

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

LECTURE II.

Division of Daillé's treatise into two heads. His first argument in support of his first proposition. Unfairness of it. Discussion of a passage in Eusebius. Fragments of the early Fathers collected by Dr. Routh. Illustrations of their value. Second argument of Daillé. Incidental allusions to important topics in the Fathers, overlooked by him. Their evidence not to be gathered without careful study. Illustration of this in establishing the doctrine and ritual of the Church. And in the Romish controversy; *e. g.* on Transubstantiation, the Papal Supremacy, Auricular Confession, Image Worship.

I PROPOSE, in the present Lecture, to redeem the promise I made in the last, and offer you some remarks on the celebrated treatise of Daillé, a distinguished minister of the French Protestant Church (published in 1631), on "The Right Use of the Fathers."

Daillé divides his treatise into two general heads. First, asserting that the testimony of the Fathers, owing to various causes which he enumerates, is vague, uncertain, and obscure. And, secondly, that, were it more clear and decisive, it is not of such authority as to settle our controversies; the latter of the two divisions very much anticipated by the other.

In support of the former proposition, he sets out with affirming, in terms of some exaggeration, the paucity of the writings of the first three centuries; and quotes a passage from the beginning of Eusebius' History to prove in general, before he proceeds to details, that very few persons in those early times addicted themselves to composing books.¹ But it will be found, on reference to Eusebius, that he does not say there were few or no books then written; but that there were none written on the plan he was proposing to adopt—in fact no ecclesiastical history or regular Church annals, which would serve him for a precedent. For, having described the various topics his own history was meant to embrace, he proceeds to

¹ Daillé, p 4.

propitiate his readers towards any defects which they might discover in it; saying, "that his subject now required him to ask the candid construction of the considerate; for that it was a thing, he confessed, beyond his powers to promise a narrative perfect and lacking nothing; seeing that he was the first person that had engaged in that particular argument; and so had to *tread a road desert and unbeaten*" (the clause adduced by Daillé); "however, that his prayer was, he might have God for his Guide, and the power of the Lord to work with him, for that of men who had travelled the same way before him (*τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῖν προωδευκότων ὁδὸν*) he could find no trace; save only a few materials, by which one or other had left him some partial information of the times in which they themselves lived." And, again, a little afterwards, repeating nearly the same words, he continues, "that he accounted it the more necessary for him to undertake the labour he was about, because he knew no ecclesiastical writer who had as yet troubled himself about that particular department of literature,"¹ meaning the department of ecclesiastical history. The thing is worth observing, because the bias of Daillé is thus made to appear by the turn he gives to a passage of Eusebius on the very threshold of his work.

Nor is that bias less apparent in what follows; for postponing for a while any emphatic mention of the writings of the first three centuries, which have come down to us entire, or nearly so, he proceeds studiously to draw attention to the *fragments* of the early Fathers which have survived—as if, of the few works we have of the Primitive Church, scarcely anything but fragments remained. And, accordingly, he gives a list of authors whose bare names and titles (says he) have been preserved by Eusebius, Jerome, and others.² Doubtless the remains of several of those authors (the catalogue of which, by the bye, his readers will perceive to be much larger than Daillé's previous proposition might have led them to expect) are inconsiderable in bulk, compared with the entire works of which they formed a part: but they are often of great value, nevertheless; and are very far from being mere names and

¹ Μηδένα πω εἰς δεῦρο τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων διέγνωσεν περὶ τοῦτο τῆς γραφῆς σπουδὴν πεποιημένον τὸ μέρος.—Euseb. Eccles. Hist. i. c. 1.

² Quorum nuda nobis nomina et tituli apud Eusebium et Hieronymum et alios supersunt.—p. 5.

titles. They have been collected, as you are aware, from various quarters in which they are scattered, by Dr. Routh, and, together with the notes on them, as edited by him, are enough to occupy four octavo volumes: those which had been previously got together by Grabe, in his "Spicilegium," in two volumes, having been mixed up with much that is apocryphal. The venerable President of Magdalene College, instead of describing them, as Daillé does, as mere names and titles, regards them as documents throwing great light on points in the Primitive Church that were otherwise obscure; and as worthy of all acceptance from their piety, learning, and authority. "*Quoniam autem mihi in animo fuit, statum primævæ ecclesiæ et dogmata et mores ex ipsius, pro facultate meâ, investigare monumentis, scripta omnia sanctorum ætatum legenda esse censui. Et vero, quod nihil omnino in hoc genere prætermittere statuerim, id plurimum contulisse ad obscuriora quædam clarius intelligenda sæpe sum expertus. Certe tot negligere Scriptores, quamvis mutilatos nimium, haud oportuisset, quorum reliquix pietate, doctrinâ, auctoritate, nobis commendatissimæ sunt.*"¹ And assuredly, an examination of the fragments themselves supports his estimate of them.

Take, for instance, the fragments of the writings of Dionysius of Corinth (one of the cases Daillé produces), as found in Eusebius. We learn from them, short as they are, that Rome was even then a wealthy Church; able to lay poor Churches under pecuniary obligation to her; and accustomed to do so from the most early times. That the Epistle of Clemens to the Church of Corinth was held in such respect as to be then read in the Church of Corinth. That the Church of Corinth and the Church of Rome had the same Apostles for their founders, Peter and Paul, who both suffered martyrdom at the same time at Rome. That there were those then abroad who had the audacity to corrupt not only Epistles written to Churches by the Bishops, but the Scriptures themselves. That there were then existing Churches at Lacedæmon, at Athens, at Nicomedia, at Gortyna, and other parts of Crete, at Amastris, at Gnossus. That the Bishops of those Churches were such and such persons; and that, in some instances, they stood in the relation to one another of Prelate

¹ Reliq. Sacr. Præf. vol. i. p. viii.

and Metropolitan—information certainly of much value, and amounting to much more than a mere name and title.

So again, take the case of Hegesippus, another of the instances cited by Daillé. In the fragments, which have reached us, of his work, we have a minute and interesting account of the character and death of James the Just; of his abstemious habits; of his ascetic devotions; of his influence with the people; of the plot framed against him by the Scribes and Pharisees; of his testimony to the Saviour; of the circumstances of his martyrdom—how he was cast down from the Temple, then stoned, then beaten with the fuller's club. We have further some very curious particulars of the last survivors of the family of Our Lord: two old men grandsons of St Jude, in the days of Domitian, possessed of no other property than a small estate, which they cultivated with their own hands; and living till the age of Trajan. We further learn from the same source the state of the Churches established in various quarters, which Hegesippus had personally visited; the general soundness of their faith; the uniformity of their teaching; the succession of their Bishops—all this very far from being fairly described under the designation of mere "name and title."

The fragments of some other authors, who are mentioned in Daillé's catalogue, are even more copious in their information than these, but it would be tedious to produce them all. I must therefore beg you to satisfy yourselves of the fact by reading them in the "*Reliquiæ Sacræ*" for yourselves. Whilst in the instance of Hippolytus, who, again, is another of the authors included in the list of Daillé, as having left us fragments that amount to no more than a mere name and title, we have not only passages of considerable length from a variety of his works, such as commentaries on different books of Scripture, particularly the Psalms, homilies, local histories, but also whole treatises; as one concerning Christ and Antichrist; another on the Patripassian heresy of Noetus, having much in common with Tertullian *adversus Praxeam*, and yielding (besides much else that is valuable) many clear testimonies to the Divinity of the Son, as well as to the doctrine of the Trinity; another, a homily probably, for it seems to have been addressed to an audience, on the Baptism of the Saviour, and like the last affording the strongest evidence that the Godhead

times even a single expression in a sentence, occurring in a treatise of which the bare title promises nothing of the sort, furnishing us with the most interesting knowledge of some point or other of doctrine, discipline, ritual, or usage of the Church of the day, and taking us quite by surprise—insomuch that no writers whatever will bear skipping, even for a line, so ill as these. A desultory reader of the Fathers, nay, a reader who is not the most patient and precise, and always on the watch, can never be sure that he has not suffered some paragraph or phrase to escape, which would in itself have repaid him for the perusal of the whole book. Nay, perhaps it is necessary that his mind should be rendered sensitive to such subjects, by living in times of controversy like our own, in order that he may detect in them all that they contain. And accordingly I think I can discover in some careful and able investigators of the works of the Fathers, but whose researches happened to be carried on when the Church was quiescent, that they have left many hints of great value unimproved, unperceived—the moment not propitious to the seizure and application of them. Indeed, a slovenly mode of study, as I am sure the audience I am addressing will admit, is safe with no works whatever; but with those of the Fathers, I must repeat, it is the most unsafe of all, owing to the little method observed in almost all of them, and the utter absence of it in some; so that Bishop Horsley might well take advantage, as he does, of Dr. Priestley's inadvertent admission, that he was in the habit of "looking through" books, and might well feel strengthened in the line of argument he had adopted with that antagonist, namely, to waive the merits of the question itself, and contend that Dr. Priestley was incompetent from ignorance of his authors, who were of a kind not to bear "looking through," to engage in the discussion of it. In these remarks I am sure that any of my hearers, who have accustomed themselves to this department of study, would at once acquiesce; but for the benefit of those who have not, I will produce a few examples.

Justin Martyr, according to Daillé, is employed in denouncing the folly of idol worship, exposing the mere humanity of Jupiter, Mars, &c., and asserting and enforcing the unity of the true God. And though this may indeed be reckoned the bare outline of his Apologies, and serve as a title to them; we

meet with much in those Apologies which comes under no such head. For instance, we there stumble upon a very accurate account, the earliest we possess, of the manner in which public worship was conducted by the Christians on Sundays—the several parts of the Service—the reading of the Scriptures—the Common Prayer, even some of the clauses of the Prayers—the office for the Communion—even one minute feature of that office, the use of the Lord's Prayer, in the consecration.¹ The whole a passage of no great length, but pregnant with conclusions the most valuable to all, who feel a reverence for primitive ecclesiastical usage.²

Again, the Pædagogoe of Clemens Alexandrinus contains a number of precepts which the Pædagogoe (who gives a name to the treatise) is supposed to impart to his pupil as he takes him to school. These precepts relate to the application of Christian principles (for the pupil is supposed to be a convert from heathenism), to the various habits and customs of ordinary life. Accordingly, regulations of the dress, and decoration of the person, constitute the subject of one chapter. Now, who would expect to find in such a place evidence for the practice of Infant Baptism? Yet such is the case. The Pædagogoe is speaking of the lawfulness of wearing seals: he would have them worn for use, not for ornament; expressly for the purpose of securing matters that require safe keeping. He then goes on to say what device he would have engraved on them; and recommends a dove, or a fish, or a ship under sail, or a lyre, or an anchor; or, he adds, if the party be a fisherman, he will remember the Apostle *and the children who are drawn up out of the water* (*καὶ τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος ἀνασπόμενων παιδίων*³)—a reference, apparently, to the words of Jesus to his disciples, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men," yet a passage so expressed, as to take into account the means by which this was to be effected, even by administering the Rite of Baptism, and *Infant* Baptism. Surely this is a subject of controversy not foreign to our own times! So, again, when he is afterwards speaking of the application of cosmetics to the complexion, a practice which he condemns, his argument leads him to express a clear opinion on the active

¹ Τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ
εὐχαρισθεῖσαν τροφήν.—Justin Martyr,
Apol. I. § 66.

³ Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xi. p.
289. Potter's ed.

² § 87.

influence of the Spirit on the heart of the Christian.¹ Yet this would not have been exactly the quarter in which we should have thought of looking for an enunciation of that doctrine.

Take another instance. Irenæus is occupied, Daillé tells us in refuting the Valentinians, the Basilidians, and other Gnostics—and, no doubt, the heretical speculations, that he has thus to contend against, are to the last degree absurd and childish, and very little like any which we should have to encounter in our own day. Are we then to lay Irenæus aside, under the conviction that his argument is no concern of ours? We should lose a vast deal of information on matters in which we ourselves take a deep interest, were we to do so; however little we may have in common with the general object of the book. Thus, the heretics, with whom he had to deal, vindicated many of their senseless tenets by the authority of tradition. Irenæus, therefore, meets them on their own ground; challenges tradition, provided it be genuine, as utterly against them, being coincident with Scripture, and the doctrines of the Church: he therefore prescribes the circumstances which were necessary to guarantee the truth of tradition, that it should be found to be uniform in the several Churches, which the Apostles had founded, and which Bishops had continued to preside over in regular succession, since the Apostles' days, down to his own; at the same time producing a catalogue of these Bishops in the Church of Rome, and only abstaining from doing so in other Churches, out of fear of wearying his readers.² All this is in refutation of certain silly fancies of the heretics he was encountering. But does a passage of this sort touch no controversies of our own age, and is the author, to whom it belongs, of no value, because he is only employed on Valentinus and his Æons? Nay, the mention of these very Æons on one occasion, furnishes an example of the kind we are now in search of, and much to our present purpose. For these Gnostics, looking about them for arguments to support them in their notion of their Æons, find one, Irenæus tells us, in an expression of St. Paul, Ephes. iii. 21, *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*, and another even in the language of the orthodox themselves, who when they say at the Eucharist, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, have

¹ Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xi. p. 291.

² Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 3.

an eye (they contend) to these *Æons*¹; a most absurd argument of the parties who used it, no doubt, yet clearly showing, however inadvertently, that there was a set form of Service for the Holy Communion in the time of Irenæus, so well known as to require a mere allusion to it in order to be understood; and which, therefore, must have descended from more ancient times still: a fact concurrent with what had previously dropped from Justin. Have casual passages of this kind, and the Fathers abound in them, nothing to do with the controversies of the present day, and may the authors in which they are deposited be safely neglected, because their title-pages happen to promise nothing of the sort? It cannot be supposed that Daillé was ignorant of this feature of patristic literature; for it is scarcely possible to read a score of pages in any department of it, which do not betray it.

I shall give you other examples of it still, because I am anxious to impress on you, that this remark in refutation of Daillé does not apply to one or two of the Fathers only, but to them all, and I multiply them the rather, because in the process I shall be still unfolding to you features of the Primitive Church. One of Tertullian's tracts is entitled, "On the Crown," *De Coronâ*, a tract, to which the following incident gave occasion. At a Donation of the emperor's, one of the soldiers appeared without a wreath or chaplet on his head; holding it instead in his hand, and thereby confessing himself to be a Christian. He is accordingly treated as one, and sentence is passed on him. Tertullian then undertakes to discuss the question, whether the man should have submitted to wear the wreath or not; and determines it in the negative. I have nothing to do with the merits of the argument, or the religious sentiments of Tertullian when he penned it. I simply ask whether the title is such as would seem to hold out any promise of the various topics touched or handled in the treatise. For I find in it many particulars relating to the administration of the Rite of Baptism—reference to promises and vows as even then formally made in it, similar apparently to those exacted by our own Church at this day, a renunciation of the devil and his pomps, for such is the phrase used.² I further find it speaking of the Eucharist; the time of its

¹ Irenæus, I. c. iii. § 1.

² Contestamur nos renuntiare dia- | bolo, et pompæ, et angelis ejus.—Tertullian, *De Coronâ*, c. iii.

celebration; the manner in which it was communicated to all, as we may infer, in both kinds; the officiating minister, an ecclesiastic.¹ I find it referring to the celebration of the anniversaries of saints as even then obtaining; to the custom of signing the forehead with the Cross, as was then usual.² Certainly, had we been in search of information on any of these points, we should not have expected à priori to discover it in an essay which had for its heading, *De Coronâ*. Yet there it is.

Take another instance. Origen, in his Commentary on Genesis, has a long discussion on Gen. i. 14. "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament," &c. Now, who would have supposed that this would have been just the place to turn to in Origen's works, to discover his opinion on the doctrine of necessity, of the freedom of man's will, his consequent responsibility for his actions, the bearing such doctrine has upon the efficacy of prayer, the nature of God's foreknowledge? Yet all these points, affecting as we must at once see they do affect a signal controversy of our own day, the Calvinistic, enter into his discussion of this text; the prevailing belief in astrology, a subject connected with these lights in the firmament, paving the way to it.³

How little, again, would the titles of most of the Letters of Cyprian enable us to guess at the multifarious matters to be found in them—much of them, too, bearing very directly on the controversies of modern times.

Nor is this all. Daillé, we have seen, exclaims with much self-satisfaction, after giving his own description of the contents of the writings of the Fathers, "What has all this to do with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the worship of the Host, the supremacy of the Pope, the necessity of secret confession, the worship of images, and other matters agitated nowadays!" But it is not necessary that the Fathers should be expressly discussing these questions, in order to their giving us a great deal of light, nevertheless, on the sentiments of the Church with respect to them when they wrote. If the doctrine of Transubstantiation had never been dreamed of in the days of Justin or Irenæus, or Clemens, it is certain enough that it would be in vain to look for an argument upon it in their

¹ Tertullian, *De Coronâ*, c. iii.

² *Ibid.*

³ Origen, *Comment. in Gen. i. 14*, vol. ii. p. 6.

works; but they may not be less effective witnesses in the dispute on that account. On the contrary, they may be the very best of all we could have. For if such phrases undesignedly fall from them, when they are speaking of the Eucharist, as are quite inconsistent with the notion that they believed in the corporal presence, that is all that is wanted to prove that the corporal presence was not a primitive doctrine. It is not necessary to require from them a regular disclaimer of such doctrine in order to avail ourselves of their testimony.

For example, there is a fragment of Irenæus, of which the following is a translation. "The Greeks seizing the slaves of the Christian catechumens, used force to extort from them the disclosure of some secret abomination of the Christians; these slaves having nothing to tell which would gratify their tormentors, except that they heard their masters say, the Holy Communion was the body and blood of Christ, thinking it was really his body and blood (*νομίσαντες τῷ ὄντι αἶμα καὶ σάρκα εἶναι*, i. e. making this mistake), reported the same to the inquirers. Accordingly these latter, supposing that this was actually the Christian mystery (*λαβόντες ὡς αὐτόχρομα τοῦτο τελείσθαι Χριστιανοῖς*, i. e. under this wrong impression), made the same report to the rest of the Greeks, and forced the martyrs Sanctus and Blandina by torture to a confession. To whom Blandina made answer well and bravely, How could we endure to do such an act; we who, in the practice of our Christian discipline, abstain even from permitted food?"¹ Now, I ask, is it possible that such a passage as this could have been penned, and yet the doctrine of Transubstantiation have been the doctrine of the Church at the time? For, if so, it would have been really the corporal body and blood of Christ, which Christians profess to partake of; and the slaves would have been perfectly correct in the information they gave the Greeks; and there would have been no room for Irenæus to explain the circumstance under which the misapprehension of the Greeks, prompted by that of the slaves, occurred, for there would have been no misapprehension at all by either party. Surely this is more decisive of the question of Transubstantiation, than any express repudiation of it by Irenæus would have been; for so far from repudiating it, he only wonders it could have ever entered into the head of the slaves to

¹ Irenæus, Fragment XIII. p. 343, Bened. Ed.

imagine ; manifestly ascribing it to the dulness of apprehension which naturally belonged to that class of persons.

Take another instance. Cyprian, in a letter addressed to Cæcilius, is contending against the practice of certain heretics or innovators, who, in celebrating the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, made use of water only, instead of water and wine mixed (for it was the custom to mix those elements in the Eucharist at that time, as it was in our own Church, till the Prayer Book of 1549 was superseded by that of 1552, not in all respects perhaps for the better). Now, argues Cyprian, "Since Christ said, I am the true *wine*, the Blood of Christ is not water, but *wine*. Nor can his Blood, by which we are redeemed and quickened, *seem* to be in the cup, when there is no wine in the cup, by which Christ's Blood is represented, and of which there is a mystical mention made all Scripture through." *Nec potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice quando vinum desit calici, quo Christi sanguis ostenditur.*¹ And again in the same Epistle, "For as Christ bare us all, since he bare our sins, we perceive that the people is *understood* in the water ; the Blood of Christ is *represented* by the wine." *Nam quia nos omnes portabat Christus, qui et peccata nostra portabat, videmus in aquâ populum intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi*²—the word *ostendi* in the latter clause clearly in apposition to the word *intelligi* in the former, i. e. the element in either case is used *figuratively* ; and to make the matter still more clear, Cyprian having quoted a well-known text in the Epistle to the Galatians, adds, "Since, therefore, neither the Apostle himself, nor an angel from heaven, could preach any other doctrine, than that which Christ and his Apostles preached once for all, I marvel more than a little, whence it could come to pass, that in some places, contrary to the Evangelical and Apostolical discipline, water should be offered in the Lord's cup, when water alone cannot possibly express the Blood of Christ"—*quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere*³—evidently implying that wine did *express* that Blood ; not that it was the Blood itself. Here you see the evidence against the doctrine of Transubstantiation is furnished us, not by any explicit discussion of the subject, but incidentally, whilst the author of it is engaged with settling a

¹ Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. § 2.

² § 13.

³ Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. § 11.

dispute of quite another character ; but still that evidence is just as decisive, as if you could have put Cyprian in the witness-box, and questioned him upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation directly and at once, nay, much more decisive, for it is just as much to the purpose, and yet delivered by him without his having any idea of the use his words might be made to serve, in entire simplicity and innocence. And to revert for a moment to the consideration we have just dismissed, might not Dailé have here asked, with the same air of triumph, when he had cast his eye over the letter, and seen that it was on the subject of substituting water for wine in the Eucharist, What is all this to us ? This is no concern of ours ; we are no drinkers of water now—we want testimony on the question of the corporal presence !

Take another example to the same purport. Tertullian writes a treatise against Marcion, who, perplexed by the origin of evil, and the admixture of it he found in the world, devised the expedient of two Gods ; the one, the God who made the world ; the other, the God whom Christ revealed, and whose He was. Tertullian contends that if Marcion would examine the world, he would discover it not to be so bad as he supposed. "Imitate," says he, "if you can, the architecture of the bee, or the ant, the net of the spider, or the thread of the silkworm." Nay, further, your own God, he continues, as expressed in and by Christ, is satisfied with the Creation ; "he did not reprobate the *water* belonging to the Creator, for he washes his disciples with it ; nor the oil, for with that he anoints them ; nor the mixture of milk and honey, with which he feeds them ;" (all, you will observe, portions of the Ritual of Baptism as then practised) ; "nor the bread with which he represents his own very Body—*quo ipsum corpus suum representat*"—(in the Ritual of the Eucharist) ; "even in his Sacraments standing in need of the beggarly elements of the Creator."¹ Or again, in another book of the same tract against Marcion, Tertullian is engaged in proving from the correspondence between the Law and the Gospel—Christ foretold and typified in the one, realised and produced in the other—that it is the same Christ which is spoken of in both ; and that Marcion is wrong in supposing the God of the Law, and the God of the Gospel, not identical. Accordingly he compares the Passover of Moses with the

¹ Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, I. c. xiv.

Passion of Christ. It was on the day of the Passover that Christ suffered; He might have chosen another day: but it had been designated before as the *Lord's* Passover; therefore, did the Lord desire with a great desire to eat it with his disciples. "Professing, therefore, this great desire to eat the Passover as *his own*—and it would have been unworthy of Him, who was God, to desire that which was *another's*—He made the bread which He took and gave to his disciples his own Body, by saying, 'This is my Body,' *i. e.* the figure of my Body, (*id est figura corporis mei*), for it would not have been a figure, unless it had been a veritable body; for a vacuity or phantasm cannot take a figure."¹ And again in a third book of the same treatise, and when still engaged in the same argument, he appeals to the evidence of the senses against Marcion, and contends that Christ's reality "was attested by three of them, the sight, the touch, and the hearing."² But this would have been very inconclusive reasoning if Marcion could have turned upon him and said, "And yet you do not believe in the bread or the wine of the Eucharist which are attested by three of the senses." Here, again, the controversy is one in which we are not concerned. Who doubts, Daillé might say, who doubts about the Creator as represented in the Old Testament, and the Creator as represented in the New Testament, being the same God? Yet we see that this controversy does afford us clear incidental evidence against Transubstantiation.

The *worship of the host* is another point singled out by Daillé, as one to which the writings of the Fathers, such as he describes them, have no reference, they being engaged on questions of quite a different character. But, as I said in the last instance, so I say again in this, that those writings do furnish indirect testimony on this matter also. Indeed, does not the case of Transubstantiation involve this and settle it? If, as we have shown, the Fathers held no such doctrine as Transubstantiation, does it not follow as a thing of course that they fell into no such practice as the worship of the Host? Besides, is there nothing to be concluded from their *silence* with respect to any such usage? Is it not argument enough, for example, that it did not obtain in Justin's time, when we find him describing, with a good deal of minuteness, the mode of administering the Holy Eucharist, and yet saying nothing

¹ Tertullian, Adv. Marcionem, IV. c. xl.

² III. c. ix.

whatever about the worship of the Host? Would he be likely to assure his readers, that in this Sacrament, the Communicants do not receive the bread as common bread, or the cup as a common cup (οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν¹), if they had actually worshipped either the one or the other as God? Is it conceivable, that in such a case he would have adopted language so unimpassioned as this? It is true Justin has no chapter "De Hostiâ adorandâ," if nothing less than that would suffice for M. Daillé, but is not the kind of testimony presented in the few words I have extracted from him—and other similar testimony might be multiplied to almost any extent—far more valuable than any direct disclaimer of such idolatry?

The *Supremacy of the Pope* is another subject of modern controversy which M. Daillé adduces as incapable of receiving any illustration from the writings of the Fathers, being out of their field of debate. Certainly none of them have composed a treatise upon it like Dr. Barrow; but is not much to be deduced from them on the question, which is very greatly to the purpose nevertheless? Clemens Romanus, though Bishop of Rome, writes his Epistle to the Corinthians not in the name of the Pope, but in the name of the Church of Rome.² Irenæus speaks by implication of Jerusalem, and not of Rome, as the metropolis of the citizens of the New Testament (ἡ μητρόπολις τῶν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης πολιτῶν³), and assigns to St. Paul a very pre-eminent rank among the Apostles⁴; and if he calls the Church of Rome on one occasion "the greatest, most ancient, and universally known" (Church), and says that certainly, "considering how chief and principal a Church it is, all Churches, *i. e.* all faithful people everywhere, must be found in sentiment conformable to it, seeing that in it is preserved that Apostolical tradition which has obtained always and in all places;"⁵ no conclusion for the supremacy of the Pope over

¹ Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 66.

² Clem. Rom. Ad Cor. I. § i.

³ Irenæus, III. c. xii. § 5.

⁴ II. c. xxi. § 2.

⁵ Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiore principatatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis

traditio.—Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 2, Bened. Ed.

The translation here given from the Latin, which is all we have, may seem to favour the Church of Rome in a manner, which the Greek very probably, had that been preserved to us, would not have even so much as seemed to do—possibly the "convenire ad" of this Latin version answering to

Christendom can be drawn from this. For what is here his argument? He is refuting the heretics on the ground of their own choosing, tradition; and takes the Church of Rome as the fairest and safest channel of tradition then extant, as the best exponent of what tradition taught, by reason of that Church being founded by illustrious Apostles, being governed uninterruptedly by their successors, and holding so conspicuous a station in the world—the “*necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam ad hanc ecclesiam*” (as Mr. Evans observes),¹ implying a *consequence* not an *obligation*—where tradition was so guaranteed, it must needs be that an orthodox Christian would accept it. For so far is Irenæus from considering the doctrine of the Church of Rome as peremptory (except from the mere fact of the peculiar circumstances of that Church having given it advantages in the preservation of doctrine over other Churches less favourably placed), that he actually goes on to confirm the tradition of the Church of Rome by the tradition of the Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus, which agreed with it—a work of entire supererogation, if it was needful to submit to the Church of Rome, let it teach whatever it might. Neither is that all. If Irenæus had felt that Christendom was bound hand and foot by the Pope’s supremacy, how could he have himself ventured to remonstrate with Victor, Bishop of Rome, on his excommunicating the Eastern Churches for their non-observance of his rule, and that of the Western Church, with respect to the time of keeping Easter? This resistance of Irenæus was the more gratuitous, as in the controversy in question he took the same side as Victor.

Again, the disputes in which Cyprian is engaged, constantly lead him to afford us light on this subject, inadvertently and by the way; for the immediate bone of contention, no doubt, may not be now what it then was. The question concerning the Baptism of heretics, however, on which he differed in judgment from Stephanus, Bishop of Rome, incidentally ac-

συμβάλλειν—as Mr. Evans observes (Biography of the Early Church, Victor, p. 257), *i. e.* simply “to have converse with;” or “confer with;” *συμβάλλειν* being the word used on very similar occasions to that in the text, as he remarks, by Eusebins (Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 23, and v. c. 24); and a still better reference would have been to

Irenæus himself, who in the very next section of this very chapter employs this word: Κλήμης, ὁ καὶ ἑωρακὸς τοὺς μακαρίους ἀποστόλους καὶ συμβεβηκὸς αὐτοῖς—Clemens, who had seen the blessed Apostles, and conferred with them.

¹ Biography of the Early Church, l. c.

quaints us with the relation in which he considered his own Church and other Churches to stand to Rome; and it is obvious that he regarded it as anything but that of passive obedience to it. He is not niggardly in his ascription of honours to St. Peter. He repeatedly considers him as the rock on which Christ founded his Church; probably in allusion to the effect of his first sermon recorded in the second chapter of the Acts. He contemplates him as peculiarly singled out by our Lord, in order that he might be a symbol of the unity which should prevail in the Church.¹ But he did not regard this as precluding the discussion of ecclesiastical questions, such as Heretical Baptism, and the decision of them accordingly. "For Peter," says he, in a letter to Quintus,² "whom the Lord chose first, and upon whom he built his Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him on the subject of circumcision, did not make any arrogant claims for himself, and say that he *had obtained the Primacy*, and ought to be obeyed by those that were younger and later in date than himself." And in another to Pope Stephanus himself, still on the same subject of Baptism, after expressing his own opinion which he knew was opposed to that of Stephanus, he adds, "In which matter we do not wish to put constraint upon any, or lay down any peremptory law, seeing that every ruler (*præpositus*) in the administration of the Church is at liberty to act according to his own free will, only having to give an account to his Lord."³ Has this nothing to do with the question of Papal Supremacy as now debated?

Again. Turn to the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. "Let the ancient customs prevail," it says, (*τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω*), "those in Egypt, and Libya, and Pentapolis, to wit, that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over them all, since in the case of the Bishop of Rome the like is customary; and in a similar manner with respect to Antioch, and in the other provinces, let the ancient customs be preserved to the Churches."⁴ And now turn to the eighth canon of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and see how this prior canon was acted on in a particular case. "Rheginus, our brother Bishop, well-beloved in God, and the well-beloved Bishops of the province of Cyprus, Zeno and Evagrius with him, have

¹ Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesie, § 4.

² Ep. lxxi.

³ Ep. lxxii.

⁴ Routh, Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opusc. tom. i. p. 374. Oxon. 1840.

brought under our notice an innovation contrary to the ecclesiastical laws and canons of the holy Fathers, and touching the liberty of all . . . that the Bishop of the City of Antioch holds Ordinations in Cyprus, as certain very reverend men, who have come to this holy Synod, have informed us by certificates, (*λιβέλλων*), and word of mouth. Therefore, since public disorders have need of greater remedies, inasmuch as they bring with them greater damage, and especially where ancient usage does not obtain, those who preside over the holy Churches of Cyprus shall, without impediment or hurt, according to the canons of the holy Fathers and ancient usage, hold Ordinations of their most revered Bishops, among *themselves*. And the same rule shall be kept in all other dioceses and provinces whatever, so that no one of these Bishops well-beloved of God shall occupy another province which has not been subject to him from the beginning, or to those before him; and if any one hath seized and subjected any such to himself by force, let him restore the same, that the canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed; and that under the pretext of the sacerdotal office, (*ιερουργίας*), the pride of worldly power may not creep in, nor we, by little and little, and without being aware of it, lose the liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ, the liberator of all men, gave us at the cost of his own Blood.”¹ Now, I ask, does this case of the Church of Cyprus afford no conclusions for ourselves; and because the supremacy of the Pope of Rome is not, in so many words, made the subject of an ancient treatise, or ecclesiastical canon, are we at liberty to throw away such documents, as having nothing to do with it? I press these considerations the more, because I have too much respect for the reading of Dailé to believe that he was writing in ignorance; but most strongly suspect that he was deliberately misleading people, who were not likely, he thought, to look into authorities for themselves; and accordingly his book has been in the vogue it has with that uncommonly large class; and, I believe, has been recently republished,² as if the times called for it; but what times can call for artifice, or what cause prosper by disingenuous defence?

The *necessity of secret confession* is another question which Dailé singles out, as one which does not admit of illustration

¹ Routh, *Scriptorum Ecclesiastic.* |
Opusc. tom. ii. p. 10.

² Re-edited and amended, with a pre-
face by the Rev. G. Jekyll, LL.B. 1843.

from anything the Fathers say, so alien from it are the topics they handle. And, as I have observed in similar cases, there certainly is no treatise expressly on the subject by any early Father ; but there is that in them which bears upon it : though a member of the Church of England, at least, however it might be with a foreign Protestant, is not called upon to be particularly careful in this matter, seeing that in her Communion Service, though not insisting upon the necessity of confession, she exhorts persons, under certain circumstances, to come to the Minister and *open their grief*, that they “ may receive the benefit of *absolution*, together with ghostly counsel and advice.” And in her Service for the Visitation of the Sick, she instructs the Minister to examine the sick man, whether he repents him of his sins ; and at a particular part of the office, to move him “ to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled ;” and after that (and not before) ; to absolve him. She does not go further than this, because she does not see *secret* confession to a Priest absolutely enjoined as a matter of necessity, either in Scripture, or the Primitive Church the interpreter of Scripture ; for though frequent mention is made in the early Fathers of confession, I doubt whether any passage can be produced from them which does not admit of being explained of *public confession* in the Church, and, in general, which does not bear this meaning evidently on the face of it, except in case of sickness. But, if so, how can Daillé adduce the subject of *secret* confession, as another topic on which the Fathers can be made of no avail, and another instance of the little concern they can be persuaded to have in modern polemics ? Irenæus touches upon the question of confession more than once, and has been claimed indeed by the Romanist as a witness in his favour—Irenæus, who is never dreaming, be it observed, of the point we are investigating ; and whose treatise, as Daillé says, is ostensibly upon heresies which have long passed away and been forgotten—he then, who is engaged in scourging the lives and conversation of these heretics, most perfect (*τελειότατοι*), as they called themselves, charges them, amongst other things, with “ corrupting other men’s wives, as the women themselves,” he continues, “ who have been seduced by them *have often confessed together with their other sins*, when they have afterwards been converted

to the Church of God"¹—and adds that some of them made a public confession, but others, shrinking from this, through shame, quietly withdrew themselves from the life of God in despair; others became apostates altogether; and others again halted between the two conditions²—evidently intimating that such public confession was necessary in order to restoration to the Church, when they had been baptized and relapsed into notorious offences.

We should draw the same conclusion from the manner in which Tertullian speaks of this *ἐξομολόγησις*: "This exomologesis or confession," says he, "is an act of great humiliation and prostration of the man; it regulates the dress, the food; it enjoins sackcloth and ashes; it defiles the body with filth, and subdues the spirit with anguish; it restricts meat and drink to the simplest possible; it nourishes prayer by fasting; it inculcates groans and tears, and invocations of the Lord God day and night; and teaches the penitent to cast himself at the feet of his Presbyters, and clasp the knees of these servants of God, and to beg of all *the brethren* to intercede with God for mercy. Such is the homologesis"³—the whole evidently a public act. He speaks afterwards of "many shrinking from the work, more regardful of their shame than of their salvation;"⁴ and asks, "whether it is better to conceal your sin and be damned, than to expose it and receive absolution."⁵

Again, Cyprian speaks of confession in numberless places, but it still seems to be *public* confession. Thus, in several of his Letters, he complains of persons who had lapsed in persecution and renounced Christ, having been received to the Communion furtively by certain Presbyters of his Church. This he resents as a breach of all discipline. Even in the case of "minor offences, sinners," says he, in a letter to his Clergy on this scandal,⁶ "express their penitence at a suitable season, and come to *Confession*, according to the rules of discipline, and are admitted into communion by imposition of the hands of the Bishops and Clergy." And in another letter,⁷ addressed to the "people," on the same affair, as though they were par-

¹ Irenæus, I. c. xiii. §§ 5, 7.

² § 7.

³ Tertullian, De Pœnitentiâ, c. ix.

⁴ c. x.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Cyprian, Ep. ix.

⁷ Ep. xi.

ties concerned in it, he begs that nothing final may be settled till he should himself be restored to them, when it might be proceeded with, "yourselves being present and judging;" still, except in cases of dangerous sickness, where the patient is confessed and absolved at once, because there will probably be no room afterwards either for confession or absolution, and where Cyprian gives directions accordingly,¹ *public* humiliation seeming to be contemplated. But this discipline, however severe, would be a very different thing from *secret* confession; and not liable to the dreadful abuses which, no doubt, the secret confessional (whether legitimate or not in itself, and when rightly restricted) was likely to lead to, and did lead to actually and in fact. But however this may be, and to whatever conclusion the Fathers may lead us in this controversy, my end is answered; which is to show that Daillé is not justified in representing the writings of the Fathers as altogether inapplicable to such a question; for however casually it may present itself in their writings, and whatever may be the aspect of it they offer, the question of secret confession is clearly one upon which they may be made to speak in one shape or other; and I could have doubled or trebled the length of this Lecture, had I chosen to bring forward all the materials they would furnish upon it. Daillé's argument, which I am combating, you will remark, is this, that the Fathers are of little worth to us in our own controversies, because they treat of matters that have no relation to them.

The *worship of images* is the last of the instances he happens to bring forward in the place I am dealing with,² to prove the irrelevance of patristical literature; but he does it with no better success than before. Certainly it was reserved for a much later age than that we are now treating of to produce dissertations for and against the use of images in Churches: nor is there any tract of an early Father, which, from its title, would bespeak it to have any especial reference to the question here contemplated. But again I say, are we on that account to put them away, and console ourselves with the reflection that, were we to trouble ourselves ever so much about them, we should only have our labour for our pains? I think not. If image-worship did not exist in the Primitive Church, it is not to be expected that we should find anything expressly

¹ Epp. xii. and xxxi.

² Daillé, p. 9.

said about it in the writers of that Church—but still we can use their testimony. For instance, we learn from the Apologies that one of the accusations most commonly brought against the Christians by the heathens, was that they were atheists. Justin replies to it at length in his first “Apology,”¹ and Athenagoras in his “Προσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν”²—the latter using language which I shall translate, because evidently pointing to the conclusion which I am about to come to. “I have made it appear,” says he, “clearly enough, that we are no atheists, accounting, as we do, God to be one, uncreated, everlasting, invisible, impassive, incomprehensible, incapable of being contained within space, comprehended by the mind and reason alone, encompassed with light, and beauty, and spirit, and unutterable power, by whom the universe was created, and set in order, and is preserved through his Word.” The very diction of the defence suggests the real ground of the accusation, viz. that atheism was imputed to the Christians because no images of their gods were to be found in their Churches; and therefore the heathens supposed that they had no God: a supposition which the Apologists endeavour to remove by showing that their God was invisible, and of a nature not to be represented by a material image. Indeed, it is their boast (Origen records it) that the meanest and least instructed of the Christians could not be brought to believe that the Deity could be expressed by symbols wrought by the hands of base mechanics; herein proving themselves, as they said, superior even to the philosophers of the heathen.³ And this conclusion is further confirmed by another consideration. It was actually imputed to the Christians that they worshipped the Cross,⁴ to which Tertullian replies by an *argumentum ad hominem*, not unusual with him; and Minucius Felix, who also adverts to it,⁵ retorts it after the manner of Tertullian, though he denies it too.⁶ But whence the charge? except from the Cross being the only symbol which the heathens could detect, either in the Churches or out of them, for which the Christians seemed to have a reverence. Could they possibly have entertained this belief, if they had seen images in the Christian Churches? There is a passage in Irenæus which

¹ Apol. I. §§ 6, 13.

² Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, § 10.

³ See Origen, *Contra Celsum*, VI.

§ 14, et alibi.

⁴ Tertullian, *Apol.* c. xvi.

⁵ Minucius Felix, *Octav.* c. xii.

⁶ c. xxix.

furnishes us with evidence on the same side of this question, and of the same indirect kind. When speaking of a certain sect of the followers of Carpocrates, he says, "they call themselves Gnostics, and adopt pictures and images of Christ, alleging that the original was made by Pilate, at the time when Jesus was among men. These they crown with chaplets, and expose them among the figures of the philosophers of this world, such as Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest; treating them with the same kind of reverence as the heathens express for their images."¹ It is impossible to believe that Irenæus would have penned a paragraph like this, if the Church of his day had been in the habit of presenting pictures and images of the Saviour to the devotions of the people.

Another opportunity will occur hereafter of enlarging upon this subject, though under another head of the argument,² and of showing, in yet more ample detail, how far Daillé is from being correct, when he represents the writings of the Fathers as inapplicable to present controversies; and, above all, when he exemplifies by the questions in dispute between the Reformed Church and the Church of Rome—another opportunity, I say, will shortly arrive for pursuing this investigation further, when I come to consider the allegation which he makes against the Church of Rome of corrupting the text of the Fathers to serve purposes of her own. For the present, let the instances I have adduced suffice to prove that the works of the Fathers may certainly be turned to account in the debate between these Churches, and that much information to the purpose is to be derived from them. Yet how incidentally do we get at it! How little would heads of chapters or tables of contents, help us to it! And who shall say that the Fathers are not to be read, because they are concerned with matters which have no relation to our disputes? Rather, I should say, they are not only to be read, but to be read most carefully, and with a spirit thoroughly on the alert for allusions in them which are thus latent, but which, nevertheless, are assuredly there—no less careful investigation of them than this sufficing for mastering the most valuable of the matter of which they are made up.

¹ Et reliquam observationem circa | Irenæus, I. c. xxv. § 6.
 eas, similiter ut Gentes, faciunt.— | ² In Lectures IV. and V.