to them, and would let it remain in the same state, until a new deliberation could take place. This letter was pre­sented to a council held at Carthage in 418, at which eight canons were drawn up against the Pelagian heresy. The bishop of Rome, in the mean time, was inclined to examine again the affair of Celestius, and to endeavour to draw from him distinct and precise answers according to the plan sug­gested by the African bishops in their memoir ; but Ce­lestius would not come forward, and accordingly withdrew from Rome. From his flight the pope concluded that he had formerly imposed upon him, and that he held the new doc­trines ; and, accordingly, changing his opinion with respect to him, he approved of the decrees of the African prelates, and renewed the condemnations of his predecessor, Pope Innocent, against him and Pelagius.@@1 This judgment he published in a letter which was sent to all the bishops. About the same time an edict was published by the Em­peror Honorius against Pelagius and Celestius, ordering that they should be banished from Rome, and that all their followers should be sent into exile.

In the following year Honorius published another edict, by which it was ordered, that the bishops who would not sign the pope’s letter should be deprived of their churches. Accordingly, Julian the bishop of Eclana, who was after­wards head of the party, and seventeen other bishops, were cashiered ; upon which they wrote a letter to Rufus, bi­shop of Thessalonica, and demanded a universal council from the emperor, which was refused. Celestius returned again to Rome, but was again expelled from the city ; whilst his followers, being expelled from Italy, retired to different countries. Some of them came over into Britain, and others went into the East. Atticus banished them from Constantinople, and they were also banished from Ephesus. Theodotus, bishop of Antioch, condemned them in a synod held at Diospolis, and banished Pelagius and his followers out of Palestine, whither they had returned. Julian, the bishop, was condemned in a provincial synod of Cilicia, whither he had retired to Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuesta, who was obliged to anathematize him. What became of Pelagius is unknown, as history gives no further account of him ; but Celestius having returned to Rome, and being driven from thence by Pope Celestin, went with Julian and some other bishops of their party to Constantinople, where they endeavoured to prevail upon the Emperor Theodo­sius to assemble a council, instead of which he ordered them to leave the city. After this they joined with the Nestorians,@@1 and were condemned together with them in a general council held at Ephesus in 431 ; and there now remained but a small number of Pelagians dispersed in the West. Julian, after having endeavoured several times to get himself reinstated in his bishopric, was at last obliged to retire into Sicily, where he died.

To the Pelagians succeeded the Semipelagians, who re­jected the doctrines of the former with respect to original sin and the power of free will to do any good.@@3 They owned that man had need of the grace of God to persevere in welldoing ; but they believed that the beginning of good will and faith did not necessarily depend upon grace ; for that man, by the mere force of nature, might desire to do good, and that God seconded that good will by his assist­ance, which depended upon liberty, and was given to all men. Besides these, they maintained some other peculiar tenets. The origin of some of their opinions is founded in this, that some of the books which were written by St Au­gustin in his last years, with respect to the ∞ntroversies which arose in the monastery of Adrumetum, relative to correction, grace, and predestination, having been carried

into Gaul, happened to give offence to several persons, and particularly to the monks of Lerins, who considered his doctrines as hostile to that of free will. This led them to think and to maintain, that, in order to be saved, it was necessary to leave to man the power of knowing and de­siring good by the force of nature, so that the beginning might come from man. Several considerable persons in Gaul, and even some bishops, but particularly the priests, were of this opinion. Cassian, deacon of Constantinople, and afterwards priest of Marseilles, authorized it in his conferences ; and Faustus, bishop of Riez, supported it very strenuously. From its very first appearance, St Au­gustin stood up to oppose this doctrine, and was supported by Prosper and Hilarius. Pope Celestin complained to the bishops of Gaul, that they suffered their priests to speak ill of the doctrines of St Augustin ; Popes Gelasius and Hormisdas condemned the books of Faustus ; and, last of all, the council of Orange, held in 529, condemned parti­cularly the principal tenets of the Semipelagians, and put an end at that time to the controversy, about a hundred years after the death of St Augustin.

The Semipelagians were very numerous ; and their doc­trines, though variously explained, were received in many of the monastic schools in Gaul, whence they spread them­selves far and wide throughout Europe. With respect to the Greeks and other Christians of the East, we may remark, that they had adopted the Semipelagian tenets, even before they were promulgated in Gaul by Cassian and Faustus.

After the period, however, at which the Semipelagian doctrines were condemned in the council of Orange, we find but little notice taken of this sect by historians. Al­though its tenets were maintained by a few in the succeed­ing centuries, the sect could boast of no eminent leaders, and sunk into obscurity. In the beginning, indeed, of the Reformation, some of the Pelagian tenets were again brought into circulation. Every one is acquainted with the hosti­lity of Luther to the doctrine of free will, who went so far into the opposite extreme as to entitle one of his works against the celebrated Erasmus on this subject, *Be Servo Arbitrio.* But notwithstanding that Luther was their leader, this doctrine of his was not adopted by some of the most eminent of the reformers. His learned friend, the mild and worthy Melancthon, although he at first, either from not having sufficiently considered the subject, or because this doctrine was so unpalatable to the great body of the reformers on account of the authority of Luther, joined with Luther in his hostility to the doctrine of free will so far as to say that free will could have no effect under the influ­ence of grace, shortly afterwards changed his opinion so as to run into the opposite extreme. For although Luther at his outset had affirmed, that the prescience of God annihi­lated free will in all his creatures, he was so softened down into moderation at the time of the drawing up of the fa­mous Confession of Augsburg, as to allow Melancthon, who composed it, to insert these words, “ that it was necessary to allow free will to all who possessed the use of reason, not however in such things as regarded God, which they could not commence, or at least which they could not com­plete, without his assistance and grace, but in the affairs or works of the present life solely, and in order to perform their duty towards society.”@@4 In this passage two truths are clearly admitted : First, that there is free will in man ; and, secondly, that of itself it has no efficacy in such works as are purely Christian or religious. But although this be evident, and although it would seem as if he attributed the efficacy of religious works solely to the grace of God, yet the restricting words “ at least,” show that he was of opi-

@@@, See the Letters of St Augustin.

@@@’ Prosper in his Chronicle.

@@@3 Hilary's Letters to Augustin.

@@@4 See the 18th article, and Melancthon's Apology.