

THE
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1893.

I.

THE DISHONESTY OF HERESY.

BY PROFESSOR JACOB COOPER, S. T. D., D. C. L., RUTGERS COLLEGE.

THE prophet in predicting the sufferings of Christ, declared that his wounds would be received in the house of His friends. However grievous the thought be, that a man's chief foes are those of his own household, yet such is the power of the devil to work harm to the people of God, that this has always been true of the Church; and must be accepted as a necessary condition under which the Gospel will struggle. History and the words of our Lord confirm this alike; and hence, without being able to fathom the Divine purpose in permitting the fiercest wolves to come from within the nominal fold, we must accept the fact and meet the issue.

If it were with external foes alone that the Church had to fight, the battle would be short and the victory decisive. But since so many depart from the faith they once professed, the world doubts whether any doctrine be sound which can be so caricatured by its pretended followers. And if those still within the fold can with impunity call in question all the distin-

II.

SCHOLASTIC AND MYSTIC THEOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

LITERATURE ON SCHOLASTICISM.

- I. *Sources*.—The works of ANSELM, ABELARD, PETER THE LOMBARD, ALBERTUS M., THOMAS AQUINAS, DUNS SCOTUS, OCCAM, BONAVENTURA, and other Schoolmen.
- II. *Works*.—DEAN D. HAMPDEN (Bishop of Hereford, d. 1868): *The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relation to Christian Theology*. (Bampton Lectures.) Oxford, 1832; 3rd ed., 1838.
- BARTH. HAURÉAU: *De la Philosophie scholastique*. Paris, 1850, 2 vols.
- H. KAULICH: *Geschichte der scholastischen Philosophie*. Prag, 1863.
- * C. PRANTL: *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*. Leipzig, 1861-'70, 4 vols.
- F. D. MAURICE (d. 1872): *Mediæval Philosophy*. London, 1870.
- * ALBERT STÖCKL (Rom. Cath. Prof. of Philosophy at Münster): *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*. Mainz, 1864-'66, 3 vols. The first volume covers the beginning of Scholasticism (Isidor of Seville, Bede, Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, Paschasius Radbertus, Gottschalk, Scotus Erigena, Anselm, Abelard, Gilbert de la Porrée, Bernard of Clairvaux, the two Victors, Peter the Lombard, John of Salisbury); the second, the period of its supremacy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; the third, the period of opposition and decline down to Jesuitism and Jansenism. Strongly anti-Protestant.
- * H. REUTER (Prof. of Church History in Göttingen, d. 1889): *Geschichte der religiösen Aufklärung im Mittelalter*. Berlin, 1875-'77, 2 vols. Important for the skeptical and rationalistic tendencies of the Middle Ages.
- * TH. HARPER: *The Metaphysics of the School*. London, 1880 sq.
- KARL WERNER (Rom. Cath.): *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*. Wien, 1881-'87, 4 vols. (Vol. I., on Duns Scotus; II., the post-Scotist Scholasticism; III. and IV., the Last Stages of Scholasticism.)
- F. L. HETTINGER (R. Cath.): *De Theologiæ speculative ac mysticæ connubio*. Würzburg, 1882.
- FR. EHRLE (S. J.): *Beiträge zur Gesch. der mittelalterlichen Scholastik*, in "Archiv für Lit.—und Kirchengesch. des Mittelalters," Bd. I. 365 sqq. (1885), and Bd. V. 603 sqq. (1889).
- III. The relevant chapters in the Doctrine Histories of NEANDER, GIESELER

BAUR, HAGENBACH, THOMASTUS, HARNACK, and those of Roman Catholic divines, BACH (*Dogmengesch. des Mittelalters*, 1873-'75, 2 vols.) and SCHWANE (*Dogmengesch. der mittleren Zeit*, 1882). FRIEDRICH NITZSCH: Art. "Scholastische Theol." in Herzog.³ XIII. 650-675.

IV. The Histories of Philosophy by H. RITTER, UEBERWEG (who gives also the literature, 7th ed. by Heinze, 1883; see English translation by Morris I. 355 sqq.), and ERDMANN (Hough's Engl. trsl., London, 1890, Vol. I. 287-543).

NATURE AND AIM OF SCHOLASTICISM.

SCHOLASTICISM, that is the theology of the School, is the ruling theology of the Middle Ages, and retains in modified form its ascendancy in the Roman Church.¹ The ancient Church produced Fathers; the mediæval Church, Doctors or Teachers; the modern Church, Reformers. The Fathers worked in the quarries of the Scriptures, and brought out the dogmas, one by one, in conflict with heresy. The Schoolmen collected, analyzed and systematized the dogmas, and proved their reasonableness against the skeptical objections of reason. The Fathers furnished the material; the Schoolmen constructed the building.

Every religion that has a theology at all has also a scholastic theology. A period of creation is followed by a period of preservation. Judaism produced rabbinical and talmudic theology; Catholicism has its mediæval scholasticism; Protestantism has a Lutheran and a Calvinistic scholasticism. The first is based on the Mosaic law and the tradition of the Elders; the second, on the Bible and the Fathers; the third, on the Bible and the Reformers. All these forms of scholasticism are attempts to formulate and define by logic and to comprehend by the understanding the facts of revelation and the tenets of faith. New ideas are systematized, analyzed, defined, fenced in, and defended against objections.

In this logical and dialectical process they lose their original freshness and freedom. The living body of divinity, the *corpus doctrinæ*, becomes at last a corpse of divinity, and is buried.

¹ Pope Leo XIII., in an Encyclical of Aug. 4, 1879, earnestly recommended the study of the philosophy and theology of St. Thomas Aquinas, as the standard of Catholic orthodoxy.

But this is not necessary. The greatest Schoolmen, as Anselm and Thomas, were conscious of the inexhaustible depth of divine truth, which transcends the powers of logic. They combined, like Augustin, a mystic element with the scholastic, meditation and prayer with speculation, and their discussions are heated by the sacred fire of devotion. Hence they still live and will live to the end of time.

Mediæval Scholasticism made noble efforts to reconcile revelation and reason, faith and philosophy. Anselm gave a few splendid specimens, proving the existence of God and the necessity of the incarnation. Peter the Lombard and his commentators covered the whole ground and worked all the dogmas into a coherent system of knowledge illuminating every nook and corner, and answering every question concerning the mysteries of faith. They started from the Augustinian principle that "faith precedes knowledge."¹ They quoted, as a biblical proof-text, Isa. 7: 9: "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established."² With this they connected the other principle, that faith necessarily leads to knowledge. Abelard reversed the order, and made knowledge precede faith; but he arrived at the same result. Revelation and reason, faith and knowledge, theology and philosophy, agree in principle and conclusion; for they proceed from the same God who cannot contradict Himself. Scotus Erigena had anticipated this position in the ninth century, and speculative theologians and Christian philosophers of modern times accept it.

But there are different conceptions of faith and of philosophy. The scholastic divines stood on the ground of the traditional faith of the Fathers and the Councils. In the firm conviction of the truth and reasonableness of the orthodox faith,

¹ "*Fides præcedit intellectum*," or as Anselm expressed it: "*Credo ut intelligam, non intelligo ut credam*."

² According to the rendering of the Vulgate: "*Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis*." The proper translation is: "If ye will not believe, surely ye shall not be established," or, to come nearer to the Hebrew assonance: "Be firm in faith, or ye will not be made firm in fact."

they ventured on the boldest speculations, raised and answered all sorts of doubts which formerly were urged by heretics from without, and ran every dogma through a fiery ordeal to show its invulnerable nature. They were the knights of theology who fought with the weapons of logic and dialectics all the real and imaginary enemies of the Church. As there were Godfreys and Tancreds, so there were also Don Quixotes and Sancho Panzas among the knights of the scholastic tournaments.

The scholastic systems furnish a parallel to the contemporary papal hierarchy and Gothic architecture. The papacy subjected all temporal kingdoms to its divine authority; architecture made all arts tributary to worship; scholastic theology ruled philosophy as a mere handmaid, and used all available knowledge for the vindication of the orthodox faith. We must admire those lofty cathedrals of thought, which rise higher and higher till they seem to float in the air, and which reflect through their painted windows the sublime mysteries of religion. They solved the highest problems of speculation to the satisfaction of their age.

DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOLASTICISM.

Scholastic theology began with Anselm, reached its height in Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, and began to decline with Oecam, and died of old age before the Reformation. One of its last representatives was Cardinal Cajetan, the commentator of Thomas Aquinas, who as papal delegate met Luther at Augsburg in 1518, and, after vainly disputing with him, said of the German monk: "*Habet profundos oculos et mirabiles speculationes in capite suo.*"

Scholasticism achieved its greatest work in the thirteenth century, but degenerated during the fourteenth into barren formalism, and lost itself in the labyrinth of empty speculations. By analyzing, dividing, sub-dividing the articles of faith, those subtle dialecticians squeezed the very life out of them. Instead of studying the Bible and discussing topics of practical importance, they busied themselves with such idle

questions of curiosity as, how many angels could dance at the same instant on the point of a needle; or, what possible effect the sacrament of the altar may have upon a mouse. Some answered that the consecrated elements would sanctify the mouse; others, that they would kill it; still others, more wisely because less foolishly, that they would have no effect at all, since they could be partaken of only by an animal *accidentaliter*, not *sacramentaliter*.

The papacy lost its power by its towering ambition; the crusades failed in gaining the permanent possession of the Holy Land; the noblest Gothic cathedrals remained unfinished; Scholasticism, by the abuse of speculation, dug its own grave, and was conquered by biblical theology. The mediæval knight disappeared with the invention of gunpowder; the scholastic philosopher, with the discoveries of science and the progress of free thought.

Scholasticism cultivated only dogmatic and ethic, theology and the canon law. It made no original contributions to exegesis and church history. The Bible was constantly used, indeed, but chiefly as a repository of proof texts with the help of the *Catene Patrum*, or compilations of patristic comments. Church history was identified with the authoritative tradition of the Church, which included such fables as the Donation of Constantine and such forgeries as the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

THE SOURCES OF SCHOLASTICISM. AUGUSTIN AND ARISTOTLE.

The fathers and feeders of mediæval Scholasticism were St. Augustin and Aristotle. The former furnished the matter; the latter, the form. The religious ideas of the African divine were fortified by the logical and dialectical method of the Greek philosopher. The decrees and canons of Synods and the *Decretum* of Gratian were also used as authorities in addition to the sentences of the Fathers.

Augustin was, next to the inspired writers, the greatest theological authority both for Schoolmen and Mystics, as afterwards for the Reformers of the sixteenth century. He has been

called "the oracle of thirteen centuries." He impressed his mind upon every page in the history of Christian thought. But it was mainly the Catholic, churchly, sacramentarian, anti-Manichæan and anti-Donatist Augustin who ruled the Middle Ages; while the evangelical or anti-Pelagian Augustin was not properly appreciated before Luther and Calvin, who adopted and reproduced his doctrines of sin and grace. How strange that the same mighty intellect who helped to rear the imposing structure of Scholasticism should have aided the Reformers in pulling it down!

The heathen Aristotle was the greatest philosophical authority of the Schoolmen. He was, in the estimation of the Middle Ages, the master-thinker, as Virgil was the master-poet. As the noblest of the heathen, both were mercifully assigned a place in the outer court of the Church. Dante consistently excludes them from Paradise and Purgatory, and places them in the vestibule of the Inferno, but without actual suffering, and Virgil accompanies him to the very threshold of Paradise. The Schoolmen revered Aristotle as a Moses or John the Baptist in the intellectual field, as a forerunner of the truth which came with Christ. His logical formulas or scheme of reasoning, his dialectical acuteness, the fertility and general applicability of his method seemed to them to be the only or the surest way to the knowledge and defense of the truth.

Aristotle's Greek writings were not accessible to Christian Europe till after the downfall of Constantinople, and, with the exception of John Scotus Erigena, the Schoolmen were almost wholly ignorant of Greek. He was known, however, from extracts by Cassiodorus and Boëthius (d. 524), and from Latin translations of Arabic versions and commentaries of Mohammedan scholars in Asia (Bagdad) and Spain (Cordova), as Avicenna (980-1036), Ghazali or Algazel (1059-1111), Averrhoës (1126-1198). The Spanish Jews also cultivated the study of Aristotle and of the Neo-Platonists, and influenced Christian scholasticism, especially Moses Maimonides (1135-1204).¹

¹ On the Moslem and Jewish philosophers, see Ueberweg, I. 402-428.

At first the study of Aristotle was looked upon with suspicion, and was even temporarily prohibited by popes and synods, as breeding heresy and intellectual pride. Simon de Tourney, a zealous champion of Aristotelian philosophy, was misled by conceit into blasphemy, and became dumb and childish.¹ But from the beginning of the thirteenth century, when the greatest Schoolmen made use of the Stagirite for the defense of the doctrines of the Church, his authority continued unabated to the period of the Reformation, when for a time it was shaken to its base.

Luther denounced in unmeasured terms "the damned heathen Aristotle," as he called him in a fit of wrath against the degenerate Schoolmen of his day. Melancthon, with all his superior knowledge and admiration of Greek literature, at first banished philosophy altogether from Christian theology. But in his maturer writings, especially in his *Ethic*, he availed himself of the aid of Aristotelian and scholastic logic and dialectic. Luther himself, in defending his ubiquitous theory of the Eucharist, resorted to the scholastic distinctions of various kinds of presence; and the Lutheran and Calvinistic divines of the seventeenth century reduce the doctrines of the Reformation to a scholastic system.

NOMINALISM AND REALISM.

- F. EXNER: *Ueber Nominalismus und Realismus*. Prague, 1842.
 H. O. KÖHLER: *Realismus und Nominalismus in ihrem Einfluss auf die dogmatischen Systeme des Mittelalters*. Gotha, 1858.
 HERMANN DOERGERS: *Zur Lehre von den Universalien*. Heidelberg, 1867.
 PRANTL: *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande*. Vol. II. Leipzig, 3rd ed., 1867.
 J. H. LÖWE: *Der Kampf zwischen dem Realismus und Nominalismus im Mittelalter*. Prague, 1876.
 Comp. NEANDER, IV. 359 sqq. (Am. ed.); ULLMANN: *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, II. 327 sqq.; UEBERWEG: *History of Philosophy*, I. 367-377

¹ After a brilliant defense of the dogma of the Trinity, he said: "*O Jesule, Jesule, quantum in hac questione confirmavi legem tuam et exaltavi. Profecto si malignando et adversando vellem, fortioribus rationibus et argumentis scirem illam infirmare et deprimendq̄ improbare.*"

(trsl. of Morris); and an appendix to *Bain's Mental and Moral Science* (London, 1868).

At the root of all scholastic speculations lay the problem of the relation between subjective thought and objective existence, between the conception of a thing and the thing itself. More particularly, it was the question concerning the nature of the general or generic conceptions, called *universalia*, such as man, animal, tree, in distinction from particular men, animals, trees.¹

On this question the Schoolmen were divided into two contending camps,—REALISTS and NOMINALISTS.

The Realists taught that the *universalia* exist really or in fact as well as in the mind. They were subdivided into two classes: the Platonic Realists contended that the *universalia* are *ante rem*, that is, the creative types of individual things in the divine mind; the Aristotelian Realists held that the *universalia* are *in re*, that is, the general substance of particular existences. Socrates is a man, partaking of the general human nature, and is at the same time an individual, distinct from all other men. The second kind of realism is also called *formalism*, as it conceives of the ideas as the primitive forms (*formæ nativæ*) of things.²

The Nominalists maintained that the general conceptions have no objective existence and are mere names (*nomina, flatus vocis*), or abstractions from concrete, individual beings and things (*universalia post rem*). Some, however, allowed them an ideal and necessary subjective existence in the mind.

¹ Sometimes the term *universalia* was applied to the five general conceptions of the Aristotelian logic, the so-called *prædicabilia*, γένος, εἶδος, διαφορά, ἴδιον, συµβεβηκός, or *genus, species, differentia, proprium, accidens*. The controversy seems to have started in a passage from the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, known to the contestants only in the translations of Boëthius. Porphyry raises the question whether the *universalia* are realities, or mere words, but declines to enter into a discussion.

² Roger Bacon, in the thirteenth century (*Opus majus*, P. I., c. 6, f. 28), states the different theories thus: "*Aliqui ponunt ea (universalia) solum in anima, aliqui extra, aliqui medio modo.*"

The philosophical controversy assumed practical importance when it was applied to theology, especially to the doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and to the doctrine of original sin.

Realism was the prevailing theory till the close of the eleventh century, when Roscellin, a canon at Compiègne,¹ and founder of a school of dialectics, proclaimed the theory of Nominalism in its extreme form. From a letter of Abelard, a pupil though not a disciple, of Roscellin, to the Bishop of Paris, we learn that he even denied the reality of the distinction of parts in an object, declaring them to be merely subjective and verbal. In his application of the nominalist principle to the dogma of the Trinity, he could not avoid falling into open tritheism. Regarding the idea of Deity (divine nature, divine essence), like all general conceptions, as a mere abstraction of the understanding, he ascribed objective existence only to the three Persons, and made them three beings equal in will and power, like three angels or three men.² If the general divine essence were a real existence, it would follow that not only the Son, but the Father and the Holy Spirit also became incarnate. Nominalism could not admit two natures in Christ without dividing Him into two persons. It was opposed to the Augustinian theory of a race-sin in Adam's fall, and of a race redemption, distinct from individual redemption. But these consequences were not all drawn.

In opposition to the tritheistic Nominalism of Roscellin, Anselm of Canterbury defended Realism and the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity.³ He charged against Roscellin, that he could not rise above the sensual and empirical; that he made all true knowledge impossible, and had no room for an incarnation or a union of the divine nature with the human nature, since he acknowledged only divine and human persons.

The tritheism of Roscellin was condemned by a Council of

¹ Roscellinus, also Rucelinus de Compendio.

² "Tres res per se, sicut tres angeli aut tres anime."

³ *De Fide Trinitatis et de Incarnatione Verbi contra blasphemias Rucelini* (written 1094).

Soissons under the lead of the Archbishop of Rheims (1093). He retired from public sight.

This action was fatal to Nominalism for a long time. Realism in its various forms prevailed down to the fourteenth century. Anselm represented the Platonic realism of the *universalia ante rem*; Duns Scotus and the later Realists adopted the Aristotelian theory of the *universalia in re*.

Nominalism was revived by William Occam (d. 1347) in concealed connection with a skeptical and Protestant turn of mind. Occam, called the *venerabilis inceptor*, taught that the *universale* or generic idea is nothing real, either in or outside of the mind, but has only an imaginary existence. He sided with Louis of Bavaria against the Pope, and opposed various abuses in the Church. He professed, it is true, absolute submission to the orthodox creed, but so repeatedly and emphatically, that his sincerity has been questioned; he may have done so to enforce his opposition to the hierarchy.

Repeated attempts were made to put down Nominalism, as a dangerous innovation, and Louis XI. even threatened the Nominalists with perpetual banishment, but in vain; he had to recall his edict (1481). Nominalism was embraced by the Schoolmen of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, D'Ailly, Gerson, Buridanus, Marsilius of Inghen, by the forerunners of the Reformation (with the exception of Wiclif, Hus and Jerome of Prague, who were Realists), and by the Reformers themselves, as far as they took part in scholastic questions.

The prevalence of Nominalism was one of the silent forces which encouraged criticism and innovation, and undermined faith in the traditional orthodoxy and in scholasticism itself, as a philosophic defense of the catholic faith. It indirectly promoted also empirical and natural sciences by laying stress on experience as a foundation of knowledge.

Under this aspect Alexander von Humboldt assigns to Nominalism a place in the development of physical science. But he speaks highly also of earlier Schoolmen, especially Albert the Great and Roger Bacon, who comprehended all the learning

of the thirteenth century and had a deep insight into some mysteries of nature. The study of Aristotelian philosophy promoted the empirical study of nature, as may be seen from the Arabic scholars of the Middle Ages. Humboldt connects even the discovery of America with the scholastic speculations of the thirteenth century.¹

MYSTICISM AND SCHOLASTICISM.

LITERATURE.

- G. ARNOLD: *Historie und Beschreibung der mystischen Theologie*. Frankf., 1703.
 BERGER: *Disputatio de mysticismo*. Harlem, 1819.
 H. SCHMID: *Der Mysticismus des Mittelalters, in seiner Entstehungsperiode dargestellt*. Jena, 1824.
 THOLUCK: *Blüthensammlung aus der morgenländischen Mystik*. Berlin, 1825. (327 pp.) See Witte, *Leben Tholuck's*, I. 360-369.
 HEINROTH: *Geschichte und Kritik des Mysticismus aller bekannten Völker und Zeiten*. 1830.
 HÖFLING: *Der wahrhaft historische Mysticismus*. Erlangen, 1832.
 THEREMIN: *Ueber das Wesen der mystischen Theologie*. In the "Abendstunden," Berlin, 1833.
 FERD. CHR. BAUR: *Die Christl. Gnosis in ihrer geschichtl. Entwicklung*. Tübingen, 1835.
 J. GÖRRES (Prof. of History in Munich, founder of German ultramontanism, d. 1848): *Die Christliche Mystik*. Regensb., 1836-'42, 4 vols. (Vol. IV. in 2 parts). An intensely mystical book; a product of genius and fancy rather than of sober, historical investigation.
 CHARLES SCHMIDT: *Essai sur les mystiques du 14 siècle, précédé d'une introduction sur l'origine et la nature du mysticisme*. Strassb., 1836.
 A. HELFFERICH: *Die Christl. Mystik in ihrer Entwicklung und in ihren Denkmalen*. Gotha, 1842, 2 parts.
 FRZ. PFEIFFER: *Deutsche Mystiker des 14 Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig, 1845-'57, 2 vols.
 NOACK: *Die Christl. Mystik nach ihrem geschichtl. Entwicklungsgang*. Königsberg, 1863, 2 parts.
 BÖHBINGER: *Die Deutschen Mystiker des 14 und 15ten Jahrh.* Zurich, 1855.
 R. A. VAUGHAN: *Hours with the Mystics*. London, 1856; 3rd ed., 1880, 2 vols.
 J. HAMBERGER: *Stimmen der Mystik aus dem Heiligtum der Christl. Mystik und Theosophie*. Stuttgart, 1857, 2 parts.
 M. JOCHAM: *Lichtstrahlen aus den Schriften katholischer Mystik*. München, 1876 sq.

¹ *Kosmos*, Vol. II., 282 sq. (German ed.).

H. S. DENIFLE (R. Cath.): *Das geistl. Leben. Eine Blumenlese aus den deutschen Mystikern und Gottesfreunden des 14 Jahrh.* Graz, 3rd ed., 1880.

W. PREGER (Oberconsistorialrath in Munich): *Geschichte der Deutschen Mystik, im Mittelalter.* Leipzig, 1874-'93. First Part, till Eckart; Second Part, till Suso; Third Part, Tauler, der Gottesfreund vom Oberlande, Merswin.

CARL DU PREL: *Die Philosophie der Mystik.* Leipzig, 1885.

Mysticism or mystic theology aims at a direct communion with the infinite Spirit. It closes the outward eye, and seeks to see God with the inward eye and to enjoy Him face to face. Religion is based upon mystery, and God is the mystery of mysteries which transcends all thought, and yet unceasingly attracts the deepest thought. Hence almost every religion, the Jewish and Mohammedan as well as the Christian, has its mysticism. The Greek, the Latin, and the Protestant Churches have produced several schools of mystics,—sound and morbid, sober and extravagant, orthodox and heretical, churchly and separatistic. A distinction is sometimes made between mystic and mysticism, as also between scholastic and scholasticism.

Scholasticism and Mysticism are two different tendencies, which supplement or antagonize each other. As long as they keep within the limits of revealed truth, the difference between them is merely psychological. Paul and John represent the two distinct types in friendly relationship, and furnish inspiration to both schools of theology. The deepest thinkers approach each other on both lines. Augustin, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, had a mystic vein. Every Christian is a mystic as far as he bends reverently before the divine mysteries and longs for immediate union with God and Christ.

Scholastic theology may be called the theology of the intellect; mystic theology, the theology of feeling. The former proceeds from the head; the latter, from the heart. The one is logical and speculative; the other is contemplative and emotional. The Schoolman endeavors to attain the conception of God and divine things by reflection and the process of reasoning; the Mystic, by direct intuition and adoration. The one tends easily, though not necessarily, to rationalism; the other,

to pantheism.¹ The mystic divine shrinks from cold, dialectic speculation, deeming it to be a profanation of what is holy. Overleaping the boundaries of patient research, he hopes to grasp and enjoy the infinite by love and by prayer. God, says St. Bernard, is more easily and worthily sought and found by prayer than by disputation. God is known, says Hugo of St. Victor, so far only as He is loved. His disciple, Walter of St. Victor, calls Abelard, Peter the Lombard, Gilbert and Peter of Poitiers the four labyrinths of France, and protested that, under the inspiration of Aristotle, they had treated the ineffable mysteries of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation with scholastic levity. Dante puts a very high estimate on Thomas Aquinas as the master of scholastic theology, but places St. Bernard still higher, and is led by him through prayer to the beatific vision of the Holy Trinity, with which his "sacred poem" closes.

The mystic as well as the scholastic theologians appealed to St. Augustin, who combined the two; but in philosophy they parted entirely. As Scholasticism was wedded to Aristotle, Mysticism took for its guide Dionysius the Areopagite, a Christian Neo-Platonist of the fifth century, whose mystic writings were translated from the Greek by Scotus Erigena in the ninth century, and exerted a great influence throughout the Middle Ages upon scholastics as well as mystics, especially on Thomas Aquinas.²

¹The tendency of scholasticism toward rationalism is very manifest in Abelard; but other speculative philosophers, like Scotus, Erigena, Spinoza, and Hegel were pantheists. The tendency of mysticism to pantheistic intoxication and absorption in the ocean of divine love shows itself in various forms in Master Eckard, Jacob Boehme, and is most daringly expressed by the famous hymnist, Scheffler,—popularly called Angelus Silesius (first a Lutheran, then a Jesuit, d. 1677), in his "Cherubinische Wandersmann," where he has the audacity to say:

*"Gott ist so viel an mir, als mir an Ihm gelegen,
Sein Wesen helf ich Ihm, wie Er das meine, hegen."*

²See Schaff's *Church History*, IV., § 187, pp. 589-901. Corderius asserts that the "Angelic Doctor [Thomas Aquinas] drew almost the whole of his

The greatest scholastics had, as already remarked, combined the two tendencies, like Augustin. In Abelard and St. Bernard, scholasticism and mysticism came into violent conflict; then they united again, or developed independently. When Scholasticism degenerated into barren speculation, Mysticism defended the inwardness and spirituality of religion, and prepared the way for the moral reformation of the Church.

There are different kinds and schools of Mysticism. Speculative mysticism or theosophy aims at the knowledge of the being of God. Emotional mysticism desires to enjoy the loveliness of God. Practical mysticism seeks a union with the will of God and the imitation of the life of Christ by conforming to His example. The last is the most useful, and is best represented by Tauler and Thomas à Kempis. All these forms may be churchly and orthodox, or unchurchly and heretical. "The Imitation of Christ" by Thomas à Kempis remains to this day the noblest monument of the sound, practical and devotional type of mediæval Mysticism.

theology out of the pseudo-Dionysian books, so that his *Summa* is but the hive in whose varied cells he duly stored the honey which he gathered from them." See Migne's ed. of Dionysius, I. 96.