tine, and usually regarded as the composition of six authors,—Ælius Spartianus, Julius Capitolinus, Ælius Lampridius, Vulcatius Gallicanus, Trebellius Pollio, and Flavius Vopiscus. Upon investigation, however, there appears good reason for reducing these writers to four. The distribution of the respective biographies among them, according to the arrangement of the MSS., is supported by no extraneous authority, and depends upon no intelligible principle. Without entering into detail, for which space fails us, it must suffice to state that up to and including the biography of Alexander Severus, the authorship of the various memoirs is interchanged among Spartianus, Lampridius, and Capitolinus, in a manner only explicable upon the hypothesis of a division of labour among these writers, or on that of their having selected their subjects entirely at random. The latter is contradicted by their own affirmations, and no trace of any mutual concert is discoverable, neither is there any perceptible difference of style. When, therefore, we find the excerpts in the Palatine MS. assigning all the biographies preceding that of Maximin to Spartianus alone, and remark that his prænomen and that of Lampridius are alike given as Ælius, we cannot avoid suspecting with Casaubon and Salmasius that the full name was Ælius Lampridius Spartianus, and that two authors have been manufactured out of one. We further find Spartianus observing, at the commencement of his life of Ælius Verus, that having written the lives of all the emperors who had borne the title of Augustus from Julius Cæsar down to Hadrian, he purposes from that point to comprise the Cæsars also. This excludes the idea of his having written without a plan, or in concert with any colleague. His biographies are regularly dedicated to Diocletian down to that of Pescennius Niger, after which, with one exception, probably due to the corruption of the MSS., they are inscribed to Constantine, as would naturally be the case with a work continued under this prince's reign after having been commenced under his predecessor's. We may also with probability ascribe to Spartianus the life of Avidius Cassius, attributed in the MSS. to Vulcatius Gallicanus, but whose author describes his undertaking in terms almost identical with those employed by Spartianus. No biography subsequent to that of Alexander Severus is attributed to Spartianus by any MS., and the next series, comprising the Maximins, the Gordians, and Maximus and Balbinus, is undoubtedly the production of Julius Capitolinus, who addresses his work to Constantine, and professedly proceeds, in some respects, upon a different plan from his predecessor. The work of Spartianus must have remained incomplete, and Capitolinus must have proposed to fill up the interval between him and Trebellius Pollio, who dedicates his life of Claudius Gothicus to Constantius Chlorus, and whom we know, from the testimony of Vopiscus, to have written the lives of the Philippi and their successors up to Claudius, some years before 303 A.D. In that year (and not 291 A.D., as supposed by Salmasius and Clinton) Vopiscus was solicited by the urban prefect, Junius Tiberianus, to undertake the life of Aurelian; this biography appears from internal evidence to have been published by 307 A.D., and the lives of Aurelian's successors down to Carinus were added before the death of Diocletian in 313. We may therefore reduce the Augustan historians from six to four, and assign their respective shares as follows: To Spartianus, the biographies from Julius Cæsar to Alexander Severus, all anterior to Hadrian being lost; to Capitolinus, those from Maximin to the younger Gordian; to Trebellius Pollio, the lives of Valerian, Gallienus, the "Thirty Tyrants," and Claudius Gothicus, those of the Philippi, the Decii, Gallus, Æmilianus, and part of Valerian's being lost; to Vopiscus, the remainder, from Aurelian to Carinus. Some difficulty is created by the mention of Capitolinus, the latest biographer in order of composition, by his predecessor Vopiscus, but the passage may be an interpolation, or may refer to some other work.

The importance of the Augustan history as a repertory of information is very considerable, but its literary pretensions are of the humblest order. The writers' standard was confessedly low. "My purpose," says Vopiscus, "has been to provide materials for more eloquent persons than myself." Considering the perverted taste of the age, it is perhaps fortunate that the task fell into the hands of no showy declaimer, who measured his success by his skill in making surface do duty for substance, but of homely, matter-of-fact scribes, whose sole concern was to record what they knew. Their narrative is most unmethodical and inartificial; their style is tame and plebeian; their conception of biography is that of a collection of anecdotes; they have no notion of arrangement, no measure of proportion, and no criterion of discrimination between the important and the trivial; they are equally destitute of critical and of historical insight, unable to sift the authorities on which they rely, and unsuspicious of the stupendous social revolution comprised within the period which they undertake to describe. Their value, consequently, depends very much on that of the sources to which they happen to have recourse for any given period of history, and on the fidelity of their adherence to these when valuable. Marius Maximus and Junius Cordus, to whose qualifications they themselves bear no favourable testimony, were their chief authorities for the earlier lives of the series. For the later they have been obliged to resort more largely to public records, and have thus preserved matter of the highest importance, rescuing from oblivion many imperial rescripts and senatorian decrees, reports of official proceedings and speeches on public occasions, and a number of interesting and characteristic letters from various emperors. Their incidental allusions sometimes cast vivid though undesigned light on the circumstances of the age, and they have made large contributions to our knowledge of imperial jurisprudence in particular. Even their trivialities have their use; their endless anecdotes respecting the personal habits of the subjects of their biographies, if valueless to the historian, are most acceptable to the archæologist, and not unimportant to the economist and moralist. Their errors and deficiencies may in part be ascribed to the contemporary neglect of history as a branch of instruction. Education was in the hands of rhetoricians and grammarians; historians were read for their style, not for their matter, and since the days of Tacitus, none had arisen worth a schoolmaster's notice. We thus find Vopiscus acknowledging that when he began to write the life of Aurelian, he was entirely misinformed respecting the latter's competitor Firmus, and implying that he would not have ventured on Aurelian himself if he had not had access to the MS. of the emperor's own diary in the Ulpian library. The writers' historical estimates are superficial and conventional, but report the verdict of public opinion with substantial accuracy. The only imputation on the integrity of any of them lies against Trebellius Pollio, who, addressing his work to a descendant of Claudius, the successor and probably the assassin of Gallienus, has dwelt upon the latter versatile sovereign's carelessness and extravagance without acknowledgment of the elastic though fitful energy he so frequently displayed in defence of the empire. The caution of Vopiscus's references to Diocletian cannot be made a reproach to him.

No biographical particulars are recorded respecting any of these writers. From their acquaintance with Latin and Greek literature they must have been men of letters by profession, and very probably secretaries or librarians to persons of distinction. They appear particularly versed in

law. Spartianus's reference to himself as "Diocletian's own" seems to indicate that he was a domestic in the imperial household. They address their patrons with deference, acknowledging their own deficiencies, and seem painfully conscious of the profession of literature having fallen upon evil days.

The first edition of the *Augustan History* was printed at Milan in 1475, by Bonus Accursius, along with Suetonius. Being based upon the best MSS. it is superior to any of its successors until Casaubon's (1603). Casaubon manifested great critical ability in his notes, but for want of a good MS. left the restoration of the text to Salmasius (1620), whose notes are a most remarkable monument of erudition combined with acuteness in verbal criticism and general vigour of intellect. Little has since been done for the improvement of the text, which is still in a very unsatisfactory state. The most accurate edition is that by Jordan and Eyssenhardt (Berlin, 1863), grounded on a collation of the Bamberg MS. with the Palatine (now the Vatican) used by Salmasius. The most important separate dissertations on the Augustan historians are that on the sixth volume of Heine's *Opuscula Philologica*; Brocks's essay on the first four of them (Königsberg, 1869); Dirksen's elucidation of their references to Roman jurisprudence (Leipsic, 1842); Peter's critical emendations (Posen, 1863); Brunner's monograph on Vopiscus in the second volume of Büdinger's *Untersuchungen zur Römischen Kaisergeschichte*, and J. Müller's disquisition in the third (Leipsic, 1868–69). There is no English translation. (R. G.)

AUGUSTI, JOHN CHRISTIAN WILLIAM, a distinguished German theologian, was born at Eschenberga, near Gotha, in 1772. He was of Jewish descent, his grandfather having been a rabbi who had been converted to the Christian faith. His early education he received partly from Moller, pastor of Gierstädt, who introduced him to the study of Hebrew, and partly at the gymnasium at Gotha. He then proceeded to the university of Jena, and completed his studies there in 1793. In 1798 he obtained a post as privat-docent, or university lecturer on philosophy, and began to turn his attention chiefly to Oriental subjects. In 1800 he was made professor extraordinary of philosophy, and three years after was appointed to the chair of Oriental languages. In 1808 he received the degree of doctor of theology, and in 1812 accepted a call to the chair of theology at the recently renovated university of Breslau. During the troubled years 1813 and 1814 he acted as rector, and received great praise for his firm and judicious conduct. In 1819 he was transferred to the university of Bonn, and in 1828 he united with his professorship the office of director of the consistory. He died at Coblentz in 1841. Augusti had little sympathy with the modern philosophical interpretations of dogma, and although he took up a position of free criticism with regard to the Biblical narratives, he yet held fast to the traditional faith. His works on theology (*History of Dogma*, 1805, and *System of Dogmatics*, 1809) are simple statements of fact, and do not attempt a speculative treatment of their subjects. In addition to several exegetical works, his most important writings are the *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, 12 vols., 1817–31, a partially digested mass of materials, and the *Handbuch der Christ. Archäologie*, 3 vols., 1836–7, which gives the substance of the larger work in a more compact and systematic form.

AUGUSTINE (AURELIUS AUGUSTINUS), one of the four great fathers of the Latin Church, and admittedly the greatest of the four, more profound than Ambrose, his spiritual father, more original and systematic than Jerome, his contemporary and correspondent, and intellectually far more distinguished than Gregory the Great, the last of the series. The theological position and influence of Augustine may be said to be unrivalled. No single name has ever exercised such power over the Christian church, and no one mind ever made such an impression upon Christian thought.

Aurelius Augustinus was born at Tagaste (Tajelt), a town of Numidia, on the 13th of November 354 A.D. His father, Patricius, was a burgess of this town, and was still a pagan at the time of his son's birth. His mother, Monica, was not only a Christian, but a woman of the most elevated, tender, and devoted piety, whose patient prayerfulness for both her husband and son (at length crowned with success in both cases), and whose affectionate and beautiful enthusiasm, have passed into a touching type of womanly saintliness for all ages. She early instructed her son in the faith and love of Jesus Christ, and for a time her instruction seems to have impressed his youthful mind. Falling ill he wished to be baptised; but when the danger was past, the rite was deferred, and, notwithstanding all his mother's admonitions and prayers, he grew up without any profession of Christian piety, or any devotion to Christian principles. Inheriting from his father a vehement and sensual disposition, he early gave way to the unbridled impulses of passion, and while still a mere youth, formed a connection, common enough at the time, but at variance with the principles of Christian morality. As the result of the connection he became the father of a son, whom he named Adeodatus in a fit of pious emotion, and to whom he was passionately attached.

In the midst of all his youthful pleasures Augustine was an earnest student. His father, observing the early development of his talents, formed the ambition of training him to the brilliant and lucrative career of a rhetorician, and he seems to have spared no expense to equip him for this career. The youth studied not only at his native town, but at Madaura and Carthage, and especially devoted himself to the Latin poets—many traces of his love for which are to be found in his writings. His acquaintance with Greek literature was much more limited, and, indeed, it has been doubted whether he could use, in the original, either the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures.[1] Apparently, he was in the habit of using translations of Plato (*Confess.*, viii. 2), but, on the other hand, Greek words frequently occur in his writings correctly rendered and discriminated; and he speaks in one of his epistles to Marcellinus (LIX. tom. ii. 294) of referring to the Greek Psalter and finding, in reference to certain difficulties, that it agreed with the Vulgate. Clausen, who has particularly investigated the point, sums up the evidence to the effect that Augustine was "fairly instructed in Greek grammar, and a subtle distinguisher of words," but that beyond this his knowledge was insufficient for a thorough comprehension of Greek books, and especially for those in the Hellenistic dialect.

While a student at Carthage he was particularly attracted by the theatre, the spectacles at which were of unusual magnificence. To his enthusiastic and sensuous spirit they were irresistible, and the extent to which he seems to have yielded to the fascination is sufficient proof of his active alienation from Christianity at this period. The Christian church, as it has been said, "abhorred the pagan theatre. The idolatrous rites, the lascivious attitudes, the gladiatorial shows, which were its inseparable accompaniments, were equally opposed to the dogmatic monotheism, to the piety, and to the mercy of the gospel." One of the most significant signs of a man having become a Christian was his habitual absence from the theatre. No one was more emphatic on this point afterwards than Augustine himself, and as the result of his own experience, he seems to have doubted, apart from the gross immoralities of the pagan stage, whether the indulgence in fictitious joys and woes is a warrantable excitement (*Confess.*, iii. 2).

Cicero's *Hortensius*, which he read in his nineteenth year, first awakened in Augustine's mind the spirit of specula-

[1] "Augustinus extitit, ut alii, Ebrææ ac Græcæ linguæ ignarus." (Walch, *Bibl. Patrist.*, p. 252.) "Imperitus non tantum Hebraicæ sed etiam Græcæ linguæ, ipsos fontes adire non potuit, sed solam fere translationem Latinam explicare conatus est."—(Rosenmüller, *Hist. Interpret.*, iii. 40.)

tion. He engaged restlessly in philosophical studies, and passed from one phase of thought to another, unable to find satisfaction in any. Manichæism first enthralled him. Its doctrine of two principles, one of good and one of evil, seemed to answer to the wild confusion of his own heart, and the conflict of higher and lower impulses which raged within him. It seemed to solve the mysteries which perplexed him in his own experience and in the world. He became a member of the sect, and entered into the class of *auditors*. His ambition was to be received among the number of the *Elect*, and so get to the heart of what he believed to be their higher knowledge. But falling in with Faustus, a distinguished Manichæan bishop and disputant, and entering into discussion with him, he was greatly disappointed. The system lost its attraction for him; he gradually became disgusted, and abandoned it. But before this he had left Carthage, shocked with the licence of the students, and had betaken himself for a time to Rome in the pursuit of his profession. There he also soon became dissatisfied, and accepted an invitation to proceed to Milan, where the people were in search of a teacher of rhetoric. He travelled thither at the public expense, and was welcomed by friends who already seem to have recognised his distinction (*Confess.*, i. 16).

At Milan the conflict of his mind in search of truth still continued. He was now in his thirtieth year, and for eleven years he had been seeking for mental rest, unable to find it. "To-morrow," he said to himself, "I shall find it: it will appear manifestly, and I shall grasp it" (*Confess.*, vi. 18). But it still eluded his grasp, and he sunk back again into despondency. The way, however, was being prepared for his conversion. Ambrose was bishop of Milan, and, although he had a weak voice, was noted for his eloquence. Augustine was attracted by his reputation, and went to hear the famous Christian preacher in order, as he himself relates (*Confess.*, v. 23), "to see whether his eloquence answered what was reported of it. I hung on his words attentively," he adds, "but of the matter I was but an unconcerned and contemptuous hearer." He confesses his delight so far: "The bishop's eloquence was more full of knowledge, yet in manner less pleasurable and soothing, than that of Faustus." He wished an opportunity of conversation with him, but this was not easily found. Ambrose had no leisure for philosophic discussion. He was accessible to all who sought him, but never for a moment free from study or the cares of duty. "Augustine used to enter, as all persons might, without being announced; but after staying for a while, afraid of interrupting him, he departed again." He continued, however, to hear Ambrose preach, and gradually the gospel of divine truth and grace was received into his heart. First Plato and then St Paul opened his mind to higher thoughts, and at length certain words of the latter were driven home with irresistible force to his conscience. He was busy with his friend Alypius in studying the Pauline epistles. His struggle of mind became intolerable; the thought of divine purity fighting in his heart with the love of the world and of the flesh. He burst into an incontrollable flood of tears and rushed out into his garden, flinging himself under a fig tree that he might allow his tears to have full vent, and pour out his heart to God. Suddenly he seemed to hear a voice calling upon him to consult the divine oracle, "Take up and read, take up and read." He left off weeping, rose up, and sought the volume where Alypius was sitting, and opening it read in silence the following passage: "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof" (Rom. xiii. 13, 14). He adds, "I had neither desire nor need to read farther. As I finished the sentence, as though the light of peace had been poured into my heart, all the shadows of doubt dispersed. Thus hast Thou converted me to Thee, so as no longer to seek either for wife or other hope of the world, standing fast in that rule of faith in which Thou so many years before hadst revealed me to my mother" (*Confess.*, viii. 30).

After his conversion, which is supposed to have occurred in the summer of 386, Augustine gave up his profession as a teacher of rhetoric, and retired to a friend's house in the country, in order to prepare himself for baptism. His religious opinions were still to some extent unformed, and even his habits by no means altogether such as his great change demanded. He mentions, for example, that during this time he broke himself off a habit of profane swearing, and in other ways sought to discipline his character and conduct for the reception of the sacred rite. He received baptism in Easter following, in his thirty-third year; and along with him his son Adeodatus and his friend Alypius were admitted to the Christian church. Monica, his mother, had rejoined him, and at length rejoiced in the fulfilment of her prayers. Dying before his return to his native country, her last hours were gladdened by his Christian sympathy. She implored him to lay her body anywhere, but wherever he might be to remember her "at the altar of the Lord," a devout duty which he invites others to share with him, so that her last request may, "through the prayers of many," receive a more abundant fulfilment.

Augustine went back to Rome for a short period and then returned to his native city, where he took up his abode in retirement, forming, with some friends who joined him in devotion, a small religious community, which looked to him as its head. They had all things in common, as in the early church, and fasting and prayer, Scripture reading and almsgiving, formed their regular occupations. Their mode of life was not formally monastic according to any special rule, but the experience of this time of seclusion was, no doubt, the basis of that monastic system which Augustine afterwards sketched, and which derived from him its name. Solitary monasticism had sprang up in the Egyptian deserts before this. The life of St Anthony by Athanasius had widely diffused the fervour for religious solitariness, and greatly touched Augustine at this period of his profession. It did not remain for him, therefore, to originate the monastic idea; but the association of monks in communities under a definite order and head received a special impulse both from Ambrose and his illustrious convert. As may be imagined, the fame of such a convert in such a position soon spread, and invitations to a more active ecclesiastical life came to him from many quarters. He shrank from the responsibility, but his destiny was not to be avoided. After three years spent in retirement he took a journey to Hippo, to see a Christian friend, who desired to converse with him as to his design of quitting the world and devoting himself to a religious life. He was the less reluctant to make this journey, because there being already a bishop at Hippo he hoped to escape all solicitation. But although the Christian community there had a bishop, they wanted a presbyter; and Augustine being present at the meeting called to choose a presbyter, the people unanimously chose him. He burst into tears, and would fain have escaped; but the church could not spare his services. He was ordained to the presbyterate, and in a few years afterwards he was made coadjutor to the bishop, and finally became sole bishop of the see.

Henceforth Augustine's life is filled up with his ecclesiastical labours, and is more marked by the series of his numerous writings and the great controversies in which they engaged him than by anything else. Already he had distinguished himself as an author. He had written several

philosophical treatises; he had combated the scepticism of the New Academy (*Contra Academicos libri tres*, 386 A.D.); he had treated of the "Blessed Life" (*De vita beata*, 386) and of the "Immortality of the Soul" (*De Immortalitate Animæ*, 387); he had defended the church against the Manichæans, whose doctrines he had formerly professed. "When I was at Rome," he says (*Retract.*, i. 7), "after my baptism, and could not hear in silence the vaunting of the Manichæans over true Christians, to whom they are not to be compared, I wrote two books, one on *The Morals of the Catholic Church*, and the other on *The Morals of the Manichæans*." These tracts or pamphlets, for they are little more, were written in the year 388, about two years after his conversion. Later, in 395, and again in 400, he pursued the controversy with the Manichæans, making an elaborate reply, in the latter year, to his old associate and friend Faustus. The reply was provoked by an attack made by Faustus on the Catholic faith, which the "brethren" invited Augustine to answer. This he did characteristically and energetically by giving in succession "the opinions of Faustus, as if stated by himself," and his own in response. It was natural that the Manichæan heresy, which had so long enslaved his own mind, should have first exercised Augustine's great powers as a theological thinker and disputant. He was able from his own experience to give force to his arguments for the unity of creation and of spiritual life, and to strengthen the mind of the Christian church in its last struggle with that dualistic spirit which had animated and moulded in succession so many forms of thought at variance with Christianity.

But the time was one of almost universal ecclesiastical and intellectual excitement; and so powerful a mental activity as his was naturally drawn forth in all directions. Following his writings against the Manichæans come those against the Donatists. This controversy was one which strongly interested him, involving as it did the whole question of the constitution of the church and the idea of catholic order, to which the circumstances of the age gave special prominence. The Donatist schism sprang out of the Diocletian persecutions in the beginning of the century. A party in the Church of Carthage, fired with fanatical zeal on behalf of those who had distinguished themselves by resistance to the imperial mandates and courted martyrdom, resented deeply the appointment of a bishop of moderate opinions, whose consecration had been performed, they alleged, by a *traditor*. They set up, in consequence, a bishop of their own, of the name of Majorinus, succeeded in 315 by Donatus. The party made great pretensions to purity of discipline, and rapidly rose in popular favour, notwithstanding a decision given against them both by the bishop of Rome and by the Emperor Constantine, to whom they personally appealed. Augustine was strongly moved by the lawlessness of the party, and launched forth a series of writings against them, the most important of which survive, though some are lost. Amongst these are *Seven Books on Baptism*, and a lengthened answer, in three books, to Petilian, bishop of Cirta, who was the most eminent theologian amongst the Donatist divines. At a somewhat later period, about 417, he wrote a treatise concerning the correction of the Donatists (*De Correctione Donatistarum*), "for the sake of those," he says in his *Retractations*, ii. c. 48, "who were not willing that the Donatists should be subjected to the correction of the imperial laws." In these writings, while vigorously maintaining the validity of the Catholic Church as it then stood in the Roman world, and the necessity for moderation in the exercise of church discipline, Augustine yet gave currency, in his zeal against the Donatists, to certain maxims as to the duty of the civil power to control schism, which were of evil omen, and have been productive of much disaster in the history of Christianity.

The third controversy in which Augustine engaged was the most important, and the most intimately associated with his distinctive greatness as a theologian. As may be supposed, from the conflicts through which he had passed, the bishop of Hippo was intensely interested in what may be called the anthropological aspects of the great Christian idea of redemption. He had himself been brought out of darkness into "marvellous light," only by entering into the depths of his own soul, and finding, after many struggles, that there was no power but divine grace, as revealed in the life and death of the Son of God, which could bring rest to human weariness, or pardon and peace for human guilt. He had found human nature in his own case too weak and sinful to find any good for itself. In God alone he had found good. This deep sense of human sinfulness coloured all his theology, and gave to it at once its depth —its profound and sympathetic adaptation to all who feel the reality of sin—and that tinge of darkness and exaggeration which as surely have repelled others. When the expression Augustinianism is used, it points especially to those opinions of the great teacher which were evoked in the Pelagian controversy, to which he devoted the most mature and powerful period of his life. His opponents in this controversy were Pelagius, from whom it derives its name, and Cœlestius and Julianus, pupils of the former. Pelagius was a British monk. Augustine calls him Brito; and Jerome points to his Scottish descent, in such terms, however, as to leave it uncertain whether he was a native of Scotland or Ireland (*habet progeniem Scotiæ gentis de Britannorum vicinia*). He was a man of blameless character, devoted to the reformation of society, full of enthusiasm, and that confidence in the natural impulses of humanity which often accompanies philanthropic enthusiasm. Travelling to Rome about the beginning of the 5th century, he took up his abode for a time there, and soon made himself conspicuous by his activity and opinions. His pupil Cœlestius carried out the views of his master with a more outspoken logic, and was at length arraigned before the bishop of Carthage for the following, amongst other, heretical opinions:—(1.) That Adam's sin was purely personal, and affected none but himself; (2.) That each man, consequently, is born with powers as incorrupt as those of Adam, and only falls into sin under the force of temptation and evil example; (3.) That children who die in infancy, being untainted by sin, are saved without baptism. Views such as these were obviously in conflict with the whole course of Augustine's experience, as well as with his interpretation of the catholic doctrine of the church. And when his attention was drawn to them by the trial and excommunication of Cœlestius, he undertook their refutation, first of all, in three books on *Forgiveness of Sins and Baptism*, addressed to his friend Marcellinus, in which he vindicated the necessity of the baptism of infants because of original sin and the grace of God by which we are justified (*Retract.*, ii. c. 23). This was in 412. In the same year he addressed a further treatise to the same person, "My beloved son Marcellinus," on *The Spirit and the Letter*. Three years later he composed two further treatises on *Nature and Grace*, and the relation of the *Human to the Divine Righteousness*. The controversy was continued during many years in no fewer than fifteen treatises. Upon no subject did Augustine bestow more of his intellectual strength, and in relation to no other have his views so deeply and permanently affected the course of Christian thought. Even those who most usually agree with his theological stand-point will hardly deny that, while he did much in these writings to vindicate divine truth and to expound the true relations of the divine and human,

he also, here as elsewhere, was hurried into extreme expressions as to the absoluteness of divine grace and the extent of human corruption. Like his great disciple in a later age—Luther—Augustine was prone to emphasise the side of truth which he had most realised in his own experience, and, in contradistinction to the Pelagian exaltation of human nature, to depreciate its capabilities beyond measure. There are few thoughtful minds who would not concede the deeper truthfulness of Augustine's spiritual and theological analysis, in comparison with that of his opponent, as well as its greater consistency with Scripture; but there are also few who would now be disposed to identify themselves with the dogmatism of the orthodox bishop any more than with the dogmatism of the heretical monk. And on one particular point, which more or less runs through all the controversy—the salvation of infants—the Christian consciousness, in its later and higher growth, may be said to have pronounced itself decisively on the side of the monk rather than of the bishop.

In addition to these controversial writings, which mark the great epochs of Augustine's life and ecclesiastical activity after his settlement as a bishop at Hippo, he was the author of other works, some of them better known and even more important. His great work, the most elaborate, and in some respects the most significant, that came from his pen, is *The City of God*. It is designed as a great apologetic treatise in vindication of Christianity and the Christian church,—the latter conceived as rising in the form of a new civic order on the crumbling ruins of the Roman empire,—but it is also, perhaps, the earliest contribution to the philosophy of history, as it is a repertory throughout of his cherished theological opinions. This work and his *Confessions* are, probably, those by which he is best known, the one as the highest expression of his thought, and the other as the best monument of his living piety and Christian experience. *The City of God* was begun in 413, and continued to be issued in its several portions for a period of thirteen years, or till 426. The *Confessions* were written shortly after he became a bishop, about 397, and give a vivid sketch of his early career. To the devout utterances and aspirations of a great soul they add the charm of personal disclosure, and have never ceased to excite admiration in all spirits of kindred piety. His systematic treatise on *The Trinity*, which extends to fifteen books, and occupied him for nearly thirty years, must not be passed over. "I began," he says (*Retract.*, ii. 15), "as a very young man, and have published in my old age some books concerning the Trinity." This important dogmatic work, unlike most of his dogmatic writings, was not provoked by any special controversial emergency, but grew up silently during this long period in the author's mind. This has given it something more of completeness and organic arrangement than is usual with him, if it has also led him into the prolonged discussion of various analogies, more curious than apt in their bearing on the doctrine which he expounds. The exegetical writings of Augustine,—his lengthened *Commentary on St John* and on the *Sermon on the Mount*, &c.,—and then his *Letters*, remain to be mentioned. The former have a value from his insight into the deeper spiritual meanings of Scripture, but hardly for their exegetical characteristics. The latter are full of interest in reference to many points in the ecclesiastical history of the time, and his relation to contemporary theologians like Jerome. They have neither the liveliness nor variety of interest, however, which belong to the letters of Jerome himself. The closing years of the great bishop were full of sorrow. The Vandals, who had been gradually enclosing the Roman empire, appeared before the gates of Hippo, and laid siege to it. Augustine was ill with his last illness, and could only pray for his fellow citizens. He passed away during the progress of the siege, on the 28th of August 430, at the age of seventy-five, and was spared the indignity of seeing the city in the hands of the enemy.

The character of Augustine, both as a man and a theologian, has been briefly indicated in the course of our sketch. Little remains to be added without entering into discussions too extended for our space. None can deny the greatness of Augustine's soul—his enthusiasm, his unceasing search after truth, his affectionateness, his ardour, his self-devotion. And even those who may doubt the soundness or value of some of his dogmatic conclusions, cannot hesitate to acknowledge the depth of his spiritual convictions, and the strength, solidity, and penetration with which he handled the most difficult questions, and wrought all the elements of his experience and of his profound Scriptural knowledge into a great system of Christian thought.

The best complete edition of Augustine's writings is that of the Benedictines, in 11 vols. folio, published at Paris, 1679–1800, and reprinted in 1836–38 in 22 half-volumes. Tillemont, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, has devoted a quarto volume to his life and writings. Two extensive monographs have appeared on him; the one by Kloth, a Roman Catholic (Aachen, 1840), and the other by Bindemann, a Protestant (Berlin, 1844, 1855). See also Ritter's *Hist. of Christian Philosophy*, vol. i.; Böhringer's *Hist. of the Church*; Dr P. Schaff's *St Augustine* (Berlin, New York, and London, 1854); Nourrisson, *La Philosophie de S. Augustine* (Paris, 1866); A. Dorner, *Augustinus* (Berlin, 1872); Neander's *Church History*; Mozley's *Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, 1855; Jameson's *Sacred and Legendary Art*. (J. T.)

AUGUSTINE, or AUSTIN, St, the first archbishop of Canterbury, was originally a monk in the Benedictine convent of St Andrew at Rome, and was educated under the famous Gregory, afterwards Pope Gregory I., by whom he was sent to Britain with forty monks of the same order, to carry out the favourite project of converting the English to Christianity. The missionaries set out with much reluctance, for the journey was long and perilous, and on the way they endeavoured to persuade the Pope to allow them to return. His orders, however, were peremptory; they proceeded, therefore, on their journey, and at last landed, some time in the year 596, on the isle of Thanet. Having sent interpreters to explain their mission to King Ethelbert, whose queen, Bertha, was a Christian, they received from him permission to preach and to make converts. He treated them with great favour, held a public conference with them, and assigned them a residence at Durovernum, now Canterbury. His own conversion to the Christian faith, which took place shortly afterwards, had a powerful influence with his subjects, who joined the new church in great numbers. Augustine, seeing the success of his labours, crossed to France, and received consecration at Arles. He then despatched messengers to the Pope to inform him of what had been done, and to propose for his consideration certain practical difficulties that had arisen. They brought back the *pallium*, with which Augustine was consecrated as first archbishop of Canterbury, and certain vestments and utensils for the new churches. Gregory also gave most prudent counsel for dealing with the new converts, strongly advising the archbishop to make the change of faith, so far as ceremonial went, as gradual as possible, and not on any account to wound the feelings of the people by destroying their temples, but rather to consecrate them afresh, and use them for Christian worship. Augustine passed the remainder of his life principally at Canterbury, where he died, probably in 607, on the 26th May. See *Lives of the English Saints*, No. III. 1847, and Mrs Jameson's *Legends of the Monastic Orders*.

AUGUSTINIANS, a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, claiming to have received its rule from St Augustine. See ABBEY and MONASTICISM.

AUGUSTOVO, a city in Russian Poland, in the government of Suvalki, situated on the river Netta, near a lake, which abounds in fish. It was founded in 1557 by Sigismund II. (Augustus), and is laid out in a very regular manner, with a large market-place. It carries on a large trade in cattle and horses, and manufactures linen and huckaback. Population, 9383.

AUGUSTUS AND THE AUGUSTAN AGE. The name of Augustus was the title of honour given by the Romans to the emperor Caius Julius Cæsar Octavianus, or, as he was originally designated, Caius Octavius. This title was intended to be hereditary in his family, but all the succeeding Cæsars or emperors of Rome continued to adopt it, long after they had ceased to be connected with the first Augustus by blood. The era of Augustus formed an illustrious epoch in Roman history, and was distinguished for its splendid attainments in arts and arms, and more especially in literature. The Romans in later times looked back to the age of Augustus with great complacency, as the most prosperous and the most distinguished in their annals. The name of the "Augustan Age" has been specially applied to it in modern times, and the same title has been given, with more or less justice, to certain epochs in modern history as the highest compliment to their glory. The reign of Louis XIV. is called the Augustan age of France; the reign of Anne, the Augustan age of England.

Caius Octavius was the son of a noble Roman of the same name, of the plebeian order. The father had married Atia, the daughter of Julia, sister to the great C. Julius Cæsar, who was accordingly great-uncle to the young Octavius. Cæsar, the dictator, having no son of his own, took an interest in this youth, caused him to be enrolled among the Patricians, and bred him with a view to the highest honours of the republic. Already, in his eighteenth year, he had chosen him for his "master of the horse," but this was a merely nominal distinction. The young man was sent to carry on his education at the camp at Apollonia in Illyricum, and there, at the age of nineteen, he heard of his great kinsman's assassination (44 B.C.) He had already become a favourite with the soldiers, who offered to escort him to Rome, and follow his fortunes. But this he declined, and crossed over alone to Italy. On landing he learnt that Cæsar had made him his heir and adopted him into the Julian gens, whereby he acquired the designation of C. Julius Cæsar Octavianus. The inheritance was a perilous one; his mother and others would have dissuaded him from accepting it, but he, confident in his abilities, declared at once that he would undertake its obligations, and discharge the sums bequeathed by the dictator to the Roman people. M. Antonius had possessed himself of Cæsar's papers and effects, and made light of his young nephew's pretensions. The liberators paid him little regard, and dispersed to their respective provinces. Cicero, much charmed at the attitude of Antonius, hoped to make use of him, and flattered him to the utmost, with the expectation, however, of getting rid of him as soon as he had served his purpose. Octavianus conducted himself with consummate adroitness, making use of all competitors for power, but assisting none. Considerable forces attached themselves to him. The senate, when it armed the consuls against Antonius, called upon him for assistance; and he took part in the campaign in which Antonius was defeated at Mutina, but both the consuls, Hirtius and Pansa, slain. The soldiers of Octavianus demanded the consulship for him, and the senate, though now much alarmed, could not prevent his election. He now effected a junction with Antonius, who quickly overthrew the power of the republican party in their stronghold, the Cisalpine provinces, with the death of Decimus Brutus, the ablest of the liberators. Thereupon Octavianus and Antonius, taking Lepidus into union with them, met on the river Rhenus near Bononia, and proclaimed themselves a triumvirate for the reconstitution of the commonwealth. They divided the western provinces among them, the east being held for the republic by M. Brutus and Cassius. They drew up a list of proscribed citizens, entered Rome together, and caused the assassination of three hundred senators and two thousand knights. They further confiscated the territories of many cities throughout Italy, and divided them among their soldiers. Cicero was murdered at the demand of Antonius. The remnant of the republican party took refuge either with Brutus and Cassius in the East, or with Sextus Pompeius, who had made himself master of the seas.

Octavianus and Antonius crossed the Adriatic in 42 B.C. to reduce the last defenders of the republic. Brutus and Cassius were defeated, and fell at the battle of Philippi. War soon broke out between the victors, the chief incident of which was the siege and capture by famine of Perusia, and the alleged sacrifice of three hundred of its defenders by the young Cæsar at the altar of his uncle. But peace was again made between them. Antonius married Octavia, his rival's sister, and took for himself the eastern half of the empire, leaving the west to Cæsar. Lepidus was reduced to the single province of Africa. Meanwhile Sextus Pompeius made himself formidable by cutting off the supplies of grain from Rome. The triumvirs were obliged to concede to him the islands in the western Mediterranean. But Octavianus could not allow the capital to be kept in alarm for its daily sustenance. He picked a quarrel with Sextus, and when his colleagues failed to support him, undertook to attack him alone. Antonius, indeed, came at last to his aid, in return for military assistance in the campaign he meditated in the East. But Octavianus was well served by the commander of his fleet, M. Vipsanius Agrippa. Sextus was completely routed, and driven into Asia, where he perished soon afterwards. Lepidus was an object of contempt to all parties, and Octavianus and Antonius remained to fight for supreme power.

The alliance of Antonius with Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, alienated the Romans from him. They now gladly accepted the heir of Cæsar as the true successor of the most illustrious of their heroes. It was felt almost universally that the empire required a single head, and that repose could only be assured by the sovereignty of the chief of its armies. The battle of Actium, followed by the death of Antonius, 31 B.C., raised the victor to universal empire. Nevertheless, Octavianus did not hasten to assume his position. He first regulated the affairs of Egypt, which he annexed to the Roman dominions, then lingered for a time in Greece, and entered upon a fifth consulship at Samos, 29 B.C. On his return to Rome he distributed the vast sums he had accumulated among the people and the soldiers, while he soothed the pride of the nobles by maintaining unchanged the outward show of republican government. Of his personal history from this period there remains little to be said. He continued to reside almost constantly at Rome and in the neighbourhood, making one expedition into Spain, 27 B.C., and a journey through Greece in 21, on which occasion he advanced into Syria, and received back the standards taken by the Parthians from Crassus. In 16 B.C. he went to Gaul to regulate the affairs of that province, an expedition which he repeated, 9 B.C. But from thenceforth he intrusted the defence of the position to his lieutenants, and more especially to the young princes of his own family. The empire continued to enjoy profound internal tranquillity. More than one plot was formed against the head of the state by some of the discontented nobility, but these were discovered and disconcerted; and when it was evident that they met with no favour from the people generally, he