The Journal of Theological Studies

JULY, 1910

ORDINATION AND MATRIMONY IN THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH. II.

II. THE EPISCOPATE IN RELATION TO MARRIAGE.

THE general principles which governed the relations between the sacred ministry and marriage, according to which in the East family life was consistent with the clerical status, continued for some centuries to be applicable, from a canonical point of view, to the highest order as well. That bishops in the oldest times of Christianity were not inevitably required to be single is unquestionable.

In the first place St Paul, as has previously been explained, required that a bishop should be husband of one wife, and nowhere mentions that he ought, after consecration, to cease to cohabit with his wife. Of course he did not exclude those who were unmarried; for if in general he gives a noticeable preference to the single life,¹ how much more might he be expected to apply this to ministers of the Church. In fact St Paul himself remained single, in conformity with his own teaching. Timothy, Titus, and many others led a single life, but voluntarily. So tradition appears to have rightly glossed St Paul's thought in the *Epitome* or *Apostolic Church Order*, where it is stated in regard to a bishop: *Καλὸν μὲν εἶναι ἀγνῡναιος, εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀπὸ μιᾶς γυναικός.*² The Apostle himself did not lay much stress on the mere question whether a candidate for episcopate was or was not married, provided that he satisfied the prescriptions laid down in his epistles.

There were sufficient reasons for the view that single life could not be required of candidates for the priesthood. The morals of Roman society were so depraved that most young men,

¹ 1 Cor. vii 32, 33.

² *Apost. Church Order* 16.

especially in the higher classes, avoided marriage in order to give a loose rein to their passions. This state of affairs was not unnoticed by the civil authorities, and laws had often been promulgated inflicting penalties on unmarried persons.¹ Hence it seems improbable that the Church at that time would have imposed the obligation of celibacy on her ministers, and so submitted them to the disadvantages of the civil statutes in question. Moreover the Church, being then at the beginning of her growth and propagation, required such freedom. To demand celibacy would probably have made it difficult for the Church, as Theodoret explains, to secure a sufficient number of persons for her service.²

Meanwhile St Paul, whether for these or for other reasons, freely allowed the ordination of married men and the right of cohabiting with their wives. The teaching of the Apostle was not forgotten, and it was used by St Clement of Alexandria in support of the practice of the Church, as an argument against the heretical views respecting marriage.³ And the Apostolical Canons in condemning the abhorrence of marriage and forbidding clerics to repudiate their wives include bishops amongst them.⁴

This did not cease to be the practice of the Church even when Christianity was openly recognized in the Roman Empire. The attempt made in the first Oecumenical Council to impose compulsory celibacy on the clergy concerned bishops as well as the rest. Certainly that proposal, while shewing the growth of ascetic feeling in the Church, proves at the same time that there were many clergymen, and among them bishops, who lived with their wives and begat children. And, as the historians inform us, practice remained unchanged. The ancient freedom of *all* orders to continue their married or unmarried life was not in the least restricted. The only enactment on the subject passed by the Nicene Council deals with some precautions concerning the life of unmarried clergymen.

Not less explicit is the testimony given by St Athanasius

¹ *Lex Iulic* and *Lex Papia Poppæa*.

² In 1 *Tim.* iii 'Ἀρχὴν εἶχε τὸ κήρυγμα, τὴν δὲ παρθενίαν οὔτε Ἕλληνες ἤσκηον, οὔτε Ἰουδαῖοι μετήρσαν· εὐλόγησαν γὰρ τὴν παιδοποιίαν ἐν νόμῳ. Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν κατ' ἐκείνους τὸν καιρὸν οὐχ οἶόν τε ἦν βρῆσαι εὐρεῖν τοὺς τὴν ἀγνείαν ἀσκούοντας, τῶν γεγενημένων τοὺς ἡν σαφροσύνην τετιμημένους κελεύει χειροτονεῖν.

³ *Strom.* iii 18. See above, p. 350.

⁴ *Apost. Canons* 5 and 51.

about thirty years after the Nicene Council. The abbot Dracontius was elected bishop, but refused to accept the bishopric, fearing lest the episcopal dignity should be a hindrance to the fulfilment of his ascetic duties. St Athanasius addressed a letter to Dracontius and endeavoured to remove his hesitation, saying among other things: *Μὴ λέγε, μηδὲ πείθου τοῖς λέγουσιν ἁμαρτίας εἶναι πρόφασιν τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν, μηδὲ ὅτι ἐκ ταύτης ἀφορμὴ τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐστίν. Ἐξεστί γὰρ καὶ ἐπίσκοπον ὄντα σε πεινῶν καὶ διψῶν, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος· δύνασαι μὴ πιεῖν οἶνον, ὡς ὁ Τιμόθεος, καὶ νηστεύειν καὶ αὐτὸς συνεχῶς, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος ἐποίει . . . Μὴ οὖν ταῦτα προβαλλέτωσαν οἱ συμβουλευόντές σοι. Οἶδαμεν γὰρ καὶ ἐπισκόπους νηστεύοντας, καὶ μοναχοὺς ἐσθίουσας. Οἶδαμεν καὶ ἐπισκόπους μὴ πίνοντας οἶνον, μοναχοὺς δὲ πίνοντας. Οἶδαμεν καὶ σημεῖα ποιοῦντας ἐπισκόπους, μοναχοὺς δὲ μὴ ποιοῦντας· πολλοὶ δὲ ἐπισκόπων οὐδὲ γεγαμήκασιν, μοναχοὶ δὲ πατέρες τέκνων γεγόνασιν· ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπισκόπους πατέρας τέκνων, καὶ μοναχοὺς ἐξ ὁλοκλήρου γένους τυγχάνοντας.*¹

The interest of this passage for us lies in the statement of St Athanasius that he knew of many bishops who had never been married, and monks who had been fathers of children; and on the other hand he knew of bishops begetting children and monks having no posterity. This evidence of St Athanasius has been misconceived. It has been contended that the children of bishops here mentioned must have been born before their fathers' consecration, since the bishops are paralleled with monks, who were fathers of children.²

This contention, however, is unnecessary and unconvincing. Though lifelong celibacy was supposed to be one of the conditions of the monastic life, yet, until the time of St Basil, it was undertaken tacitly without any formal vow³; and apart from this, it is known that some monks could not endure the strictness of solitary life and did not always remain loyal to their profession. Thus transgressions of the monastic discipline occurred even in this period, as may be inferred from the writings of St Basil.⁴ It is no doubt to this monastic relaxation that St Athanasius refers when he says that he knows of monks not fasting, drinking

¹ *Epist. ad Dracont.* 9 (Migne P. G. xxv c. 532).

² Thomassinus *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Disciplina* I i 43 § 21.

³ St Basil *Can.* 19.

⁴ St Basil *Can.* 19 and 60: *Εἵρ.* xlv and xlv.

wine, and becoming fathers of children. On the other hand, if he really has in view the private life of men before they became bishops or monks, we cannot see what this would contribute to the purpose of his argument. He desires to illustrate by examples that it is possible for Dracontius to lead as a bishop the same life as he had hitherto led as a monk. And the parallel drawn between bishops and monks aims simply at pointing out the fact that virtues may be found in the ranks of bishops and deficiencies among ascetics, and that holiness of life is not the privilege of monks, but, as he says, Παιταχοῦ τις ἀγωνιζέσθω· καὶ γὰρ ὁ στέφανος οὐ κατὰ τόπον, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν ἀποδίδοται.

Besides the evidence already cited, several examples of married bishops have been adduced in defence of the contention that until after the fourth century it was not required that bishops should abstain from their wives.¹

It should, however, be remarked that almost all these examples, owing to the lack of sufficient evidence, are of little or no value. It cannot be denied that continence was considered a useful discipline in the Church, and it has accordingly been assumed that, though married, the clergy did not cohabit with their wives after ordination. It is therefore hazardous to lay stress on the mere mention in writers or canons of the name of a bishop's wife or of his children, without any further confirmation.

We must not pass over two examples, which have frequently been cited as proof that bishops were allowed in this period to continue their family life. The first is that of St Gregory the Elder, the second that of Synesius of Cyrene.

As to the former, an examination of the authorities makes it clear that, though Gregory might, without any reproach, have begotten children even after his elevation to the episcopate, yet chronological facts do not allow us to accept the belief that his

¹ As married bishops are mentioned—Marcion's father (Epiph. *Hær.* xlii 1); Chaeremon, bishop of Nilus (Euseb. *H. E.* vi 42); Demetrianus of Antioch (*ibid.* vii 30); Phileas of Thmuis (*ibid.* vii 9); Philogonius of Antioch (Chrys. *de Beato Philog.* in Migne *P. G.* xlviii c. 751); St Spyridon of Trimithus in Cyprus (Socr. *H. E.* i 12); Eulalius of Caesarea in Cappadocia (Socr. *H. E.* iii 43); Hilary of Poitiers (*Epist. ad Abram filiam suam* in Migne *P. L.* x 549); Gregory of Nyssa (Greg. Naz. *Ep.* cxvii); Gregory the Elder (*ibid.* ἐπιστολὴ, &c.); six bishops whose wives are cited by Palladius *Vita Chrysost.* (Migne *P. G.* xlvii 51); Synesius of Cyrene (*Ep.* cv). Cf. Apost. Canons 38 and 40; Carthag. Canons 15, 21, 35.

eldest son, Gregory the Theologian, was born after his father's consecration.¹ With regard to Caesarius all we know is that he was the second son, and this means that he was born after his father's ordination, but it does not follow that he was born during his father's episcopate.

Concerning the bishop of Ptolemais, Synesius, it should be noted that it has been hastily assumed that he continued to live

¹ Gregory the Theologian tells us that he was about thirty years of age at the time when St Basil left Athens for Cappadocia (*Carm. xi de vita sua* 511). It is known that Basil quitted Athens in 355, after Julian's departure in October. It follows that St Gregory was born in 325 or rather early in 326. Again he tells us that his father, Gregory the Elder, was baptized in the presence of some bishops (among them Leontius of Caesarea), who were then on their way to the Council of Nicaea (*Oratio xviii* 12 : Migne *P. G.* xxxv 1000), and that the priesthood was conferred on him not immediately after his baptism, as was frequently the case at that period, but after a short period had elapsed (*ibid.* c. 1004 : cp. Nicene Canon 2). Therefore Gregory the Elder's ordination may be placed at the end of 325 or at the beginning of 326. Now the dates of the father's ordination and the son's birth come so close together that it is not easy to say precisely whether St Gregory was born before or after his father's ordination. The question turns on what meaning is given to the following verses of St Gregory :—

Οὐκ ὡς τοσούτον ἐκμεμέτρηκας βίον

ὅσος διήλθε θυσιῶν ἐμὸν χρόνος (*Carm. xi de vita sua* 512).

It is not strange that this passage has been the subject of much controversy (*Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* ii p. 742). Though the explanation, that the Elder's meaning is that his son's lifetime has not been so long as his own priesthood, is not in itself untenable ; yet a closer examination of the context inclines one rather to the view of those who render the passage thus : 'Have you not calculated my long life—how many years I have spent offering sacrifice !' ; understanding that Gregory, in trying to persuade his son to become his coadjutor, lays stress only on his advanced age and on the long time he has been working as priest and bishop, without any allusion to the age of his son.

If, however, St Gregory's birth can be fixed in 325 or 326, it becomes certain that he was born at any rate before his father's consecration. It is quite clear that the elevation to the episcopate of Gregory the Elder did not follow immediately after his ordination. Gregory Nazianzen says that the Church over which his father was placed as bishop had been for a long time neglected, owing to the loss of its leader (*Or. xviii* 16), while on the other hand it is known that he succeeded the bishop who had baptized him (*ibid.* 13).

Meanwhile, apart from these inferences, there is clear evidence for the date of Gregory the Elder's consecration. It is known that he lived about a hundred years, forty-five of which he spent in the episcopate (*ibid.* 38). Consequently, as his death is placed in the spring of 374 (Migne *P. G.* xxxv c. 1000), he must have been consecrated bishop in the year 329.

Hence it is evident that a period of about three years intervened between the ordination and the consecration, and we must conclude that St Gregory may have been born either before or after his father's ordination (and in the latter case not very long after), but before his consecration.

conjugally with his wife after his consecration. In fact, when he was elected bishop of Ptolemais (409), he writes to his brother, and, among other difficulties, expresses the fear that, being a married man, his advancement to the episcopate might cause separation from his wife; but he declares that he will not consent to this, since he wishes to have a large number of virtuous children.¹ Nevertheless it is doubtful whether Synesius adhered to his intention of retaining his wife; and at least there is no proof of it.

After the dispatch of the letter referred to, the philosopher went to Alexandria, where he spent more than seven months consulting the Patriarch Theophilus on the subject. Thus it has been presumed that the Patriarch, owing to the strong tendency of the age towards celibacy, may have exhorted and persuaded Synesius to conform to the rule of the Church by giving up his wife. This view is to a certain extent confirmed by the sense of desolation expressed in some letters of Synesius, written after his elevation to the episcopate,² and by the fact that no child was born to him after his consecration; for his three sons were all born during the five years before he became bishop.³

In spite of these and similar arguments the question still remains open, nor can it be easily settled. As Mr W. S. Crawford remarks in his elaborate book, *Synesius the Hellene*, after a detailed and careful consideration of the arguments advanced on both sides: 'Each student of our author's life must form his own conclusion from the facts of the case, and not from any *a priori* notions. For our own part we are content, or rather constrained, to remain uncertain' (p. 371). Moreover, even if we allow that Synesius was permitted to hold his philosophical theories and to retain his wife, the case is an exception, for which excuse may be found in the peculiar circumstances of the case.

¹ Synesius *Ep.* cv 'Ἐμοὶ ταγαροῦν δ' τε θεός, ὃ τε νόμος, ἥ τε ἱερὰ Θεοφίλου χεῖρ γυναικα ἐπιδέδωκε. Προσαγορεύω τοίνυν ἅπασι, καὶ μαρτύρομαι, ὡς ἐγὼ ταύτης οὐτε ἀλλοτριώσομαι καθάπαξ, οὔτε ὡς μοιχὸς αὐτῇ λάθρα συνέσομαι. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἥκιστα εἰσεβέει τὸ δὲ ἥκιστα νόμιμον. Ἀλλὰ βουλήσομαι τε καὶ εὐχομαι συχνά μοι πάντων καὶ χρηστὰ γενέσθαι παῖδιά.

² *Ep.* viii, lxxix, lviii, xciii, lxxxix, cxxvi, lxx, x, xvi.

³ T. R. Halcomb in *Dict. Chr. Biog.* s.v. 'Synesius'; J. C. Nicol *Synesius of Cyrene: his life and writings*, Cambridge 1887, p. 133. See also Miss Alice Gardner *Synesius of Cyrene*, London 1886, p. 53.

Thus the examples of Gregory the Elder and Synesius do not give much, if any, support to the supposition that bishops were allowed to lead family life. Indeed the 105th letter of Synesius indisputably proves that by the early part of the fifth century it was required of bishops, in some provinces, to separate from their wives and lead a celibate life; at least it was so in the provinces of Egypt.

Here the question naturally arises how this change came about, since it is known that no ecclesiastical law had yet been passed in the Eastern Church to enforce strict celibacy among bishops. The rule was certainly practised as a custom, and a very binding one, and was no doubt due to the influence which Monasticism had acquired over ecclesiastical opinion by that time. Without examining the questions which beset the origins of Christian Monasticism—questions in themselves beyond the present scope—it will be sufficient to point out that the monastic movement as it appeared in the fourth century could not but exert a great influence over public opinion. The ideal of self-denial, which found in monastic life its true realization, the unflagging efforts of the monks after the achievement of Christian morality and the protection of the doctrine of the Church, won for them the gradual growth of public admiration, as the only men entirely fulfilling the evangelical principles on earth. When in the year 338 St Antony went to Alexandria to preach against the Arians, crowds of people, both Christian and heathen, followed him, anxious to see 'the man of God'.¹ Μακαρία τοῶν ἡ Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλις ὑμᾶς ἔχουσα πρεσβευτάς, wrote Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, to the Egyptian monks.² No controversy arose in the Church in which monks did not take part with all their powers. Any attack on the dogmas of the Church met, on every side, with strong monastic opposition, and the definition of the doctrine of the Church bears the stamp of the monastic mind. They completely worsted the Arians and all the other heretics, so that Sozomen could write: Οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ ἐπισημοτάτην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἔδειξαν, καὶ τὸ δόγμα ἀνέσχον ταῖς ἀρεταῖς τοῦ βίου, οἱ τότε μετιόντες τὴν μοναστικὴν πολιτείαν.³

¹ St Athan. *Vita S. Antonii* 70 (Migne P. G. xxvi c. 941). Cf. Theodoret *H. E.* iv 24.

² *Epist. ad Monachos* (Migne P. G. xl c. 929).

³ Soz. *H. E.* i 12; cf. vi 27: Soz. *H. E.* vii 14. See also D. A. Petrakakes *Οἱ μοναχικοὶ θεσμοί*, Leipzig and Athens, 1907, p. 9.

Hence, when on the one hand the monastic movement was in the heyday of its growth, and on the other hand heretical doctrines threatened the existence of orthodoxy, the Church turned her attention to the citizens of the desert and drew from their ranks her highest ecclesiastical dignitaries. First the Church of Alexandria, owing to her situation, availed herself abundantly of the vigour of the monastic movement. St Athanasius in his letter to Dracontius mentions many bishops, who were summoned from their hermitages to occupy episcopal sees. They fulfilled, as he also remarks, the expectations of the Church, converted many from heathenism, and by their teaching brought true servants to the Gospel.¹

Theophilus, archbishop of Alexandria, walked in the path thus marked out. He elected seven or eight out of the one hundred and fifty disciples of the abbot Isaac, presbyter of the Scetic desert, and consecrated them bishops. Another abbot of the Nitrian desert, also named Isaac, was the head of two hundred and ten recluses, a great number of whom Theophilus (in 400) chose and made bishops, as Palladius, the biographer of St Chrysostom, relates.²

In Syria and Mesopotamia also, where Monasticism spread and increased rapidly, the untiring struggle of monks in behalf of the Church drew the attention and the general respect of the people, so that the episcopate was conferred on them *honoris causa*, as a recompense. They were consecrated bishops not of any special city, but in their own monasteries.³ Moreover the new system established by St Basil the Great, who founded institutions, adjoining the monasteries, where boys were carefully and religiously brought up in the study of the Scriptures and of different arts, formed an additional reason for the favour in which monastic life was held. Monasteries had already associated education with worship and devotion. This system was largely adopted everywhere, and really produced excellent men who combined scientific with moral training.

¹ St Ath. *Ep. ad Dracont.* 7.

² Migne *P. G.* xlvii c. 60.

³ Soz. *H. E.* vi 34 Βάρσης τε καὶ Εὐλόγιος, οἱ καὶ ἐπισκοπῶν ἀμφοῖν ὑστερον ἐγενέσθη, οὐ πόλει τινος, ἀλλὰ τιμῇ ἔνεκεν, ἀταμοιβῆς ὥσπερ τῶν αὐτοῖς πεπολιτευμένων, χειροτονηθέντες ἐν τοῖς ἰδίαις μοναστηρίοις ἐν τρόπῳ καὶ δόξῳ ὁ θηλασθεῖς.

The State itself, by a law promulgated by the emperors Arcadius and Honorius in July 398, exhorted bishops to ordain their clergy, when they have need of them, preferably from among the number of monks. Monks were considered more fit, as well-proved persons and free from public and private obligations.¹ Such indications of general reverence could not but have an influence on the discipline and life of the clergy with respect to marriage. The splendour of the monastic clergy gradually overshadowed the secular clergy, and in some places the prevalent opinion inclined, if not to the celibacy, at least to the strict continence, of all grades of clergy. St Epiphanius's statement is an illustration of this practice,² and though he confesses that subdeacons, deacons, and priests in some churches begat children after ordination, the use of marriage on the part of bishops was out of the question.

Although no law whatever existed binding them to abstain from conjugal relations, yet custom had almost assumed the force of law. It seems that continence was by this time considered an essential condition for the highest order of the church, the transgression of which met with censure. Hence Eusebius, bishop of Valentinianopolis, had no scruple in bringing against Antoninus of Ephesus (400) before the Synod of Constantinople the charge, among others, that ἀποταξάμενος τῆς οἰκείας γαμετῆς, πάλιν αὐτῇ συνῆλθε καὶ ἐπαιδοποίησεν ἐξ αὐτῆς.³

In the fifth century the historian Socrates says that celibacy, though only as a custom, was observed by the clergy with great strictness in Thessaly, Macedonia, and Hellas; remarking that in the East also continence was practised, but only of free will, for many bishops had begotten children from their lawful wives during their episcopate.⁴

This testimony with regard to bishops, and the question concerning priests and deacons which has been previously dealt with, shews that in the Eastern Church traditions of ecclesiastical antiquity are more faithfully adhered to and that ascetic tendencies

¹ *Cod. Theod.* xvi 2 § 32 'Si quos forte episcopi deesse sibi clericos arbitrantur, ex monachorum numero rectius ordinabunt, non obnoxios publicis privatisque rationibus cum invidia teneant, sed habeant iam probatos'.

² *Exposit. fidei* 21: *adv. Haer.* lix 4.

³ Palladius *Vita Chrysost.* 13 (Migne *P. G.* xlvii c. 48).

⁴ See above, p. 359.

introduced by Monasticism could not rob all the grades of the clergy of the ancient freedom of choice between the married and unmarried life. Though, however, priests had not as a general rule, and the inferior orders never, if married before Ordination, subsequently discontinued that relation, it must be observed that the episcopate could not long resist the strong current of feeling in favour of celibacy, and finally, as we shall see, yielded to its influence.

The honour and admiration in which celibacy was held certainly increased as time went on. The great examples of the fathers and doctors of the Church—Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, and the rest—were a sufficient security for the preference of single men for the episcopate. With the high estimate of celibacy for its own sake, other reasons as well seem to have concurred, so that the mere custom of elevating celibates to the episcopate was soon invested with the validity of a civil law.

It is known that the management of Church finances has always been one of the bishop's duties, and in the exercise of this function it is probable that some cases occurred,¹ which indicated that a family life was a stumbling-block to bishops in watching over the spiritual and material interests of the Church. Therefore Justinian with his great care for ecclesiastical affairs promulgated laws concerning the election of bishops. The first constitution issued on the matter (528) prescribes that only those should be elected bishops who have no children or descendants, on the ground that family cares ought not to divert a bishop from the proper discharging of his ecclesiastical duties, and in order that donations made to the Church for pious purposes might not be spent on their children and relations.² Three years later it was enacted that no one should be consecrated bishop who lives with his wife or is father of children; but that, instead

¹ Pallad. *Vita Chrys.* 13 (Migne P. G. xlvii c. 48).

² Justinian *Const.* I iii 41 (42) Τινῶν γὰρ διὰ τὴν εἰς Θεὸν ἐλπίδα καὶ διὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν περισώσαι ψυχὰς προστρέχοντων ταῖς ἀγιοτάταις ἐκκλησίαις καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῖς ταύταις προσφερόντων καὶ καταλιπαρόντων ἐπὶ τῷ εἰς πτωχοὺς καὶ πένητας καὶ ἐτέρας εὐσεβεῖς ταύτας δαπανᾶσθαι χρήας, ἀποπόν ἔστι τοὺς ἐπισκόπους εἰς οἰκεῖον ταῦτα ἀποφείσθαι κέρδος ἢ περὶ τὰ ἴδια τέκνα καὶ συγγενεῖς καταναλλίσκειν. Χρὴ γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον μὴ ἐμποδίζομενον προστελεῖν σαρκικῶν τέκνων πάντων τῶν πιστῶν πνευματικῶν εἶναι πατέρα· διὰ ταῦτα τοῖνυν ἀπαγορεύομεν τὸν ἔχοντα τέκνα ἢ ἐγγόνους χειροτονεῖσθαι ἐπίσκοπον.

of a wife, he should adhere firmly to the Church, and instead of children should have all the Christian flock.¹ This is the first imperial law, which requires the separation from his wife as one of the conditions for the election of a bishop. Some bishops may have been living with their wives at that time, but the law did not interfere with them. Their example probably became an excuse for some deviations. And therefore Justinian felt it necessary to issue another law in 535 on the same subject. He stated that his first law did not refer to those who were already bishops, but only to future candidates, who, adds the Novel, should be either monks or clerics of not less than six months' standing, having no wife, children, or posterity. The observance of the law was rigidly exacted, and transgression rendered the consecrated and the consecrator alike liable to deposition.² Likewise the Novel of the year 546, prescribing the mode of the election and the qualifications of a bishop, repeated the demand that the candidate should have neither wife nor children.³

It need hardly be said that both the letter and the spirit of all the laws in question shew that Justinian's intention was rather to secure the due discharge of the episcopal duties and to protect the financial interests of the Church than to consider whether the married or the unmarried state in itself is consistent or not with the discipline of the Church. At any rate, although civil laws again and again commanded that only those should be eligible for the episcopate who did not live with their wives, yet the previous custom and mode of life could not easily be uprooted everywhere.

¹ Ib. 47 (48) Θεοσπίζομεν μηδένα εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν προχειρίζεσθαι, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τὰ τε ἄλλα χρηστὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς εἴη καὶ μήτε γυναῖκα συνοικεῖν μήτε παῖδας εἴη πατήρ, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ μὲν γυναῖκα προσκαρτεροῖ τῇ ἀγιατάτῃ Ἑκκλησίᾳ, ἀντὶ δὲ παίδων ἅπαντα τὸν χριστιανικὸν καὶ ὁρθόδοξον ἔχει λαόν.

² Justinian Nov. vi I Θεοσπίζομεν τοίνυν . . . ἥνικα τις εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἐπὶ χειροτονίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος ἀγατοῦ . . . πρότερον δὲ ἢ μοναχικὸν βίον ἀσκήσας ἢ ἐν κλήρῳ καταλεγόμενος οὐκ ἔλαττον μὴν ἔξ, γυναῖκα μὲντοι, καθάπερ εἰπόντες ἐφθήμεν, μὴ συν-οικῶν ἢ παῖδας ἢ ἐγγόνους ἔχων. Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντως ἐπὶ τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ζητοῦμεν, καθάπερ καὶ πρότερον δύο θέλαις ἡμῶν τοῦτο διατάξει νενομοθέτηται, καθ' ὅς τοις μὲν ἤδη συνοικούντας γυναῖκιν οὐ περιεργασάμεθα, τὸ παρῳχηκὸς ἅπαν ἀφέντες, τοῦ λοιποῦ δὲ ἐκ τῆς θέσεως τοῦ νόμου μηδεὶ συγχωροῦντες γαμετῇ ἔχοντι τοιαύτην ἐπιτιθέμεναι χειροτονίαν· ὅνπερ νόμον καὶ νῦν ἀναθεσόμεν, μήποτε, εἰ παρὰ ταῦτα γένηται, αὐτὸς τε ἐκείνοις τῆς ἱερωσύνης, τὸν χειροτονήσαντά τε ὁμοίως ἐκβληθῆναι ταύτης παρασκευάσειεν.

³ Justinian Nov. cxliiii I Θεοσπίζομεν τοίνυν δόκασι ἄν χρεῖα γένηται ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονῆναι . . . οὐδὲ γαμετῇ οὐδὲ παῖδας τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔχει.

So late as one hundred and fifty years after Justinian's legislation, instances of bishops leading a family life might still not infrequently be met with in some churches. Public opinion, however, no longer tolerated such a state of life; bishops living with their wives were a scandal and an offence to the people. This was the chief cause which urged the Council in Trullo to issue its 12th canon, condemning the practice of some bishops in Africa, Libya, and elsewhere, who were said to be living conjugally with their wives, and ordering their deposition, in case of future offence.¹

The fathers of the Council, however, were aware that such a demand was not entirely compatible with the scriptural freedom and the ancient discipline of the Church. They knew that examples of bishops, who either were celibates or abstained from their wives, existed in the primitive Church, but that these were cases of free-will, of optional practice, and not the result of an unconditional law. As a justifiable reason for the change the Council adduced the new demands of the time. No doubt the common judgement on this matter had changed in the course of time. While at an earlier date the separation of a bishop from his wife was an object of reproach and blame, in the seventh century on the contrary the continuation of a bishop's conjugal union had become a matter of offence in the eyes of the public, as the canon relates. Therefore, in order to prevent such anomalies in the future, it was enacted that, if a married priest was about to be consecrated, he should first be separated from his wife.

The separation of a candidate for the episcopate from his wife, be it observed, was to take place, according to the 48th canon of the same Council, by mutual consent, κατὰ κοινήν συμφωνίαν; and

¹ Canon 12 Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ εἰς γινώσκιν ἡμετέραν ἦλθεν, ὅτι ἐν τῇ Ἀφρικῇ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ ἑτέροις τόποις οἱ τῶν ἐκείσε θεοφιλέστατοι πρόεδροι συνοικεῖν ταῖς ἰδίαις γαμεταῖς, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ' αὐτοῖς προελθοῦσαν χειροτονίαν, οὐ παραιτοῦνται, πρόσκομμα τοῖς λαοῖς ἐντείνοντες τινέτεσσι καὶ σκάνδαλον. Πολλῆς οὖν ἡμῖν σπουδῆς οὕσης, τοῦ πάντα πρὸς ὠφέλειαν τῶν ὑπὸ χεῖρα ποιμνίων διαπράττεσθαι, εἶδοξεν, ὥστε μηδαμῶς τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν γίνεσθαι. Τοῦτο δὲ φαμέν, οὐκ ἐκ' ἀρετῆς ἢ ἀνατροπῇ τῶν ἀποστολικῶς νεομοθετημένων, ἀλλὰ τῆς σωτηρίας καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ πρεῖτον προκοπῆς τῶν λαῶν προμηθεύμενοι, καὶ τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι μῶμῳ τινα κατὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς καταστάσεως. Φησὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸστολος 'πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ ποιεῖτε, ἀπόσκοποι γίνεσθε καὶ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἑλλήσι καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καθὼς ἐγὼ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω, μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ συμφέρον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν, ἵνα σωθῶσι. Μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ.' Εἰ δὲ τις παρευρεθῇ τὸ τοιοῦτο πράττων, καθαιρεῖσθαι.

in order that the separation of the parties should not be a mere formality, but really effected, the same canon enjoined that the bishop's wife must enter into a distant monastery and there be provided for by the bishop. It further remarks that, should she prove worthy, she might become a deaconess.¹

Results of the practical application of the Trullan Canons.

It has already been said that the 12th canon of the Council in Trullo required, as a condition for the consecration of a bishop, separation from his wife (μη συνοικεῖν ταῖς ἰδίαις γαμεταῖς); while the civil law in force enjoined that a candidate for the episcopate should have neither wife nor children (οὐδὲ γαμετὴν οὐδὲ παῖδας τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔχει²). Thus there existed no small diversity between the civil and the ecclesiastical law, which probably embarrassed the Church in the fulfilment of her task—a divergence which was made more obvious by the incorporation of Justinian's legislation into the *Basilica*.³

This inconsistency was removed by Leo VI the Philosopher, who modified the civil law in accordance with the ecclesiastical canons, and issued a Novel enacting that the existence of children should not debar a worthy person from elevation to the episcopate.⁴

¹ Canon 48 Ἡ τοῦ πρὸς ἐπισκοπῆς προεδρία ἀναγομένου γυνή, κατὰ κοινὴν συμφωνίαν τοῦ οἰκείου ἀνδρὸς προδιασκευθεῖσα, μετὰ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτῇ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς χειροτονίαν ἐν μοναστηρίῳ εἰσὶται, πύρρον τῆς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καταγωγῆς ψυκοδομημένη καὶ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου προνοίας ἀπολαύετω. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡμία φανείη καὶ πρὸς τὸ τῆς διακονίης ἀναβιβασθῆσθαι ἀξίωμα.

² Justinian *Nov.* cxiii i.

³ *Basilica* III i 8.

⁴ Leo VI *Nov.* ii in Zachar. iii p. 69 Τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ θείων κανόνων τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ ὅσοι περὶ τε ἱεροσύνης καὶ χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπων ἐθέμισαν, εἰς ἀριστὸν τε καὶ ἀκριβέστατον ἐκπεφανημένον· (πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἐμελλον ἀκριβῶς ἐκπεφανεῖσθαι, θείας ἐπινοίας ἐν τοῖς φθεγγομένοις ἐνεργούσης;) θαυμάζειν ἔπεισέ μοι πῶς οὐκ εὐλαβήθησάν τινες, ὥσπερ ἐνδεῶς ἐκείνων ἔχοντων, τολμᾶν, ἐτέρων ἐκθέσει νόμον, τοὺς ἱεροὺς καὶ θείους ἀθετεῖν νόμους. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν οἷς τὰ περὶ χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπων διατάττουσι, τῶν ἱερῶν θεσπισόντων κανόνων τε δὲ ἐκ νομίμου γάμου παῖδας ἔχει, εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἄλλη τοῦ βίου ἀρετὴ ἐμποδὼν οὐχ ἴστανται, εἰς ἀρχιερωσύνην προάγεσθαι. Οὗτοι ἀντιθεσπίζοντες φασί, μὴ εἶναι πρὸς ἐπισκόπου ἀξίωμα τοῖς ἔχουσι παῖδας, κἂν δῶρον ὡς γάμου νομίμου, ἀναβαίνειν ἀκάλυτον· ἴσως μὲν (τί γὰρ ἂν τις ἄλλο εἴποι;) ἐκεῖνο ἐπινοεῖν λαβόντες, ὥς τῇ πρὸς τέκνα διαθέσει ταῖς ἱεραῖς ὑπάρξεσι λυμανεῖται ὁ χειροτονούμενος· πλὴν οὐκ ἔχει καλῶς ἡ αἰτία· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἢ συγγενῶν ἐτέρων προσόντων, οὐχ ἔξει τις χώραν πρὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονίαν. Ἡ γὰρ συγγενὴς διάθεσις καὶ πρὸς τοὺτους ὁρᾷ. Ἀλλὰ προειδότες τοῦτο οἱ θεῖοι κανόνες, ἔδοσαν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις ἐξουσίαν, εἰ συγγενεῖς εἰεν ἀποροι ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς ὑπάρξεως τούτων παραμυθεῖσθαι τὴν ἀπορίαν. Ἡ οὖν ἐκ θεοῦ βασιλεία ἡμῶν τοῦτο ἀρμοδιώτερον κατανοοῦσα τοῖς θεῖοις ἔπεισται ἐντάλμασι, σύμφωνον ἐκείνοις ἐκφέρει νόμον, ὥσπερ αὐτοῖς δοκεῖ τὸ πρὸς

Moreover the application of the 48th canon *in Trullo* met with other difficulties in practice. It requires that the separation of the parties shall be by common consent, and secondly that the bishop's wife shall enter a monastery. We are informed that in the twelfth century some wives of already consecrated bishops did not express such consent and continued cohabiting with their husbands in the same house. In this case human weakness attempted to find, by subtle interpretation of the canonical phraseology, reasons to excuse the transgression of the rule; and out of this arose many questions and disputes. Can the absence of consent to separate on a wife's part, it was asked, annul the election of her husband to the episcopate? Secondly, does the phrase of the canon, ἐν μοναστηρίῳ εἰσέλτω, mean that the wife of a bishop must become a nun? and if not, can she marry again like the wife of a man who becomes a monk? All these questions were differently answered, as Balsamon relates.¹

Finally, the Metropolitan of Cyzicus in an imperial council in which the Emperor Isaac Angelus, the Patriarchs of Constantinople, of Antioch, and of Jerusalem, and forty bishops took part, drew attention to these disorders and violations of the canons. The Emperor then, after consulting the ecclesiastical dignitaries, in 1187 issued a law (σημείωμα) enacting that in case the wife does not agree to separation, the husband cannot be elected bishop. When, however, consent is given and the consecration completed, the wife is compelled to become a nun, and can neither continue to live with her first husband, nor contract a second marriage. Moreover, to avoid any difficulty, it is required that both parties shall sign a written agreement to this effect before consecration takes place.²

ἀρχιερασίην ἀνάγεισθαι ἢ ἐξίον τῆς τιμῆς, ἐὰν ᾧσι γοναὶ νόμῳ τετιμημέναι. Οὗτοι δρίζουσά τε ἀντιφθέγγεσθαι θρασυθέντα νόμον, διὰ τὴν τε θρασυτήτος τὸν εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον διηνεκή ἀφωρίαν εἰσπράττεσθαι.

Nevertheless Gregory V, Patriarch of Constantinople, issued a decision (συνδικαὶος τόμος) in October 20, 1798, forbidding the consecration of those of the clergy who were widowers with children (Gedeon K. Διατάξεις i p. 410). But this decision had evidently only provincial force.

¹ On the 48th canon in *Synlogma* ii p. 420.

² Zachariae iii p. 514 Ἡ βασιλεία μου . . . διαρίσατο, προτρεφάμενος τοῦτο καὶ τῶν ἀγιωτάτων πατριαρχῶν, ἐν γυναικείᾳ μοναστηρίῳ ἀνυπερβέτως εἰσαγαγεῖν τὰς πρὸ τῆς χειροτονίας συναφθείσας γαμετὰς τοῖς χειροτονηθεῖσιν ἀρχιερεῦσι, πόρρω τῆς τῶν ἀρχιερέων φιλοδομημένης καταμονῆς, καὶ ἀποκείρεσθαι ταύτας, καὶ κατὰ μοναχὸν διαγεῖν

The history of the relation of the episcopate to marriage from a canonical point of view shews that in the Eastern Church during the first five and a half centuries, no law whatever existed binding bishops to lead a celibate life or to separate from their wives; whether they led a married or an unmarried life was left to their own discretion, although there are indications that in some places by the end of the fourth century and under the influence of asceticism it was strictly exacted from bishops that they should be celibate or should separate from their consorts. This *custom* was confirmed by the *civil legislation* in the sixth century, and finally became from the seventh century a binding *ecclesiastical canon*. From this time forward cases of bishops cohabiting with their wives occur in practice only as exceptions from the general rule, and married priests are eligible for the episcopate so long as they separate from their wives, who are bound to become nuns. It should be observed, however, that separation of the parties by common consent as a preliminary to the elevation of the husband to the episcopate does not, so far as I am aware, occur in the present practice of the Eastern Church.¹

III. THE EPISCOPATE IN ITS RELATION TO MONASTICISM.

It is evident from its enactments that the Council in Trullo has not bound up the episcopate with monasticism. The Council in defining the relation of bishops to the married life enacts that candidates, if married, shall, before consecration, separate from their wives, *μη συνοικεῖν ταῖς ἰδίαις γαμεταῖς*. It is only in respect of matrimony that the canon may seem to establish a relation between the episcopate and monasticism, since both

ἐκαστὴν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ μονῇ καὶ τὴν τρίχα ἀπέθετο· ἢ, μὴ βουλομένῳ τῶν γυναικῶν ἐκουσίῳς τὴν ἀπόκλισιν δέξασθαι, τοὺς πρὸ τῆς χειροτονίας συναφθέντας αὐταῖς ἀπογεγυμνωμένους εἶναι τοῦ ἀρχιερατικοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἀξιώματός, καὶ ἑτέρους ἀντ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς λαχοῦσαις αὐτοὺς ψηφίζεσθαι· καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε μὴ ἄλλως χειροτονεῖσθαι τὸν πρὸ τῆς χειροτονίας νόμιμον ἔχοντα γαμετὴν, εἰ μὴ διαζευχθεῖεν ἐκάτεροι κατὰ κοινήν τῶν συνεόντων ἐγγράφον συμφωνίαν τε καὶ ἀρτίσκειαν, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τὸν μονήρην βίον ἀσπάσῃται· καὶ οὕτω τὰ τῆς χειροτονίας προβαλεῖν κατὰ τοῦτ' ἱερῶς καὶ θεῖου κανόνος ἀσκανθάλιστα καὶ ἀπρόσκοπτα καὶ μύμου παντός ἀπεφευγμένα τῆς ἱερατικῆς καταστάσεως.

¹ In the codex of the Acts of the Patriarchate of Constantinople is extant a decision given in August 1846 under Anthimus IV, according to which it is prohibited to a widower priest, whether having children or not, to become a bishop. This decision, as M. Gedeon remarks, bears no signatures (Κ. Διαιρέτ. ii p. 358).

institutions are put on the same level in so far as marriage is concerned.

Monasticism is not an indispensable part of the ecclesiastical administration, as the episcopate is; and the Church would not make her hierarchy entirely dependent on a system naturally so unstable as monasticism. When monastic life made its appearance and won universal reverence, the Church availed herself of its vigour, and since celibacy formed one of the many virtues of the monastic life, monks were naturally considered more fit than other persons for the fulfilment of episcopal duties, and so were admitted more freely to the hierarchy of the Church.

Nevertheless, although the Church drew largely on the monasteries for her bishops, yet the existence and exercise of all the duties of a monk side by side with the rights and duties of a bishop is canonically regarded as an impossibility and consequently is not permitted.

For many reasons it happened that some bishops took the monastic vows after their consecration. Since in accordance with the regulations of monasticism, which received synodical sanction, one who was to become a monk had to be under the guidance of an experienced person, or of the superior to whom he professed subordination and obedience,¹ doubts naturally arose whether bishops could submit to such rules and still exercise their episcopal functions. The question was laid before a council summoned in the Church of St Sophia at Constantinople (879) under the Patriarch Photius. According to the acts of this Council, the reason adduced by Photius and the Papal legates against this practice was that bishops, by becoming monks, surrender themselves to obedience and to penance, states of life which are taken to be incompatible with the dignity of a bishop. The representatives of the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem also declared that in their churches, while monks were advanced to the episcopate, bishops were not allowed to become monks. The Council therefore issued its 2nd canon whereby it enacted that no bishop should accept the monastic tonsure with its vows, while retaining his bishopric; and this because some of the monastic obligations involve subordination and discipleship and not leadership or teaching authority; nor do monks profess to give guidance,

¹ Basil the Great *Ὅροι κατὰ πλάτος* 26 and 46.

but to be under guidance. Thus the bishop who desires to become a monk, i.e. to descend to the rank of those who are subjected to guidance and penance, since he deprives himself willingly of his rank, cannot return to the episcopal dignity.¹

Such a solution gives rise to another question, viz. how can the custom of electing bishops from among monks, which existed in the practice of the Church before that Council and continues even till the present time, be reconciled with the terms of the canon? In other words, since episcopal duties are not compatible with monastic duties, and for this reason it is not allowed to a bishop after his consecration to take on himself monastic vows, how can a monk undertake episcopal duties? The canon itself gives no help in solving this question. The seeming contradiction, however, may be removed as follows.

Monastic life was regarded as an excellent training for the episcopate; for the strict discipline of such a life produces moral

¹ Dositheus of Jerusalem Τόμος Χαράς, Jassy 1705, pp. 91 sq. Πρᾶξι πέμπτῃ μηνὶ Ἰανουαρίου . . . Φώτιος ὁ ἀγιώτατος πατριάρχης εἶπε, Πῶς ὑμῖν δοκεῖ περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ ἀρχιερατικοῦ τάγματος λαυτοὺς εἰς τὴν τῶν μοναχῶν καταγόντων χώραν; ἄρα εἰς ὑποταγὴν λαυτοὺς παραδόντες, δύναται ἔτι οἱ αὐτοὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ποιμαρχίας ἔχεισθαι;

Οἱ ἀγιώτατοι τοποτηρηταὶ εἶπον, Τοῦτο παρ' ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ σώζεται. Ὅταν γάρ τις ἀπὸ ἀρχιερατικοῦ τάγματος εἰς τὴν τῶν μοναχῶν, τούτῃσιν, τῶν μετανοούντων καταρβηθῇ χώραν, οὐ δύναται ἔτι τῷ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης λαυτῷ διεκδικεῖν ἀξίωματι.

Βασίλειος καὶ Ἡλίας οἱ τοποτηρηταὶ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν θρόνων εἶπον, Οὐδὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐφαρβῆθ' τοῦτο ποτε γενόμενον. Τουναντίον μὲν οὖν μονάζοντες πρόεισιν εἰς ἀρχιερέας ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχιερέων εἰς μοναχοὺς κατέρχόμενοι, ἀρχιερεῖς μένειν οὐ δύναται.

Ὅρισθῆται καὶ περὶ τοῦτου κανὼν. Πολλάκις γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν ἀμφιβολαὶ γίνονται περὶ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ταύτης, τῶν μὲν λεγόντων μὴ καλύεσθαι τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς μοναχοὺς γεγεννημένους, τὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων τελείν, τῶν δὲ συνευδοκούντων ἐπὶ τούτῳ.

Οἱ ἀγιώτατοι τοποτηρηταὶ εἶπον, Ἐκτεθῆτω κανὼν . . . Κανὼν β'. Εἰ καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν ἔνιοι τῶν ἀρχιερέων, εἰς τὸ τῶν μοναχῶν κατιόντες σχῆμα ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης ἐβιάζοντο διαμένειν ὕψει, καὶ τοῦτο πράττοντες παρωρῶντο· ἀλλ' οὖν ἡ ἀγία καὶ οἰκουμένη αὕτη Σύνοδος, καὶ τοῦτο βυθμίζουσα τὸ παρόραμα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς τὴν ἀτακτον ταύτην ἐπανάγουσα πρᾶξιν, ὥρυσεν, ἵνα, εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ ἄλλος τις τοῦ ἀρχιερατικοῦ ἀξιώματος, πρὸς τὸν μοναδικὸν θελήσῃ καταλθεῖν βίον καὶ τὸν τῆς μετανοίας τόπον ἀναπληρῶσαι, μηκέτι τοῦτον τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς ἀντιποιεῖσθαι ἀξίας. Αἱ γὰρ τῶν μοναχῶν συνθήκαι ὑποταγῆς λόγον ἐπέχουσι καὶ μαθητείας, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ διδασκαλίας ἢ προεδρίας. Οὐδὲ ποιμαίνειν ἄλλους, ἀλλὰ ποιμαίνεσθαι ἐπαγγέλλονται. Διό, καθ' ὃ προείρηται, θεσπίζομεν, μηκέτι τινα τῶν ἐν ἀρχιερατικῇ καταλόγῳ καὶ ποιμένων ἕξεσθαι μέσων, εἰς τὴν τῶν ποιμαινομένων καὶ μετανοούντων χώραν λαυτὸν καταβιβάζειν. Εἰ δέ τις τοῦτο τολμήσειε πᾶσαι, μετὰ τὴν ἐκφάνησιν καὶ διάγραφωσιν τῆς νῦν ἐκφανομένης ψήφου, αὐτὸς ἐαυτὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερατικοῦ ἀποστερήσας βαθμοῦ, οὐκ ἔτι πρὸς τὸ πρότερον, δεῖ δ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων ἡθέτησεν, ἀξίωμα ἐπικραστῆσαι. The scholiasts of the Πηδάλιον say on this canon: Ὁ θεληματικῶς παραιτήσας τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ εἰς τὸ σχῆμα τῶν μοναχῶν καταβιβασθείς, οὔτε τὰ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου δύναται ἐνεργεῖν (p. 210 footnote).

qualities which are most necessary for those destined to fill the highest ecclesiastical offices. Such qualities, in addition to chastity, are self-denial, uncovetousness, strong will, humility, and the rest. Hence it is supposed that one who undergoes such training acquires those moral qualities and is able to become a teacher and leader of others. Such a man on his elevation to the episcopate lays aside that part of the monastic discipline, which is inconsistent with the dignity of an ecclesiastical ruler. This part is neither chastity, nor self-denial, nor frugality, but the promise of subordination and obedience, which, as a pedagogic means used for strengthening the human will, can evidently be suspended when its purpose has been fulfilled.

Thus one who through monastic life has developed such virtues, may put off obedience and rise from a pupil to a teacher, from subjection to leadership. On the other hand a non-monastic bishop is regarded as having already obtained all those moral qualifications required for a bishop, so that he need not afterwards undertake monastic vows, some of which—e. g. continual penance and obedience—are laid aside even by a monk, when he becomes a bishop. It is presumed that both monastic and non-monastic candidates for the episcopate are so well trained that it is not necessary for the former to continue, nor for the latter to undergo, the whole *régime* of monastic discipline.¹ This view is partly expressed by the scholiasts Zonaras and Balsamon in expounding the canon in question.²

Though monasticism till the ninth century consisted of only one habit (σχῆμα), apart from the novitiate, in the course of time it was divided into two grades, the little and the great monastic habits (μικρὸν σχῆμα, μέγα ἢ ἀγγελικὸν σχῆμα). This division was established by the twelfth century, as we are informed by Balsamon. Henceforth some bishops who had accepted the little monastic habit before consecration, after this event also took on themselves the great habit; so that doubts arose whether the 2nd canon of St Sophia was applicable to such cases. Balsamon in dealing with this question answered it positively on the ground that, εἰ τὸ μικρὸν σχῆμα τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην παύει, πολλῶ πλέον σχολάσει ταύτην ἢ τελεία ἀπόκασις.³

¹ See A. Christodoulou Δοκίμιον Ἑκκλ. Δικαίων, Constantinople 1896, p. 279.

² Scholion on the 2nd canon of St Sophia.

³ Scholion on the 2nd canon of St Sophia. Balsamon mentions another question,

This view, however, was not entirely carried out in practice. There is extant a synodical decision of the Church of Constantinople issued on February 15, 1389, in the case of Anthimus, bishop of Mavroblachia, who being already a monk,¹ after his consecration took on himself the great monastic habit on account of illness. This document states that, in spite of the opinion of the scholiasts, since the canon refers to non-monastic bishops, and since at that time there was only one monastic habit, not two as later, it was therefore decided that, in case a non-monastic bishop became a monk, he should in accordance with the canon desist from episcopal duties; but that if a monastic bishop took on himself the great habit, the case should rest with the synod, which could recall him to the exercise of his episcopal functions, if it thought fit. The document, moreover, in support of this decision, makes an appeal to the practice of the Church in which Balsamon's view was not always followed.² Thus the bishop of Mavroblachia was allowed to retain, as formerly, his episcopal rank, and on this synodical decision the subsequent practice of the Church has been generally based.

It is not out of place to mention here, from a historical point of view, a dispute connected with this question. Mark of Ephesus, arguing in his profession of faith for the validity of the Council of

viz. why do priests after becoming monks continue their priestly functions, and are not deprived of them? The explanation given for this is that priests, not being teachers, the force of the canon is not extended to them. See also a special answer to this question by the same scholiast addressed to Mark patriarch of Alexandria, Question 8. (Migne P. G. cxxxviii c. 960.)

¹ See decision of the patriarch of Constantinople, Philotheus, issued in Nov. 1370 (*Acta Patriarch.* i p. 535).

² Gedeon K. Διατάξ. i pp. 21, 23 Πατριαρχείουτος κυρίου 'Αντωνίου ἐν ἔτει 'σαφ', Ἰνδικτιῶνος ιβ', Φεβρουαρίου ιε' ὁ Οὐγγροβλαχίας κύρ. 'Ανθίμος, φορέσας τὸ μέγα σχῆμα ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ ὑγιαίνων τὸν νοῦν, συνεχωρήθη ὥστε ἔχειν τὴν ἀρχιερασύνην ὡς πρότερον. διεκρίθη γὰρ παρὰ τῆς συνόδου ὅτι ὁ κανὼν περὶ κοσμητῶν ἀρχιερέων δοκεῖ λέγειν παθεῖσθαι μεταχωροῦντας εἰς τὸ μοναχικὸν σχῆμα· καὶ προσήκει τοῦτο τηρεῖσθαι ἀδασείστας· εἰ γὰρ τοῖς ἐξηγηταῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου σχήματος τοῦτο δοκεῖ, ἀλλ' ἡ σύνοδος εἶπεν, ὡς ἔως ἀν μὴ παρὰ τοῦ κανόνος τοιαύτη συνάγηται ἔννοια, ἐν γὰρ ᾗ πρότερον τὸ μοναχικὸν σχῆμα καὶ οὐ δύο, οὐκ ἀνάγκη τοῖς ἐξηγηταῖς ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῷ κανόνι· ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἀνάγκη δῆλον, ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς ἀπρακτῆσαι τὴν ἐξήγησιν ταύτην. 'Ὅθεν διεγνώσθη, ἵνα ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν κοσμητῶν ἀρχιερέων, ἵαν μοναχοὶ γίνωνται, παύσωνται ἱερουργεῖν κατὰ τὸν κανόνα· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν μοναχῶν ἀρχιερέων, ὅταν τὸ μέγα ἐνδύσωνται σχῆμα μὲν τούτου ἐπὶ τῇ ψήφῳ τῆς συνόδου ὡς ἀν, ἵαν διακριθῇ ὁ μεγαλοσχημήσας ἀναγκαῖος διὰ τινος πλεονεκτήματα λυσιτελεῖ, κληθῇ πάλιν πρὸς τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν ἐργασίαν, πλὴν ἀβιάστας· ἵαν δὲ καὶ κληθῇ, ἵνα μὲν πεποιημένους . . .

St Sophia, mentioned besides the other decisions of that Council, its promulgation of canons, which, he said, could be found in all canonical books. Gregory, then the confessor of the emperor, one of the partisans of the union in the pseudo-Council of Florence, refuting the arguments of Mark, stated, either through ignorance or through wilful perversion, that, although the three canons of Photius were included in the canonical books, yet this fact did not prevent the transgression of the one in question, and produced in proof the examples of Anthimus, already mentioned, and of Holovulus of Gotthice (at the end of fourteenth century).¹

No doubt if Gregory had only read the decision to which he referred, he would have seen that it does not at all violate the canon of the Council of St Sophia, but on the contrary carefully guards the observance of it.

How far the Episcopate is bound up with Monasticism.

The canonical legislation of the Eastern Church concerning the episcopate has now been examined, with the result that, canonically speaking, the episcopal order is not converted into an exclusive privilege of monks, so as to deprive the rest of the clergy of any claim on it. Nevertheless, in the practice of the Greek Church, a custom arose, though not without exceptions, in accordance with which non-monastic candidates chosen for the episcopate were required to become monks before their consecration.

On this account many writers have been led into thinking that the episcopate throughout the Eastern Orthodox Church is inseparably bound up with monasticism; for her bishops either are always chosen from monasteries or else undertake monastic vows before being consecrated. We must therefore examine the

¹ *Respons. in prof. fidei Marci* (Migne P. G. clx c. 100) Ἐφ' ἑσού. Αὕτη ἡ σύνοδος καὶ κανόνας ἐξέθετο τοὺς ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς κανονικοῖς βιβλίοις εὑρισκομένους. . .

[Γρηγόριος]. . . Οὐ θαυμαστὸν οὖν εἰ καὶ οἱ τρεῖς τοῦ Φωτίου κανόνες ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις εὑρίσκονται, μᾶλλον δέ, καὶ τὸν ἕνα παρήλυσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ Μαυροβλαχίας Ἀνθίμου ἐκείνου· πρότερον γὰρ εἰς αὐτὸν τὸ ἀγγελικὸν σχῆμα ἀναπληρώσας πάλιν ὑπὸ Συνόδου προτραπείς τὰ ἀρχιερατικὰ ἐνέργει· καὶ Γοτθίας δὲ ὁ Ὀλόβωλος τὰ ὁμοία ποιήσας ἐν τῷ τέλει αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀρχιερεὺς ἐκρίθη καὶ ὡς ἀρχιερεὺς ἐκηδεύθη ἐν τῇ μονῇ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου Χριστοῦ παρόντος καὶ τοῦ δοιδίμου καὶ ἀγιωτάτου Πατριάρχου κυροῦ Ματθαίου καὶ τοῦ Ξερῶν καὶ τοῦ Βερροίας, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ μέχρι παντὸς ὁ κανὼν οὗτος οὐκ ἐστέργετο. . .

origin of this custom and consider how far it prevails at present in the Eastern Church.

In the Council of St Sophia (879) Zacharias of Chalcedon, refuting the objections of the Roman Church to the election of Photius, proved by examples that elections from among laymen were not unusual in the Eastern Church, and, if they were regarded only as matter of custom, this was enough to overcome even canonical regulations. As an illustration of this, i.e. of the force of custom, he mentioned that in Antioch and Jerusalem no one, without taking monastic tonsure, could become a bishop, and that the Western Church accepts monks for the clergy generally, whereas both these customs were unknown in the Church of Constantinople as binding.¹

It appears according to this statement that the origin and foundation of the custom of regarding the monastic tonsure as a necessary condition for the reception of the episcopate is due to the Churches mentioned, as being centres of monastic life. As to the Church of Constantinople, in order to ascertain the extent of the custom there, which apparently was not wide, it is necessary to examine the practice of this Church in the election of her bishops. For this purpose it will be advantageous to trace the status of the patriarchs of this See before their election, without neglecting any other evidence that may bear on the question.

Let us therefore consider a series of Patriarchs, starting from the beginning of the seventh century.² From this time till the end of the eighth century there were twenty Patriarchs on the throne of Constantinople, four of whom were elected from the monks,³ while most of the rest of them belonged to the clergy of the Great Church of Constantinople, i.e. were presbyters or deacons serving in the manifold offices of the Patriarchate.

¹ Dositheus *Τόμος Χαρᾶς*, Jassy 1705, pp. 67, 71 *Ζαχαρίας ὁ θεοφιλέστατος μητροπολίτης Χαλκηδόνος εἶπε . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἔθος αὐτὸ ἱκανὸν ἐστὶ νικᾶν νόμον. Ταῦτα πολλὰ ὀρώμεν σήμερον. Ὑμεῖς οἱ φωστῆρες τῆς ἐκκλησίας, οἱ τὰς οἰκείας αὐγὰς ἀπὸ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πέμποντες, εὐρεῖν ἔχετε αὐτοὺς ψηλαφῶντες καὶ ἐρευνῶντες πολλὰ ποιῶντες παρὰ τὸν κανόνα, τοῖς ἔθουσιν ἐνόμενοι. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἔθος αὐτὸ πολλὰ νικᾷ τὸ ἔθος. Εἰς τὴν Ἀνατολὴν εἰ μὴ ἐστὶ τις κεκαρμένος ἐν Χριστῷ ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πατριάρχης οὐ γίνεται. Ἡ δὲ Δύσις καὶ τοὺς ὄντας μοναχοὺς κληρικοὺς ποιεῖ. Τοῦτο δὲ ἡμεῖς οὐ γράφωμεν.*

² See appendix below.

³ *Pyrrhus* (638-641); *Cyrus* (705-711); *Constantine II* (754-766); *Nicetas I* (766-780).

The election as a rule, it is true, fell on the unmarried, but whether they became monks before consecration as Patriarchs is not recorded. On the other hand it is known that at the end of the eighth century Paul IV (780–784) became a monk after his resignation of the throne.¹

The first mention of the reception of the monastic tonsure as a step to ordination is found in the case of Nicephorus (806), who himself, as his biographer informs us, expressed a wish for it.² Theodotos Kassyteras (815), a soldier (σπαθαροκανδιδάτος), became a monk before his ordination.³ In the same manner Photius (861), a layman, who within five days passed through all clerical orders, became a monk before being accepted for the lowest order, i.e. the readership.⁴ Nevertheless, that this custom was not generally observed by the bishops of the dioceses belonging to the Church of Constantinople, may be seen from the preamble to the 2nd canon of the Council of St Sophia spoken by Photius himself, and from the statement mentioned above of Zacharias of Chalcedon at the same Council.

Turning back to the list of Patriarchs, it is noticeable that after the iconoclastic controversy (717–843), when monasticism through its heroic sufferings endured in the cause of orthodoxy reaped fresh glory, the throne of Constantinople was occupied chiefly by monks; although a few examples of elections from the clergy of the Great Church, from chaplains of the palace, and from laymen, are to be found. Of the latter persons it is well known that some did, while others did not, become monks before their ordination. Thus of the Patriarch George Xiphilinus (1192–1199), who was elected from among the deacons of the

¹ Theophanes *Chronol.* (Migne P. G. cviii c. 921) Τῇ δὲ λα΄ τοῦ Αὐγούστου μηνὸς τῆς αὐτῆς ζ' Ἰνδικτιῶνος Παῦλος ὁ δαῖος καὶ ἀγιάτατος πατριάρχης ἀσθενήσας κατέλιπε τὸν θρόνον καὶ κατελθὼν ἐν τῇ μονῇ τοῦ Φλώρου ἔλαβε τὸ μοναχικὸν σχῆμα.

² Migne P. G. c c. 68 Τῆς οὖν θείας ἐπ' αὐτῷ τελετῆς τοῦ μοναχοῦ προβάσσης . . . καὶ τῆς ἱερατικῆς κατὰ βαθμὸν καὶ τάξιν προελθούσης κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν θεσμὸν τελειώσεως, τούτοις ἦδη καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς ἀγαστείας ἐπηκολούθησε διακόσμησις.

³ *Vita Leonis Armeni* (Migne P. G. cviii c. 1036) Θεόδοτος σπαθαροκανδιδάτος ὄντα συνθέμενος τῷ δόγματι αὐτοῦ ἐκούρευσε στεφανίτην, καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν πατριάρχην, χειροτονήσαντες αὐτὸν τὸ πάσχα.

⁴ Nicet. Paphl. *Vita Ignatii* (Migne P. G. cv c. 512) Πρώτῃ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ μοναχὸς ἀντ' λαλεῖτο, τῇ δευτέρᾳ δὲ ἀναγνώστης, καὶ ὑποδιάκονος τῇ ἑξῆς, εἰτα διάκονος, εἰτα πρεσβύτερος ἔπειτα τῇ ἑστῇ, Σριστοῦ δὲ ᾗ τὰ γενέθλια, καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ ἱερατικῷ προβάς θρόνον τὴν εἰρήνην τῷ λαῷ προσεφάνει.

Great Church, it is recorded that he became a monk after he retired from the throne.¹ Gregory II (1283–1289), who being a layman was elected to be Patriarch, received the monastic tonsure before ordination, as was the custom.² In accordance with the same custom John Glycys (1315), also a layman, who had a wife and children, was about to take the vows; but since as a monk he would have to abstain from meat, the use of which was prescribed for him by the doctors on account of ill-health, the Emperor prevented him from becoming a monk, while his wife became a nun, according to ecclesiastical canons.³ John XIV (1334), who had a wife and children, was elected, while serving as palace chaplain, and consecrated without becoming a monk. This is known from Cantacuzene, who states that on the occasion of a festival, the white linen which was worn around the head-dress by the Patriarchs who were not of the monastic rank, was used by the Patriarch John, adorned for the first time with gold and images of our Saviour, the Virgin Mary, and John the Baptist.⁴ Moreover, the decision of the Patriarch Antonius IV (1389) previously quoted, shews that up to the end of the fourteenth century there were some bishops who had no connexion with monasticism.

It has already been remarked that the custom of taking the monastic vow before consecration is found in the practice of the Church of Constantinople early in the ninth century. This without doubt is due to the great influence exercised over the Church by monasticism from the epoch of Iconoclasm. It seems, however, that this custom was not at first generally observed, but only enforced in certain cases. This is indicated by the

¹ Nic. Callistus *Enarr.* (Migne P. G. cxlvii c. 464) *Καὶ ἀπεκάρη ἐν τῇ μονῇ τῶν Φρυγανῶν, ἣν ᾠκοδόμησεν ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Ἀγγέλου Ἀλεξίου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἰσαακίου.*

² Ephraem. v. 10346 *Τὰ τῶν μοναχῶν πρὶν τελεσθεῖς ὡς ἔθος.*

³ Nic. Gregoras in Migne P. G. cxlviii c. 444 *Τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ τὸ μοναχικὸν εἶδός τε ὑπελθούσης σχῆμα. Καὶ αὐτὸν μέντοι τὸ μοναχικὸν ὑπελθεῖν ὀρμήσαντα σχῆμα αἰδοῦ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς ὁρμῆς ἐπέσχεεν ὁ βασιλεὺς. Συμμοῦ γὰρ τις διεφθορότος οὐ πάνυ πρὸ πολλοῦ τὰ τούτου διαδραμύντος ἄρθρα, τακταῖς περιόδοις τοῦ ἔτους ἔπασχε τὰ δεινότερα, καὶ ἦν ἀνάγκη κατὰ τὰς τῶν λατρῶν κρίσεις κῆρατι τούτων χρῆσθαι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ μοναχικὸν ὑπελθεῖν οὐ συγκεχώρηται σχῆμα.*

⁴ Migne P. G. cliii c. 999 *Καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς καλύπτραν, ἣν τοὺς πατριάρχας ἔθος φέρειν ἀντὶ τοῦ τῶν τάγματος ὡσεὶ τῶν μοναζόντων, ὁδόνῃ λευκῇ περιελημμένην πρότερον, αὐτὸς κατεκόσμησε χρυσοῖς, ἐκόντας αὐτῇ τοῦ τε Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἱγγραῖφας Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῆς τεκούσης αὐτὸν ἀρχάντου θεοτόκου, καὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ.*

irregularity of its application, which is apparent from the examples and evidences mentioned above.

The examples of Nicephorus, Theodotus, Photius, and especially the statement about the election of Gregory II and John XIII, would seem to indicate that monastic tonsure, though a mere custom, was considered a *sine qua non* for candidates for the episcopate. But, on the other hand, when we bear in mind that all these were chosen for their high office from among the laity; and if at the same time we take into consideration the 2nd canon of St Sophia and the decision of the Patriarch Antonius IV, both of which speak of non-monastic bishops, and more especially the fact that George Xiphilinus, deacon, and John XIV, a married priest, did not become monks after their election, we are naturally led to conclude that the custom in question was strictly enforced only for those who were elected to the episcopate from among the laity, but not in the case of those who, being already ordained, whether married or unmarried, were called to the Patriarchate.

It appears, however, that in course of time the force of this custom was gradually extended so that in the first half of the fifteenth century, according to the testimony of Symeon archbishop of Salonica, the majority of bishops received the monastic habit before their consecration.¹ In another passage the same writer, speaking about the preference of monks for the episcopal order, says that it is very seldom possible to see any of the secular clergy elevated to the episcopate, and that even in such case the Church requires them, before consecration, to take on themselves the monastic habit.²

Similar assertions about the relation existing in practice between episcopacy and monasticism may be found even in

¹ Symeon Thessal. *Περὶ μετανοίας* 266 (Migne P. G. clv 489) Διὸ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία τοὺς πλείους τῶν εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν ἀγομένων ἀρτι τῷ θεῷ σχήματι τούτῳ κατακοσμοῦσα πρότερον, οὕτως ἐπισκόπου καθιστᾷ, τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἅγια τῶν ἀγίων τῷ παραγίῳ ἐξασφαλισμένη καὶ ἐρῷ σχήματι.

² Id. *de Sacerdotio* (ib. 954) Καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη τῶν πολλῶν δόξα καλλίστη, καὶ τῶν καθόλου μᾶλλον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, καὶ κατὰ τοσοῦτον βεβαιωθείσά ἐστιν, ὥς καὶ τὴν προστασίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πόσης σχεδὸν τοῖς μοναχοῖς ἐγχειρίζεσθαι. Καὶ ἐξετάζων ἤδη σπαριάνεις εὗροις τινὰ ποτε τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἱεραρχίας ἡγούμενον, τοῖς μοναχοῖς δὲ τοῦτο ὥσπερ ἀποκεκλήραται. Καὶ ἴδοις ἂν τινὰς ἐκ τοῦ κοσμικοῦ βίου πρὸς ἱεραρχίαν ἀγομένους. Καὶ τοῦτο δὴ παρὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀπαιτούμενον τὸ τῶν μοναχῶν πρότερον ἐνδυμα ἐκένδυσσθαι.

later authors. In spite of the extension of this custom the consciousness of the possibility of reaching the highest order of the Church without becoming a monk had not vanished. Thus the priest John Nathanael, who flourished about the end of the sixteenth century, states that the monastic habit is closely related to penance. It cleanses the sins of the offender and elevates him with virtue; but it does not consecrate a monk to the priesthood. For this reason one may be a bishop without becoming a monk, but a monk of bad life cannot proceed to ordination.¹ Evidently his remark about the possibility of a secular clerk becoming a bishop without taking monastic vows shews that the opposite was the predominant practice.

Thus when Metrophanes Critopulos, of Balliol College, afterwards Patriarch of Alexandria, composed his *Professio*, and forwarded it, in May 1625, to the professors of the University of Helmstadt, he could write that the Greek Church chooses her bishops always from monks.²

In the same century Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669–1707), speaking of the use of meat, says that bishops, being at first elected without being monks, had the right of using or of abstaining from meat, as they chose; but that after it became customary not to be consecrated before taking monastic vows, they were not allowed to eat meat.³

The compilers of the *Πηδάλιον* (1790), the hieromonachus Agapius and the monk Nicodemus, in glossing the 51st Apostolical canon, make the same remark about the established custom of a bishop becoming a monk before consecration; and this leads to the conclusion that the episcopate of the Eastern Church at that time consisted chiefly of monks.⁴

¹ Joh. Nathanael Ἡ θεία λειτουργία μετὰ ἐξηγήσεων διαφόρων διδασκάλων . . . 29 Περὶ τοῦ μοναχικοῦ σχήματος p. 15 (Venice 1574) Τὸ σχῆμα δὲ τοῦ μοναχοῦ εἶναι ἴδιον τῆς μετανοίας, διότι καθαρίζει τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τοῦ ἑπαισμένου πιστοῦ, καὶ ὑψώνει τὸν μὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἀλλ' οὔτε τελειώνει τὸν μοναχὸν εἰς ιερέα, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ μοναχικοῦ σχήματος δύναται νὰ γίνωται ἐπίσκοποι, ἀλλ' ὅμοι οἱ μοναχοὶ ποὺ εἶναι κακοῦ βίου δὲν δύναται νὰ ἔλθωσιν εἰς ἱεροσύνην.

² See Kimmel *Mon. fid. eccl. orient.*, Jena 1850, ii p. 143 Τοὺς δὲ ἐπισκόπους ἐκλέγει ἡ Ἐκκλησία πάντοτε ἐκ τῆς τάξεως τῶν μοναχῶν.

³ Dositheus *Hist. patr. Hierosol.* viii 4, Bucharest 1715, p. 779 Ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τὸ πρῶτον, ὅτε ἐγίνοντο, πολλοὶ αὐτῶν μὴ ὄντες μοναχοί, εἶχον θέλημα ἐσθίειν, ἢ ἐγκρατεῦσθαι, ἀφ' οὗ δὲ συνειθίσθη μὴ γίνεσθαι ἐπισκόπους, πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι μοναχοὺς, μήτε αὐτοὺς κρεωφαγεῖν δεῖ, καὶ ὅσοι καταλύουσι, παρὰ τὸ πρέπον ποιοῦσι.

⁴ Πηδάλιον, ed. 1841, p. 37 footnote.

Now before entering into an examination of the present practice of the Church with regard to this matter, it should be noted that, although the custom owes its existence to the influence of monasticism, yet, when the Church summoned the monks from their solitude and offered them the episcopal order, she did so, not because she believed that the formal acceptance of monastic obligations was necessary for the reception of the episcopate, but in view of the virtues and abilities which monks had developed in monastic life. Can it, however, be accepted that candidates for the episcopate may within a few days reap the benefits of the monastic training, so as to acquire those habits of virtue which especially gained for monks the right of holding the highest offices of the Church? ¹ Evidently the custom, although an ancient one, does not realize the idea upon which the election of monks for the episcopate was originally based.

The present practice.

The receiving of monastic tonsure before approaching the episcopate, being a mere custom, which was never confirmed by any law, could not be expected to prevail unchangeably throughout the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Thus in the Russian Church to-day the rule is strictly observed that no one can be consecrated bishop without having taken the little monastic habit.² In the Church of the Kingdom of Greece, as has been stated, the unmarried clergy have to belong to one of the monasteries of the country. They are considered members of the monastery after becoming *βασοφόροι*,³ according to the special rite of the Church.⁴ From this class of clergy of course bishops are elected, but they are not required to take the little monastic habit before consecration.

¹ See G. Pachymer *De Andron. Paleol.* i § 34.

² *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ μέγα*, Venice 1891, p. 190. It is for this reason that neither a bishop in the Russian Church nor a hieromonach is allowed to celebrate the matrimonial service, to confer baptism, or to partake of meat, as the representative of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in Moscow, the very Rev. Archimandrite Jacobus, kindly informs me. On this subject see also Canon 4 of the Council of Chalcedon; an answer given by Peter Chartophylax of the Great Church (*Synagoga* v p. 369); and a decision of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Michael III (1169-1177), in *Synagoga* i p. 41.

³ See M. Sakellariopoulou *Ἑκκλησιαστικὴν διακονίαν*, Athens 1898, p. 325.

⁴ *Εὐχολόγιον* p. 188.

In the Church of Constantinople of to-day such a custom no longer exists. It should be remarked, however, that in the theological college of Halki, from which almost all the bishops of that Church graduate, it was usual, until some few years ago, for the candidates for the diaconate to become *ῥασοφόροι*; but as such they were not considered monks, because the impediment to marriage only begins on receiving the little habit with the vows which it involves. Even this, however, as P. Comnenos, professor of theology in the same college, kindly informs me, is no longer observed either in this college or by all the bishops in the various dioceses at the ordination of unmarried persons. Candidates for the episcopate, even if already *ῥασοφόροι*, need not undertake monastic vows; while those who are not *ῥασοφόροι* are not required to submit even to this preliminary ceremony, much less to become monks by receiving the little habit.

The clergy of the Church of Jerusalem, except the married secular clergy, form a monastic brotherhood, so that all bishops, as well as the other clergy, being members of the community, must be monks.

As to the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria I can make no definite statement. In view, however, of the smallness of these communities, it is probable that their practice in this matter changes from time to time to suit the views of their leaders.

With this review before us of the practice prevailing to-day in the various branches of the Eastern Orthodox Church it is difficult to see how modern writers on this subject are justified in asserting that this Church in practice has made the taking of monastic vows a necessary step to the episcopate.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, a short account of the basis upon which the whole relation of marriage to ministry in the Eastern Orthodox Church rests will not be superfluous, although indications of it have already been given above.

For this purpose the canons of the Trullan Council, which deal with the matrimony and celibacy of clergy and constitute the standard of the discipline of the Greek Church up to the present day, should evidently be taken into consideration. A mere com-

parison of these enactments one with another¹ shews clearly that the Council in making its canons was not influenced by the dogmatic grounds upon which the sacrament of marriage rests. And the application of such a criterion in examining the canons in question would reveal inconsistencies in that part of the legislative work of the Council.

It would certainly be difficult to understand how the scriptural texts about marriage quoted in the 13th canon regarding priests and the inferior orders are inapplicable to bishops, to whom the conjugal union is forbidden by the 12th canon. Moreover, if marriage contracted before ordination is allowed to continue in all orders except the episcopate (can. 13), why should unmarried members of those orders be forbidden to marry after their ordination (can. 6)?

This legislation would not be intelligible if considered from a dogmatic point of view, while its seeming contradictions disappear when we reflect that the intention of the Church was, not to rest her disciplinary enactments on such principles, but rather to codify existing rules of custom, which either ecclesiastical tradition or long usage had stamped as right and expedient. The ratification of those customs by the Church was felt to be the more necessary inasmuch as venturesome innovations appeared in ecclesiastical discipline.²

Meanwhile, whatever reasons may have urged the Council in Trullo to enact the canons in question, in any case the historical side of the relation of marriage to ministry, which has been traced above, indisputably proves that the Eastern Orthodox Church followed faithfully the gradual developement of the question, and the last official enactment has fixed her discipline. Therefore the system of this Church with regard to the matrimony or celibacy of her clergy is not the outcome of a provincial synod or of the legislation of a particular Church, but is the requirement of the whole Church, the legislation of an Oecumenical Council.³

¹ Cf. canon 13 with can. 12 and 6.

² See can. 3 and 13.

³ The oecumenical character of the Trullan Council was questioned later on by the Roman Church. It is unnecessary, however, to enter into interminable and subtle discussions as to how far the Western Church was or was not right in doing this. The important historical fact is that the oecumenical character of that council has always been acknowledged throughout the Eastern Orthodox Church and

This is the sole and firm basis on which the present practice rests and, according to the teaching of the Eastern Church, it cannot be affected by the action of any one branch of the Church, but can only be changed or superseded, in case of necessity, by an authority similar to that to which it owes its establishment.

APPENDIX.

A chronological list shewing the status of the Patriarchs of Constantinople before their election, from the seventh century to the fall of Constantinople (1453).¹

NAME.	DATE A.D.	STATUS BEFORE ELECTION.
Thomas	607	Deacon of the Great Church and Sacellarius of the Patriarch (Theoph. <i>Chronog.</i> , Migne P. G. cviii 620).
Sergius	610	Deacon of the Great Church and Supporter of the poor (πρωχοτρόφος) (Chron. <i>Paschal.</i> , Migne P. G. xcii 980).
Pyrrhus	638	Abbot at Chrysopolis (Niceph. <i>Chronog. brevis</i> , Migne P. G. c 1048).
Paul	641	Presbyter and Steward (οικονόμος) of the Great Church (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Pyrrhus (a second time)	652	
Peter	652	Presbyter of the Great Church (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Thomas II	665	Deacon of the Great Church and Archivist (χαρτοφύλαξ) (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
John V	668	Presbyter and Sacristan of the Great Church (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Constantine I	674	Deacon of the Great Church, Sacristan, and Steward (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Theodore I	676	Presbyter of the Great Church, Syncellus, and Sacristan (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
George	678	Presbyter of the Great Church, Syncellus, and Sacristan (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Theodore I (a second time)	683	
Paul III	686	Layman, Secretary (δοκηρῆτης) (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Callinicus	693	Presbyter and Sacristan of the Church of Blachernae (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).

scholars support this view (Beveridge *On the Articles* pp. 394 sq.; *Pandect. Can.* vol. ii p. 126; Van Espen *Comment. in Canones*, Louvain 1753, p. 359).

¹ The list has been taken from M. Gedeon *Πατριαρχικοί Πίνακες*, Constantinople 1890, but my task has been to search out what mention is made in the authorities of the status of the patriarchs before their election. * indicates that the patriarch in question was a monk before election to the patriarchate; † that he became a monk on his election; ‡ that he became a monk after his consecration.

NAME.	DATE A.D.	STATUS BEFORE ELECTION.
*Cyrus	705	Presbyter and monk (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i> 1049).
John VI	711	Deacon and Archivist of the Great Church (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Germanus	715	Bishop of Cyzicus (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
Anastasius	730	Presbyter and Syncellus (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
*Constantine II	754	Monk and bishop of Syllaëum (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
*Nicetas I	766	Presbyter of the Church of the Apostles; Curator of the monasteries (Theoph. <i>Chron.</i> , Migne cviii 369).
‡Paul IV	780	Deacon from Cyprus. After his resignation of the throne, retired to the monastery of Florus and became a monk (Theoph. <i>ibid.</i> 913 and 921).
Tarasius	784	Chief secretary to the emperor (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
†Nicephorus	806	Layman (<i>Vita Niceph.</i> , Migne c 68).
†Theodotus	815	Layman, a high officer of the emperor's body-guard (σπασαρχανδίδωρος) (<i>Vita Leonis incerti auctoris</i> , Migne cviii 1036).
*Antony	821	Monk, bishop of Syllaëum (<i>Vita Leonis, ibid.</i> c. 1025).
*John VII	832	Abbot of the monastery of SS. Sergius and Bacchus and Syncellus of the Great Church (Theoph. <i>Continuat.</i> liv 4 § 7, Migne cix 169).
*Methodius	842	Monk (<i>Method. Patriarch. Vita</i> , Migne c 1245).
*Ignatius	846	Monk (Nicet. Paphlag. <i>Vita Ignat.</i> , Migne cv 492).
†Photius	857	Layman (Nicet. Paphlag. <i>ibid.</i> 512).
Ignatius (a second time)	867	
Photius (a second time)	878	
Stephen	886-893	Deacon and Syncellus (Leo Grammat. <i>Chronog.</i> Migne cviii 1096).
*Antony II	893	Monk (Ephraem <i>Chronog.</i> v. 10026; Migne cxliii).
*Nicolaus Mysticus	895	Monk (Ephraem <i>ibid.</i> v. 10033).
*Euthymius	906	Syncellus and monk (Leo Grammat. <i>ibid.</i> 1113).
Nicolaus Mysticus (a second time)	911	
Stephen II	925	Bishop of Amasia (Leo Grammat. <i>ibid.</i> 1148).
*Trypho	928-931	Monk (Ephraem v. 10047).
Theophylact	933	Syncellus (Leo Grammat. <i>ibid.</i> 1148).
*Polyeuctus	956	Monk (Ephraem v. 10058).
*Basil	970	Monk (Ephraem v. 10061).
*Antony III	974-980	A monk of the Studium (Ephraem v. 10064).
Nicolaus Chrysobergius	984	Unknown.
Sisinius	995-998	Layman (Cedrenus, Migne cxvii 181).
*Sergius II	999	Abbot of the monastery of Manuel (Cedren. <i>ibid.</i>).
Eustathius	1019	First of the palace chaplains (Cedren. <i>ibid.</i> 208).
*Alexius	1025	Abbot of the Studium (Cedren. <i>ibid.</i> 212).

ORDINATION AND MATRIMONY IN EASTERN CHURCH 511

NAME.	DATE A.D.	STATUS BEFORE ELECTION.
*Michael Cerularius	1043-1058	Monk (Cedren. <i>ibid.</i> 284).
Constantine III	1059-1063	Protovestiarius (Scylitza <i>Historia</i> , Migne cxxii 373).
*John Xiphilinus	1064	Monk on Mount Olympus (Georg. Hamart, Migne cx 1237).
*Cosmas	1075	Monk (Scylitza <i>ibid.</i> 461).
*Eustratius Garidas	1081	Monk (Zonaras <i>Annal.</i> xviii 21, Migne cxxxv 297).
*Nicolas III	1084	Monk (Zonaras <i>ibid.</i> 299).
John IX	1111	Hieromnemon, from the clergy of the Great Church (Ephraem v. 10125).
Leo Styppis	1134	Steward of the Great Church (Ephraem v. 10132).
*Michael II	1143	Abbot of the monastery of Oxeias (Choniat. <i>De Man. Commem.</i> i 2, Migne cxxxix 381).
Cosmas II	1146	Deacon of the Great Church (Choniat. ii 3).
Nicolas IV Mouzalon	1147	Archbishop of Cyprus (Cinnamus <i>Hist.</i> ii 18, Migne cxxxiii 408).
*Theodotus II	1151	Abbot of the monastery of Resurrection (Cinnamus <i>ibid.</i>).
*Neophytus I	1153	Monk from the monastery of the Virgin Mary (Lequien <i>Oriens Christianus</i> i 269).
Constantine IV	1154	Deacon of the Great Church and Sacellarius of the Patriarch (Ephraem v. 10176).
*Lucas Chrysobergis	1156	Monk (Ephraem v. 10180).
Michael III Anchialon	1169	Deacon and Sacellarius of the Great Church (Ephraem v. 10183).
*Chariton	1177	Abbot of the monastery of Mangana (Ephraem v. 10188).
*Theodosius	1178	Monk (Ephraem v. 10191).
Basil II	1183	Deacon and Archivist of the Great Church (Ephraem v. 10197).
Nicetas Mountanis	1187	Sacellarius of the Great Church (Choniat. <i>De Isaac. Ang.</i> ii 4).
*Leontius Theotokitis	1190	Abbot of the monastery of the Apostles (Choniat. <i>ibid.</i>).
*Dositheus	1191	Patriarch of Jerusalem and formerly monk of Studium (Choniat. <i>ibid.</i> 769, 772, 773).
†George II Xiphilinus	1192	Deacon and Great Sacristan of the Great Church. He became monk after his resignation (Choniat. <i>ibid.</i> c. 773; Nic. Callisti <i>Enarrat.</i> , Migne cxlvii 464).
John X Xamaterus	1199	Deacon and Archivist of the Great Church (Ephraem v. 10232).
Michael IV Autourianus	1206-1212	Deacon and Sacellarius (Ephraem v. 10241).
Theodore II	1213	Deacon and Archivist of the Great Church (Ephraem v. 10245).
*Maximus II	1215	Abbot of the monastery of Acoemetoi (<i>ibid.</i> v. 10250).
Manuel	1215-1222	Deacon of the Patriarchate (Nic. Callist. <i>Enarrat.</i> c. 465).

NAME.	DATE A. D.	STATUS BEFORE ELECTION.
*Germanus II	1222	Monk, and formerly deacon of the Great Church (Niceph. <i>ibid.</i>).
*Methodius II	1240	Abbot of the monastery of Hyacinthus at Nicæa (G. Acropol. <i>Annales</i> 42; Migne cxi 108).
Manuel II	1244	Protopresbyter of the Palace (Nic. Callisti <i>ibid.</i>).
*Arsenius Autorianus	1255	Monk (Ephraem v. 10276).
Nicephorus II	1260	Metropolitan of Ephesus, and formerly Archdeacon of the Palace (Ephraem v. 10286-88).
Arsenius (a second time)	1261	
*Germanus III	1267	Metropolitan of Adrianople and formerly a monk (Pachymeres <i>Pal.</i> iv 12, Migne cxliii 725, 727).
*Joseph	1268	Abbot of the monastery of Galesium, formerly married chaplain of the Palace (Gregoras iv 8; Ephraem v. 10302).
John XI Beccus.	1275	Deacon and Archivist of the Great Church (Pachymeres <i>de Michael.</i> <i>Paleol.</i> v 24; Nic. Callistus <i>ibid.</i> 468).
Joseph (a second time)	1282	
†Gregorius II	1283	Layman (Pachym. <i>de Andron.</i> <i>Paleol.</i> i 14; Migne cxliv 51).
*Athanasius	1289-1293	Monk (Pachym. <i>ibid.</i> ii 13, c. 155; Ephraem v. 10349).
*John XII	1294	Monk and priest (Ephraem v. 10353-65).
Athanasius (a second time)	1303	
*Niphon	1311-1314	Metropolitan of Cyzicus and formerly abbot (Ephraem v. 10370).
John XIII Glycys	1315	Layman with wife and children. He did not become a monk, on account of ill-health (Niceph. Gregoras <i>Histor.</i> vii 11 § 1, Migne cxlviii 444).
*Gerasimus	1320-1321	Abbot of the monastery of Sosandrum (Ephraem v. 10385).
*Isaiah	1323	Monk (Gregoras viii 12 § 1; Ephraem v. 10388).
John XIV	1334	Priest with wife and children. Chaplain of the Palace. He did not become a monk (Gregoras x 7 § 3; Cantacuzen. <i>Hist.</i> iii 36).
*Isidore	1347	Metropolitan of Salonika, and formerly monk at Athos (Isidore <i>P. C. testament.</i> , Migne clii 1298).
*Callistus I	1350	Monk-priest (Gregoras xviii 1 § 3).
*Philotheus	1354	Metropolitan of Heraclea and formerly abbot (Cantacuzen. <i>Hist.</i> iv 16, Migne cliv 124, 125).
Callistus I (a second time)	1355-1363	
Philotheus (a second time)	1364	
*Macarius	1376-1379	Metropolitan of Sebastia and formerly monk. (Miclosich-Müller <i>Acta et diplomata</i> ii p. 65).
*Nilus	1380-1388	Monk (Miclosich <i>ibid.</i> p. 108).

NAME.	DATE A. D.	STATUS BEFORE ELECTION.
*Antony IV	1389	Monk (Miclosich <i>ibid.</i> p. 112).
Macarius (a second time)	1390	
Antony IV (a second time)	1391	
*Callistus II	1397	Monk (Miclosich <i>ibid.</i> p. 292).
*Matthew	1397	Metropolitan of Cyzicus, formerly monk (Miclosich <i>ibid.</i> p. 312).
Euthemius II	1410	Unknown (G. Phrantzæ <i>Chronicon</i> i 35, Migne clvi 726).
Joseph II	1416-1439	Metropolitan of Ephesus (<i>ibid.</i>).
Metrophanes II	1440	Metropolitan of Cyzicus (Phrantzæ ii 17 Migne clvi 796).
Gregory III	1443	Great Protosyncellus and confessor of the Emperor (Phrantzæ <i>ibid.</i> ii 15 c. 792).
*Athanasius II	1450	Abbot of the monastery of Peribleptus (Dositheus <i>De Patr. Hierosol.</i> x 9 § 2 p. 915).

CHR. KNETES,
Archivist of the Great Church,
Constantinople.