – the Heavenly Kingdom, as opposed to the weakened world, all of which should encourage penance. 213


209 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 167, 2: “Poenitentiam agite. Poeniteat plane, poeniteat qui diuinis praetulit humana, qui seruire uluit mundo et dominationem mundi cum mundi domino non habere”: OSPC 3, 260; compare Mt 3:1–2.

210 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 167, 8: OSPC 3, 264.


7.5.7. The meaning of fasting

Fasting is a continuation of the work of Christ. By fasting, a Christian follows God’s example and by overcoming the weakness of hunger he overcomes the temptation of the devil and becomes a member of ‘the army of the kingdom of heaven’ and ‘the police of sacraments’. Fasting strengthens the believers in their road to God, that is why Chrysologus calls it “heavenly rock, the campus of God, the spiritual wall, the banner of faith, a symbol of purity, a trophy of holiness.” As an ascetic act, it is always directed against one’s faults and helps to eradicate them. Christian fasting is always a voluntary act not the result of a law. In God’s eyes as a voluntary act it has special value. It is therefore a spiritual effort supporting the ascetic in his coming to God. The severity of fasting

---

214 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 11, 5: OSPC 1, 114; compare Mt 4:2; Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 11, 2: OSPC 1, 112; compare Mt 4:2–3.
215 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 12, 7: OSPC 3, 123; compare Mt 17:21.
216 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 13, 2: “Qui ergo ista noluit audire, qui statuta regis nostri talia et tanta scire contemptis, iudicate si non ipse se exuit nostrae militiae sacramentis, et a caelesti contubernio reddidit et fecit extorrem”: OSPC 1, 124; to read more about military terms used by Chrysologus to refer to lack of spiritual struggle and fasting, which is equivalent to breaking the vow of ‘celestial army’ and excluding oneself from the ‘militia of sacraments’: F. J. Dölger, *“Militiae sacramenta” bei Petrus Chrysologus*, op. cit., p. 150–151.
217 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 12, 4: “ieiunium, fratres, scimus esse dei arcem, Christi castra, murum spiritus, uexillum fidei, castitatis signum, sanctitatis trophaeum”: OSPC 1, 120.
218 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 7 bis, 1–2: OSPC 1, 92; Chrysologus compares there the soothing effect of fasting to spring (which calms winter gusty weather) or to the helm, leading the human body to the right port. Compare Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 14, 4: OSPC 1, 132.
219 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 8, 3: OSPC 1, 96. In *Sermo* 8, 1: OSPC 1, 94, Chrysologus compares the hardship of fasting to the hard work of sailors.
220 Peter Chrysologus, *Sermo* 31, 2: “Quia penes uos est de lege, non de voluntate ieiunium. Ieiunium non ieunantem respicit, sed iubentem. Et quis uobis ieunii fructus est, qui ieunium ieunantis inuitum?”: OSPC 1, 234; compare Mt 9:14.
is not easy and thus can be compared to an internal fight aimed at a struggle against the temptations of the Devil,\textsuperscript{222} a struggle of farmers\textsuperscript{223} or hardworking sailors at rough sea aimed at overcoming the devious temptation of the Devil.\textsuperscript{224}

In order for fasting to bring the desired effect in the form of spiritual exoneration of the sinner and becoming closer to God, it should be combined with other virtues, first of all with mercy.\textsuperscript{225} Fasting without mercy is useless. Combined with alms it becomes more fruitful just like alms becomes sanctified by fasting.\textsuperscript{226} The basic values of Christian fasting are: lack of legalism and complete freedom at taking it up, sanctifying and strengthening the believer’s spirituality, eradicating vices, surfacing immorality, revealing vices, sowing the seeds of love, reviving generosity and strengthening innocence.\textsuperscript{227}

7.5.8. The benefits of fasting

Fasting elevates human aspirations and focuses him on God. According to Chrysologus, Elijah is a special example of a prophet who attained ascension in this way.\textsuperscript{228} Abstinence from food causes strengthens and purifies one spiritually. By eradicating vices, calming the senses, purification and by getting rid of vices it leads the ascetic to spiritual exoneration.\textsuperscript{229} Fasting prepares the body of the believer for the articles of faith. It is par-

\textsuperscript{222} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 12, 1–3: OSPC 1, 118; compare 1 P 5, 8.
\textsuperscript{223} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 7, 5–6: OSPC 1, 88.
\textsuperscript{224} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 8, 1: OSPC 1, 94.
\textsuperscript{225} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 8, 4: OSPC 1, 96; To read about the social aspect of fasting see: M. Spinelli, \textit{Il ruolo sociale del digiuno in Pier Crisologo}, “Vetera Christianorum” 18 (1981), p. 143–156.
\textsuperscript{226} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 8, 2: OSPC 1, 94.
\textsuperscript{227} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 31, 3: OSPC 1, 234.
\textsuperscript{228} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 2, 1: OSPC 1, 54; compare 1 Kings 19:8–14; 2 Kings 2:1–11.
\textsuperscript{229} Peter Chrysologus, \textit{Sermo} 7 bis, 1: “scire debemus quia quo corporibus humanis nitrum praestat, hoc ieiunium conferunt mentibus christianis, sensuum sordes mundat, delicta lauat animorum, diluit cordis crimina, maculas cordis tollit, et ad candorem castitatis hominem totum miro splendore perducit”: OSPC 1, 92. Chrysologus also discusses the cleansing effect of fasting in \textit{Sermo} 166, 3: OSPC 3, 254.
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particularly recommended when learning about the Symbol of the Apostles. Singing Psalms, as the Bishop of Ravenna recommends is a reliable method of bearing the hardships of Lent. The “heavenly melody calms and eases the burden of abstinence.”

7.5.9. Threats for those who fast

One of the main abnormalities of fasting is hypocrisy when the person only pretends to have the right religious stand and by doing this wastes the credit for the sacrifice and “destroys the fasting by fasting.” Lack of mercy is another negative feature as “lack of mercy is an opportunity for greed and not a proposal of self-restraint.” Losing weight is not a penitential act when refraining from food or drink is not connected with acts of mercy, on the contrary leads to gaining wealth. Such practices are a sign of a superficial personality and only try to give the appearance of virtue. Chrysologus also reminds us of Christ’s recommendation of avoiding ostentation in religious conduct and not showing sadness. He called for common sense in fasting, following Christ’s guidelines of the Gospel and avoiding extremes – both rigorism and liberalism. If someone cannot fast he can offer alms to the poor instead: […] Where does the custom of irregular fasting come from, which either torments without offering forgiveness or leaves time for gluttony and drunkenness.

---

230 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 60, 2: OSPC 1, 402. In F. Sottocornola’s opinion, the fact that Chrysologus stressed the importance of fasting in Sermo 60, proves that he delivered Sermi 55–62 bis at the end of Lent.

231 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 10, 1: “sic nos fratrem, Quadragesimae ieiunio cantica diuina iungamus, ut abstinentiae pondus celestis temperet et subleuet symphonia”: OSPC 1, 106.

232 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 1: “Hypocrisis secura simulat, fallit prospera, curiosa mentitur, et crudely arte uirtutes truncat mucrone uirtutum; ieiunium ieiunio perimit”: OSPC 1, 86.

233 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 8, 3: “sine pietate ieiunium occasio est avaritiae, non est propositum parcitatis”: OSPC 1, 96.

234 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 8, 3. Chrysologus used Vetus Itala, compare the Vulgate, Ps 84:11: “misericordia et veritas occurrerunt”; Mt 6:16.

235 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 7, 4: OSPC 1, 88; compare Mt 6:17–18.

236 Peter Chrysologus, Sermo 166, 9: “Si ergo quadragesinta diernum simplex, purum, aequale, tantis testimoniis, sub tanti numero sacramenti traditum, nobis a dominio ieiunium perdocetur, unde ista uarietas, unde nouitas ista, unde ebdomadae nunc resolutae, nunc rigidae,
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What is interesting Salvian does not have a complex concept of fasting. The author only mentions a general need for physical mortification and sacrifice connected with fasting necessary to sanctify not through human strength but through divine grace. For this reason, the body of the ascetic is weak but the holy ghost is strong and sacred.237

7.6. Summary

Repentance
Both authors suggest different theological views. For Saint Peter Chryso-logus, repentance is an internal transformation which is expressed in the acceptance of God’s rules, for the soul to control the lust of the body and to reject the norms of the outside world and the temptations of the devil. The spirituality of the body takes place gradually by directing the mind to the Gospel.

---

Chrysologus’ spirituality of repentance has its equivalent in Salvian's spirituality of compensation. Salvian perceives man first of all from the perspective of sin, therefore he expresses his view on compensation, reparation for wrongdoings and penance rather than repentance. What is important in case of spirituality expressed in this way, is the way we free ourselves from sinfulness and good deeds. What is characteristic of repentance in case of Chrysologus, is a wider theological perspective. Repentance means all man’s control and the transformation is not limited to penitential actions as is the case in Salvian’s opinion.

In case of both authors, human dignity results from the fact that man is God’s creature. Chrysologus presents a dynamic vision of human dignity, from the moment of man’s creation and his existence, through his loss of dignity in sin and the regaining of dignity though baptism and finally through his complete transformation after the end of the world, in Heaven. Salvian didactically concentrates on man’s dignity according to the quality of life after baptism.

The authors stress different things in relation to religious conscience. According to Chrysologus, this depends on proper religious cognition, directed at God, but also on knowledge and man’s religious zealfulness. Salvian omits the subject of religious cognition but stresses the importance of responsibility which each Christian should submit to the authority of God. Thus, in the opinion of Chrysologus, man’s religiousness comes from his knowledge and religious zealfulness, whereas, in case of Salvian religiousness comes from responsibility in fulfilling laws resulting from being Christian.

Penance
Both authors express their view on penance, not in the sacramental meaning but as a spiritual attitude characteristic of all responsible Christians. However, the opinions of clergymen vary. For Chrysologus, penance is an internal act, expressed as a return to God, perceived as a Father. The moment of undertaking penance is instant and clear but the process of purification through God’s mercy, is gradual. Penance is also the grace of forgiveness and the closeness of God, the result of which is an internal transformation. For Salvian, penance is first of all compensation for sins,
which should be proportional to the sins committed. As man is unable to impose proper compensation, the most important thing is a change of heart in the form of mercy towards his neighbours. From Salvian’s point of view, penance is man’s struggle against adversities by making his thoughts and wishes unanimous with God’s wishes.

In the opinion of Chrysologus, penance clearly refers to God’s mercy on God’s side and the concept of the sinner-son returning God-Father on the sinner’s side. Whereas, Salvian did not express his view on the role of God in the process of penance, nor did he mention the sanctifying role of mercy. Instead, he stressed the human element in penance, proportional to the sins committed, which is done in the form of mercy towards other people.

**Monasticism**

For Chrysologus, this is a marginal topic. He does not pay too much attention to it. Whereas, Salvian mentions monastic life from historical point of view and organized Church asceticism. The motivation behind it, is the wish to serve God with religious zealousness. In his opinion, monasticism means offering your entire life to God until death, according to the norms of organized penance making the sacrifice is to do penance for one’s individual sins and to show people their goal, that is Heavenly Kingdom. But for Salvian, the crowning achievement of asceticism is active mercy.

**Spirituality and religious deeds**

In the works of Chrysologus, one can notice an outline of spirituality of trust in God through thought, internal repentance, withdrawal from temptations and lust and gradually gaining virtues. Salvian of Marseilles presents a vision of spirituality of services and gaining Heaven through individual holiness. The Christian should prove his faith by fulfilling virtues by doing so, cooperate with God, who supports people in their striving for Heaven.

The description of the different types of spirituality agrees with the system of terms both authors use. They represent a Biblical form of piety. The basic deeds of religious people are prayer, fasting and mercy. For Chrysologus, for whom prayer is an internal bond with God, expressed in an individual form, as well as, common prayer, the culminating point being the Holy Communion. When discussing prayer, Salvian concentrates
mainly on the individual aspect as in his opinion this is proof of man's trust for God. Issues connected with fasting are mainly undertaken by Chrysologus. Salvian only mentions the need for fasting, as a form of abstinence and is a form of control of the body by the spirit and man himself by God. Thus, Chrysologus’ teaching on fasting is no doubt more thorough. According to the Bishop of Ravenna, fasting is a spiritual behavior, mortifying the body should make the sinner subordinate to God. Fasting should be linked with mercy and treated as a form of spiritual transformation, deserving God’s praise. Chrysologus accentuates the complimentary character of religious deeds, which deepen man’s faith. But the forty day fasting known as Lent is a religious practice resulting from imitating Jesus Christ himself (Mt 4:2). In the opinion of Chrysologus, fasting undertaken by Christians is a continuation of the work of Christ. This is a form of asceticism which by overcoming the weakness of hunger, allows to surmount the weaknesses of one’s body and to resist the devil. Thus, the benefits of fasting include the sublimation of man’s aspirations and directing them to God. The main obstacle connected with fasting is human hypocrisy, lack of common sense in practicing fasting and lack of mercy.
Conclusion

The pastoral remedies proposed by these two authors under study were attempts at adopting the demands of the Gospel to the world of both the Romans and Germanic Barbarians. Regardless of the particular pastoral approaches proposed in the Fifth Century by St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian, an analysis of their ways of thought and the Evangelical solutions they proposed may help today’s Christians in their involvement in the life of the Church. St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles, both left an overview of their pastoral teachings in their works, particularly representative of the Western Church in the Fifth Century. They did not engage in a systematic study of theology in their works, yet they tried to educate Christians according to the theological, pastoral and ascetical spirit of the Bible. Both authors originated from the Western part of the Roman Empire. The conducted their pastoral work in the urbanized and Christianized areas of the Empire. They both lived and worked in the same epoch: Peter Chrysologus (ca. 380 – ca. 450), Salvian of Marseilles (ca. 390 – ca. 470), both were significant figures for their contemporaries, and through their writings both influenced the following generations. Both of them studied rhetoric and were both lawyers as well. As theologians they often consulted the Bible. Chrysologus in the exegesis of the Holy Scripture often resorted to allegory, while Salvian often preferred a more literal exegesis and moral interpretation of these texts. The language of both these authors was abundant in
rhetorical devices and often characterized itself with use of maxims. These two authors differed significantly in their individual perception of the Bible and in the style of their preaching. Although both of these authors worked as pastors, Chrysologus as Bishop of Ravenna preached the Word of God more formally in the form of sermons, while Salvian was a priest and ascetic who invoked the faithful in his writing to a more radical imitation of Christ.

A comparison of the writings of the two authors

The similarities in their thoughts

By undertaking a descriptive analysis of the Christian communities in the Fifth Century, the authors did not propose any essential structural changes, rather their observations of the events that took place lead them to an evaluation of these phenomena from a religious perspective. They both had the same diagnosis when it came to the overall and general appraisal of the situation. Both of these authors observed that the weakening of the Christian faith was indirectly caused by the structure of the society at that time and by other external factors (social rebellions and wars). The persistence of the faithful to remain in the state of sin is in the opinion of these two authors, what led to the further escalation of sinfulness. Both of these authors attempted at preventing the proliferation of negative social phenomena through the preaching of the need to conversion to the Gospel.

Both of these authors observed that common weaknesses were present amongst believers such as infidelity to God and life in the state of sin. Both tried to remind and encourage the faithful to convert to a life according to the Divine precepts. For both of these pastors, heresy destroyed the unity of the Church.

Both of these authors also recognized that the cause of disbelief is the refusal to accept the authority of God, which eventually led to idolatry while that which is the root of evil in man is avarice. A common teaching present in the writings of these two authors is the need to practice a life of virtue which should in turn be grounded on the faith, and the fact that virtue should always lead to a disposition of mercifulness.
Conclusion

Both of these authors examined the right to ownership only in its religious context. Both considered wealth as the greatest threat, because both of them believed that wealth easily led to avarice and the disorderly use of material goods. Almsgiving was perceived by both authors only in its religious sense.

Human dignity, according to these two authors, is based on the fact that man was created by God. Penitence did not possess any sacramental character, according to these two authors, but was considered as the basis that characterized responsible Christians. Good works, was seen in accordance with the biblical triad: prayer, fasting and mercifulness.

The difference in the writings of St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles

Salvian of Marseilles, deals with the problem of barbarians rather extensively, while on the contrary this aspect is not present in St. Peter Chrysologus’s works. Chrysologus observes that the basic pastoral problem consisted in the falsity of conversions to Catholicism, while Salvian deals with the evils arising from the sins of Roman communities.

St. Peter Chrysologus widely describes and emphasizes the universality of the faith which leads man to salvation in God. Salvian’s approach to the problems of the Church was characterized by an ecclesiology which was moralizing, catechetical and ascetical in nature. Heresy, according to Chrysologus, resulted from a the founding of faith in more rational philosophy and from the imperfection of human reason. For Salvian, heresy was caused by erroneous translations of the Bible and imperfections in education.

The teachings on sin and the consequent study of man related to it: the anthropology of Chrysologus was the anthropology of the salvation of man in God and the continual willingness of God to provide for the salvation of man. Salvian’s understanding, in this respect, is more didactic and ascetical. It tends to concentrate on personal sin and the related punishment caused by sin.

Chrysologus in his teachings on virtues concentrates on the good works which facilitate the faith, he likewise concentrates on those human acts
which weaken the faith as well. Salvian, on the other hand, possessed a juridical vision of the faith, which was confirmed by practice of good works and the fulfilling of the commandments.

Chrysologus derives the right to ownership from its biblical sense, in which matter was conceived as created by God *ex nihilo*, it was temporal and clearly limited. For this reason, the believer’s only imperishable good is God and heavenly goods. Salvian recognizes the divine origin of all goods, thus defining their purpose, possessions have to be entrusted to God, and one has to conduct himself with mercy in the administration of these material goods.

For Chrysologus, the use of material goods have to be governed in accordance to the dictates of mercy and morality. For Salvian, on the other hand, while wealth itself is morally neutral, the accumulation of wealth can procure Divine merit if wealth becomes an opportunity towards generosity to the poor.

Almsgiving for Chrysologus is the extension of the virtue of mercy, while for Salvian it is an obligation which is a consequence of Christ’s teaching on the need to do acts of mercy towards others.

Conversion was for Chrysologus an interior change of heart, which led to a life inspired by Divine precepts. For Salvian, the spirituality of conversion is seen in the perspective of sin, that is why he speaks of the need to justification, penitence and the reparation of evil.

Chrysologus in speaking of religiosity itself claims that it is a consequence of knowledge and religious zeal, while according to Salvian, religiosity is the effect of man’s sense of responsibility in keeping religious laws and precepts.

Penitence for Chrysologus is an interior attitude, expressed in the man’s aspiring for a return to God, while Salvian maintains that this is the human activeness understood as the struggle against difficulties and the seeking of the capacity of human thoughts and desires to fulfill the will of God.

Chrysologus possessed a spirituality defined by the trust and confidence in God in one’s thoughts, and the interior conversion and rejection of all temptation and the acquisition of virtues. Salvian presents a spirituality of merits and the seeking of heaven through personal sanctity.
Conclusion

Other writings

For Chrysologus, marriage is a natural and Divine institution, while Salvian treated the question of matrimony marginally and proposed the need to spiritualize marriage. The aim of the pastoral work of the Church was defined only by Chrysologus (the Church faithfull’s attempt at seeking salvation in Christ). The essential teachings of the Church was dealt by Chrysologus alone.

It is particular of Chrysologus to deal with the teachings on original sin, the evil of sin, the necessity of Divine grace and the consequence of penitence. However, it was only Salvian who talks of the Divine pedagogy of punishment and mercy towards sinners.

An overall description of virtues can be found only in Chrysologus’s works, where virtues are perceived as gifts which facilitates getting nearer to God.

With respect to penitence, Chrysologus clearly refers to the workings of Divine grace; this aspect is not dealt with in Salvian’s works, although he clearly accentuates the concreteness of human penitential acts and the fullness of reparation for one’s sins realized in acts of mercy towards others.

Monasticism is a teaching solely dealt with by Salvian, while Chrysologus is the only one of the two authors who deals with the building of a Catechesis on Christian fasting.

The value of these teachings today

One aspect of the teachings of these two authors which is of particular importance today is the question of the half-heartedness of conversions; the continual recognition and single-minded struggle against structures of sin; the elimination of immoral state legislation with respect to financial obligations and inappropriate legal relations and the execution of penal law with respect to all citizens.

The question of the universality of the faith which leads man to salvation in God, is an aspect continually emphasized by Chrysologus. Chryso-
logus likewise underlines the basic cause of the turning away from God: infidelity to God and life in sin.

The Chrysologian anthropology of the salvation of man in God and the teaching of God’s continuing willingness to save man. The emphasizing of the fact that the cause of lack of faith is the rejection of the authority of God, which eventually leads to idolatry. The prevention of avarice by the proper use of earthly riches (Chrysologus) and the rejection of temptations of disorderly desires for wealth according to basic principle that one should possess that which is truly necessary (Salvian).

The Biblical understanding of matter as something created, temporal and limited. The principle of the orderly use of wealth according to the principles of mercy and morality.

The spirituality of conversion understood as the interior disposition expressed in man’s seeking and return to God, who embraces the entirety of all human powers. The understanding of penitence as the cooperation of man with Divine grace.

The comparison and similarities of the teachings of these two authors, other teachings and chosen works of St. Peter Chrysologus and Salvian of Marseilles prove that at least in a more general view, these two pastors share the same convictions. The differences evident from the distinct styles in preaching the Gospel arises from the varied education which shaped the ecclesiastical mentality of these two pastors to the manner of preaching the Gospel, one who is a bishop-pastor and the other, who is a priest-ascetic.

The theological perspective is more universal rather than moralizing and radical as in the case of the priest-ascetic. It seems that part of the teachings of the authors discussed may be used in today’s pastoral work.

Some of the specific problems were ignored as being lesser essential to the overall problem discussed in this dissertation. Other investigations should deal with the analysis of the legal problems discussed by Chrysologus and Salvian (the meaning of law, the fulfilling of the law, the virtue of righteousness, the difference between the Divine Law and natural law, revealed law in the Old and New Testament and the fulfilling of the law in cases of immoral societies). In further studies, an essential problem could be the general understanding of the problem of pastoral work.
Conclusion

in the Fifth Century according to a much wider list of authors of the antiquity, as represented by the Church territories of those times.

Both pastors of the Fifth century presented, within the framework of one faith, different pastoral models, regardless of the differences presented above, this was a pastoral work that was evangelical, committed and crucial in creating a community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA. VV.</td>
<td><em>autori vari</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td><em>Acta Apostolicae Sedis</em>, Roma 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td><em>Antologia modlitwy patrystycznej</em>, tłum. i oprac. M. i H. Wójtowicz, wstęp P. Gołębiowski, przedmowa J. Szymusiak, Sandomierz 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnCra</td>
<td><em>Analecta Cracoviensia</em>, Kraków 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td><em>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</em>, Berlin–New York 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>A. Bober, <em>Antologia patrystyczna</em>, Kraków 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td><em>Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos</em>, Madrid 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaise-Chirat</td>
<td><em>Dictionnaire latin-française des auteurs chrétiens</em>, éds. A. Blaise., H. Chirat Strasbourg 1954¹, Turnhout 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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