

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 III.

Third argument of Daillé—its insufficiency to establish his proposition. The quotation of the Sibyl by the Fathers explained. Vindication of them from the charge of dishonesty in quoting Apocryphal books. Opinions of Vossius, Hammond, and others, on the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Pastor of Hermas. Arguments of Daillé against the Epistles of Ignatius inconclusive. Comparison of passages in Irenæus, Polycarp, Tertullian, with passages in those Epistles. Quotation of them by Origen. Improbability that Eusebius should have been deceived as to their genuineness.

THUS far we have found Daillé decrying the use of the Fathers, first by reason of the writings they have left being few, and often fragmentary ; secondly, by reason of the subjects of those writings being altogether alien from the controversies of modern times.

The third ground on which he depreciates them is the suspicion of forgery and interpolation which affects many of their works.

Accordingly he produces a long catalogue of spurious compositions, bestowing a good deal of ostentatious pains on each, as it passes in review, and then concludes, that it is evident very many persons, and, especially, the Latin monks and clergy, from the eighth century to his own, considered it lawful to invent, change, and interpolate, whenever such proceeding might seem to conduce to the advantage of their religion. And as whatever we possess of ancient books is derived to us from this quarter, he does not think it so wonderful, that numbers of these are now in circulation under the title of ancient, which are partly false and supposititious, partly vitiated and corrupted, as that there should be any, however few, which should have reached us pure and genuine.¹ But though this array of mendacious documents is very well calculated to produce an impression of distrust in antiquity on persons, who have not turned their attention to patristic theology, yet

¹ Daillé, p. 46.

others would know that of these writings, which he produces in general the spuriousness is now and has long been universally admitted; and that when we urge the advantage of reading the Fathers, we are never contemplating these, but far other works. Surely it does not follow that because there is much that is false, there is nothing that is true: on the contrary, it is the existence of the genuine that gives occasion to the counterfeit. Irenæus expressly tells us, that the heretics "had concocted and put in circulation an unspeakable number of apocryphal and spurious Scriptures, to the confusion of illiterate persons and of such as were not acquainted with the writings of truth."¹ And if you will look at Jones on the Canon of Scripture, you will see² that the mere titles of apocryphal books, which issued in the very earliest age of the Church, and laid claim more or less to Apostolical authority, occupy five octavo pages. Are we then on that account to reject or suspect the canonical books of the New Testament? They are very few in comparison with the others; and it would be a very easy thing for a sceptic, arguing in the spirit of Daillé, to mislead people, too ignorant or too indolent to inquire for themselves, into a notion that in the midst of such a mass of moving quicksands, it was next to impossible to find any solid, trustworthy footing. Certainly it is credible that in the time of Daillé arguments might occasionally be drawn from one or other of the works on his condemned list; perhaps it may be alleged of some of our great divines of even the Augustan age of our Church, that they were not always sufficiently scrupulous in their appeals to ancient authority: indeed, the credit of some of the tracts they rely on, had not then, perhaps, been accurately tested; now, however, and for a long time past, controversialists would not have recourse to any such weapons; severer criticism and a more jealous public taste having superseded the more confiding temperament of former ages: so that Daillé's inflated difficulties³ on this subject need not disturb us.

However, Daillé at length escapes from this cloud of false witnesses, with which he has taken a good deal of trouble to compass his readers about, and proceeds⁴ to charge several of those Fathers, who certainly are genuine, with ministering to the system of fraud, which he is exposing, by themselves

¹ Irenæus, I. c. xx. § 1.

² Jones on the Canon, Part I. c. iii.

³ Daillé, p. 48.

⁴ p. 53.

quoting as authority works which were of none. Thus Justin, Theophilus, and others, do not scruple to fetch arguments from the verses of the Sibyl; as if they were really oracular.¹ It is not quite clear, whether Daillé means to impute a fraudulent intention to these authors in this transaction or not. For he says, that the Fathers were not always gifted with powers to discover these impostures; but he insinuates the worse alternative. Now, undoubtedly, several of the early Fathers do quote the Sibyl; Justin and Theophilus amongst the rest; but in the first place it must be remembered, that on these occasions they were addressing heathens, often literary heathens, and that there was very little ground which they could occupy in common. It was in vain to plead with them Scripture testimony; for the authority of the Scripture they were not prepared to admit. Accordingly, whenever they can do it, they sustain their arguments on other evidence, which the heathens were accustomed to respect. Thus for some of the incidents of our Saviour's life, they would appeal to the Acts of Cyrenius or to those of Pilate²; for the mystical power of the Cross, to the writings of Plato, who found it in the letter X, with which he represented the world as impressed from one end to the other³; and on numberless other occasions they make the sentiments of that philosopher tributary to establishing the facts and doctrines of the revelation they taught. And so in like manner they availed themselves of the writings of the Sibyl, which circulated very largely throughout the heathen world and were held in much reverence as prophetic by the class for whom they were writing, to give force to many arguments which might otherwise have seemed strange to them, and would have hardly obtained credence—such as the creation of man—the final conflagration—the future Advent of the Messiah—and many of the circumstances which should attend it.⁴ There was nothing necessarily disingenuous in this. Doubtless in process of time verses of the Sibyl became multiplied without end, and bore on their very face the mark of the comparatively modern date at which they were composed, and yet were adopted by Christian writers. But from the beginning it was not so. Bishop

¹ Daillé, p. 53.

² Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I. §§ 34, 35.

³ § 60.

⁴ Justin Martyr, *Cohort. ad Græcos*, §§ 37, 38; *Apol.* I. § 20.

Bull considers, and with the strongest grounds for doing so, that the Jewish prophecies pervaded a great part of the heathen world, more or less obscured, (for the Jews were dispersed over nearly the whole of it,) and that out of these prophecies many of the verses of the Sibyl (as they were called) were fabricated from times the most ancient. The Septuagint translation of the Scriptures, circulating, as it did, amongst the Jews of all nations, must have communicated its contents to many Gentiles¹; and it may be added, that an early version of the Old Testament into Greek long before the Septuagint translation, of which Clemens Alexandrinus tells us on the authority of Aristobulus, would materially conduce to this.² Prophetical the verses were, strictly prophetical, and not unworthy in such cases of being quoted by the primitive Fathers, as they were witnesses on their side; the Fathers themselves ascribing, no doubt, the truth they felt to be in them, either to the sacred channels, from which they supposed them to be derived—Justin, when giving the history of the Sibyl,³ expressly makes her to be born at Babylon, and thence come to Italy: where more likely that she should become acquainted with the writings of the Prophets?—or to the fact of her own inspiration, which was the vulgar belief; or at least it was the belief that there was one *inspired* Sibyl, the existence of whom occasioned a number of counterfeits,⁴ she, raised up by God as a prophetess amongst the Greeks, as the prophets, properly so called, were by Him to the Hebrews. Is there anything in this derogatory to the character of Justin for honesty, or even for judgment? What was Balaam but such a Prophet amongst the nations of the East, and Job amongst the Arabians, and Melchizedek amongst the inhabitants of Canaan? We read of prophetic

¹ See Grinfield, Apology for the Septuagint.

² Ἀριστοβούλου δὲ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα, κατὰ λέξιν γράφει: “ Κατηκολούθηκε δὲ ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ’ ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιεργασάμενος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων. διειρημένεται δὲ πρὸς Δημητρίου, ὑφ’ ἑτέρου, πρὸ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τὰ τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγωγῆν τῶν Ἑβραίων τῶν ἡμετέρων πολιτῶν, καὶ ἡ τῶν γεγονότων ἀπάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια, καὶ

κράτησις τῆς χώρας, καὶ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις: ὥστε εὐδελον εἶναι, τὸν προειρημένον φιλόσοφον εἰληφέναι πολλά· γέγονε γὰρ πολυμαθής· καθὼς καὶ Ἡθθαγόρας πολλά τῶν παρ’ ἡμῶν μετενέγκας εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δογματοποιίαν.”—Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § xxii. pp. 410, 411.

³ Cohort. ad Græcos, § 37. He represents her as the daughter of Berossus.

⁴ Tertullian, Ad Nationes, II. § 12, and Fragment attached to the Apology, Ed. Havercamp, p. 443.

dreams even amongst the Midianites.¹ Certainly by some means or other, you must account for a great deal of very curious knowledge with respect to the Messiah to come, which pervaded the whole heathen world—knowledge, too, which the Gentiles themselves (though not understanding it of the Messiah, but puzzled how to understand it at all), did consider to relate to the events of futurity, and themselves assigned it to the Sibyl as its author. I scarcely need remind you of the *Pollio* of Virgil, where the incidents are expressly said to be drawn from the vaticinations of the Sibyl, some of them according most remarkably with those of Isaiah, and the whole almost as applicable to Christ as any chapter of that Prophet. The *Prometheus*, too, of Æschylus, though the facts are not in that case avowedly referred to the same source, does savour of the same original; and however dark the fable might seem to those who handled it, nobody can dispute that it is founded on more than human knowledge. The well-known passage in Suetonius' *Life of Vespasian* tends to the same point, that "there had been for a long time, all over the East, a prevailing opinion, that it was in the *Fates*," (in the decrees or books of the Fates, says Lardner,) "some one from Judæa should *then* obtain the empire of the world."² Where was the harm of the early Fathers taking advantage of a medium like this for arresting the attention of the heathen to the tidings they had to impart to them? more especially as it should appear from a few words let fall by Origen, that it was really debated (whether amongst the Christians one with another, or amongst the heathens and Christians), what authority was due to the Sibyl, and whether she was to be accounted a prophetess or not, so that there would seem to be nothing clandestine or underhand in the use the Christians made of the argument³; and, moreover, the passage would lead us to infer that this question had been agitated even as early as the times of Celsus, who lived some hundred years before Origen.⁴

As another instance of the unscrupulous use made of authorities by the Fathers, Daillé adduces the appeals, which Clemens Alexandrinus makes to Apocryphal books that circulated under the names of Apostles and disciples of the Lord,

¹ Judges vii. 13, 14.

² Suetonius, *Life of Vespasian*, § 4.

³ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, V. § 61.

⁴ I. § 8.

and his quotations from the pretended works of Barnabas and Hermas.¹ He also takes the like exceptions to Fathers of a later age than I am concerned with, and which, therefore, I shall not investigate; my object being to impress you with the importance of reading, not all the Fathers of every age, so much as the Fathers of the first three centuries. But does the manner in which Clemens avails himself of Apocryphal writings affect his own credit as an author or a candid Apologist? Certainly he refers to the "Gospel according to the Hebrews;" to the "Gospel according to the Egyptians;" to the "Traditions of Matthias;" to the "Preaching of Peter;" to a "certain Gospel;"² and perhaps to the "Acts of Peter."³ And often he so refers without any remark whatever as to the value of the document he is laying under contribution. But you will bear this in mind, a fact which Daillé altogether overlooks, but a very important one; that on one of these occasions he expressly speaks of no Gospels being of authority except the *four*. "On Salome inquiring," this is the passage, "when the things which she asked about would be known; the Lord replied, when ye shall tread under foot" (or have no need for) "the covering of your shame; and when two shall become one, and the male with the female shall be neither male nor female;" and then Clemens adds, by way of shaking the effect of this paragraph, which was advocating a cause to which he was opposed,⁴ "First, then, I contend, that we have not this saying *in the four Gospels delivered to us*, but in the Gospel according to the Egyptians."⁵ I say this observation must be carried along with us, when we meet with other quotations from Apocryphal Gospels and like works in Clemens; for however he may not at the moment declare in so many words the comparative estimation in which he holds them, we have it under his own hands, that none of them rank with him at all as the four Canonical Gospels do. For example, he adduces this same Gospel according to the Egyptians in another place, as follows: "But they who oppose

¹ Daillé, p. 53.

² Ὁ Κύριος ἐν τινι Εὐαγγελίῳ. — Clem. Alex. Stromat. V. § x. p. 684.

³ VII. § xi. p. 889. See Grabe, Spicilegium, vol. i. p. 79.

⁴ The passage was advanced by a heretic, one Cassianus, as adverse to

marriage; Cassianus being himself opposed to marriage, whilst Clemens contends for the lawfulness of it.

⁵ Ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέταρτων εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους. — Clem. Alex. Stromat. III. § xiii. p. 553.

themselves to the Creation of God by their specious continence, allege those things which were addressed to Salome, whereof I have made mention already. They occur, I think," continues Clemens, "in the Gospel according to the Egyptians."¹ Now here you see the Gospel according to the Egyptians is cited without any notice of distrust in it or any mark of depreciation. Yet from the other passage, already laid before you, it appears, that though he is here silent about its merits, Clemens had no wish to disguise his real opinion of it. I may as well observe by the way, that though Clemens does not specify what were the *four* Gospels to which he assigns such superior weight, there can be no doubt that our *four* they were; for he was contemporary with Irenæus, though probably born a few years later than that author; and the testimony of Irenæus to the Canonical Gospels of his day being the four we now have, and no other, is undeniable²; not to say that Clemens himself quotes St. Matthew in one place as τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον,³ and St. Luke in another, as τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν.⁴ The same reasoning as before applies to the quotations made by Clemens from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He is contending, for instance, that to admire is the first step to knowledge, and therefore, "in the Gospel according to the Hebrews," says he, "it is written, he that admireth shall rule, and he that ruleth shall rest,"⁵ without any remark added on the nature of the document; but if there were then only four acknowledged Gospels (as he felt was the case), there was no need for remark. The same may be said of his citation of the τὴν Εὐαγγέλιον. "It belongs to few to take these things in, for the Lord says in a *certain Gospel*, that he does not teach in a niggardly spirit, 'My mysteries are for me and the children of my house:'"⁶ no note or comment subjoined, because none was wanted. Even in the case of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, where the observation respecting the Four Gospels, on which I am relying so much, is made, it is made, you will perceive, quite incidentally, and almost as though it escaped him by the by.

¹ Clem. Alex. Stromat. III. § ix. pp. 409.
539, 540.

² Irenæus, III. c. xi. § 8.

³ Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § xxi. p.

⁴ p. 407.

⁵ II. § ix. p. 453.

⁶ V. § x. p. 684.

And if it be said, why then multiply quotations? It may be answered in the first place, that Clemens was a man of enormous reading, and could not help showing it; his reference to profane as well as to sacred, or quasi-sacred authorities, being most profuse; indeed, he had a reason for the former display, which I shall make appear in a future Lecture. There is nothing singular or offensive in this. Look at Bishop Jeremy Taylor's *Life of Christ*, and you will see him supporting or adorning his narrative by appeals to numberless authors, whose credit he leaves his readers to settle as they will, contenting himself with saying who they are, or with referring to them in the margin. Yet how many of these authors are of little or no account! And in the next place, no doubt many of the documents, which were written at this very early period of the Church, in the midst of much error, contained much truth. It is the testimony of an Apostle himself, that "there are also many other things" (besides those carefully recorded), "which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one," he supposes, "that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."¹ There is a saying assigned to Jesus in the Acts,² which there is no previous memorandum of his having ever uttered. There are several other sayings preserved by the early Fathers³; together with one or two incidents respecting him, not taken notice of by the Evangelists.⁴ There might be, nay, it is highly probable that there was, much of this kind to be discovered in the many unauthorized publications which found their way into the world in the age immediately after our Lord's Passion, and which, however overlaid by base materials, did give to those publications a certain value nevertheless. Indeed, St. Luke's Preface to his Gospel implies, I think, that the histories of our blessed Lord, which his own was meant to supersede, were of this mixed character, not absolute fiction, but truth adulterated. "Forasmuch as *many* have taken in

¹ John xxi. 25.

² Acts xx. 35.

³ Ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.—Justin. Dialog. § 47.

Venient dies, in quibus vineæ nascentur, singulæ decem millia palmitum habentes, et in uno palmite dena millia brachiorum, &c.—Irenæus, V. c. xxxiii.

§ 3. A collection of these sayings and histories of Christ will be found gathered

from their several sources in the Appendix of the first volume of Jones on the Canon.

⁴ Ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμης κατέλυσε.—He put up in a certain cave near the village.—Justin. Dialog. § 78. Ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἄν, ἄστροικα καὶ ζυγά.—Justin. Dialog. § 88.

hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word ; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed,"¹ the spirit of the passage not being utterly to condemn the writings he is contemplating of gross and wilful falsehood, but to imply that the authors' understanding of the incidents they had related was not perfect ; that their opportunities of learning them had not been like his own, he having had perfect knowledge of them from the first, and that the knowledge therefore which he would communicate would be certainty, which could not be said of that of the others. Even when these early documents proceeded from *heretical* quarters, as probably many of them did, the substance of them would still, in many cases, be truth ; they would scarcely have answered the purpose of their compilers had it been otherwise. The "Traditions of Matthias," the "Preaching of Peter," "the Acts of Peter," and something "of Paul's," probably combined with the "Preaching of Peter,"² all, as I have said, quoted by Clemens, were, no doubt, publications of the nature I am describing ; truth mingled, or, as it might be, grossly debased with error. Origen himself takes this view of the last of these documents, observing, in a passage of his commentary on St. John, where he has occasion to quote a saying of Heracleon, who had adopted certain words from the "Preaching of Peter," we must inquire touching this work "whether it is genuine, or spurious, or mixed,"³ himself apparently leaning to the last supposition. With respect to the first of these, the "Traditions of Matthias," Clemens refers to it several times, but not in a way to impress us with his confidence in it ; rather the contrary ; for though in one or two places he simply quotes without preface, in others he intimates in a manner that ought to satisfy M. Daillé himself, that its character, even in his eyes, was suspicious. Thus of the heresies, says Clemens, "some are called by the name of their

¹ Luke i. 1-4.

² See Jones on the Canon, Part II.

³ Πότερόν ποτε γνήσιον ἐστίν ἢ

μικτόν.—Origen, vol. iv. p. 220. Bened. Ed.

author, as that of Valentinus, and Marcion, and Basilides, although, indeed, they boast that the *opinions of Matthias* may be adduced in support of their own. But as there was but one doctrine delivered by all the Apostles, so can there be but one (true) tradition.”¹ Surely there is here a caveat interposed by Clemens sufficiently intelligible to prevent any of his readers from being misled by the authority of the “Traditions of Matthias,” though he has occasion to refer to that work. With respect to the “Preaching of Peter,” another of the ecclesiastical writings frequently cited by Clemens, it is to be observed, that Clemens never cites it as Scripture, and that in the long extracts he makes from it there is nothing heterodox to be found; nothing which might not be consistent with the theory, which is Dr. Grabe’s,² that it was what some or other of St. Peter’s hearers had committed to writing after he was dead. Take the following as a specimen of the work, and say whether it falls short of the character I am imputing to it. The passage occurs in the sixth book of the *Stromata*. “And the companions of Christ, who preached the word as he did, lost their lives after him. Hence Peter in his *Preaching*, speaking of the Apostles, says, ‘But when we had read the books, which we possess, of the Prophets, and which now in parables, now in enigmas, now again authoritatively and literally speak of Jesus Christ by name; we found his presence, and death, and cross, and all his other sufferings, which the Jews inflicted on him (described), and his resurrection, and ascension into heaven, before (the new) Jerusalem should be built,³ even as it is written: ‘these things are all which he ought to have suffered, and what should be after him.’ We therefore, becoming acquainted with these things, believed in God, by reason of the things which were written concerning him.’ And presently, afterwards,” Clemens adds, “Peter again infers that the prophecies were (written) by Divine foreknowledge, thus saying, ‘For we know that God really appointed these things, and without the Scripture we say nothing.’”⁴

¹ Μία γὰρ ἡ πάντων γέγονε τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὡς περ διδασκαλία, οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡ παράδοσις. — Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* VII. § xvii. p. 900.

² Grabe, *Spicileg.* i. pp. 61, 62.

³ Πρὸ τοῦ Ἱεροσολύμα κτισθῆναι, unless we read ληφθῆναι, ἀλωθῆναι,

καθαυρεθῆναι, vel tale aliquid, making the words then refer to the earthly Jerusalem.

⁴ Καὶ οὐδὲν ἄτερ γραφῆς λέγομεν. — Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* VI. § xv. pp. 804, 805.

Is it then to be charged upon Clemens as an act of fraud and fallacy, or even of folly and weakness, that he made use of a work which expresses itself after this manner, when his subject happened to remind him of a passage in it that suited him, without cautioning his readers against its pretensions; what it really was being most likely notorious all the while? Would it expose a man now to the charge of wilful deception, if in a treatise he should quote the Apocrypha without expressly stating that the Apocrypha was not canonical?

The same reasoning will apply to his use of the "Acts of Peter;" if indeed it is to that document that a passage in the *Stromata* refers,¹ as Grabe supposes,² though the title is not given by Clemens. At all events it is only quoted by him with a *φασί*—"they say that the blessed Peter, when he beheld his wife led to death, was pleased that she was sent for and conducted homewards, and addressed her with a cheering word of comfort and exhortation, calling her by name and saying, 'Remember the Lord.'"

With respect to Clemens' citations of the writings of Hermas and of Barnabas, fictitious as they are according to Daillé, which is another article of impeachment that Daillé prefers against him on this occasion, we may observe, that supposing Clemens to have believed in the title of these writings to be considered the works of the authors whose names they bear, which seems to have been the case, still there is nothing in this to damage his character in any way. He erred, if he did err, in common with many others of the early Church; indeed it was nothing but a general feeling of that kind prevalent in the Church that preserved them. In those times it must have been beyond measure difficult to decide the canon of Scripture peremptorily. All was to be done by the inspection of manuscripts, which circulated in the several distant churches throughout the world, and a comparison of the local evidence possessed by these churches for fixing each manuscript upon the writer. There were then no Councils of the Church. Conference was no easy matter where the parties were very remote from one another and often watched with jealousy by the powers of the day, and had to conduct so many of their operations clandestinely, and under the constant experience or

¹ *Stromat.* VII. § xi. p. 869.

² Grabe, *Spicileg.* i. p. 79.

apprehension of persecution. There was no volume of the New Testament bound up as now, in ordinary use, and dispersed by millions; but some manuscript books in the keeping of some Churches, and some in the keeping of others, as it might be. And the absolute necessity for such a volume was not at first so imperative, as it became shortly afterwards: for the appeal was not in those days so directly and invariably to Scripture as it now is. There was for a time a substitute for it to some extent in the fresh tradition, which as yet ran pure and unpolluted in every Apostolical Church—a tradition which the sound Churchmen were perpetually appealing to (as we actually find to have been the case), and were compelled to appeal to in support of the truth against the heretics, who often denied the authority of the Scriptures which were objected to them, and were only to be refuted by the living voice of the Church, which had taught otherwise than they would have it, from the time of Christ and the Apostles to the time in question; against the heretics too, who often again adulterated Scripture, and could only have their iniquities exposed and refuted by producing the usage and language of the Church, ever since a Church there was. I say that under all these circumstances, a man must have had great perplexity in satisfying himself what was canonical Scripture, and what was not, particularly when (as I have already observed) the latter was often only the truth alloyed, not the truth denied—alloyed in a more or less perceptible degree. And his perplexity would perhaps be greater, as to excluding certain books, than as to admitting certain others, for the evidence in favour of the latter might have been at once overwhelming, whilst the evidence against the former might be supposed then to have come but partially to light, and it might have been imagined, that further intercourse among the churches would supply testimony which seemed at first lacking. Who shall wonder therefore that, for a time, a few documents should have been amongst the doubtful—that the judgment of the Church should have been suspended with respect to them, waiting for further facts to transpire. It was so with respect to some Scriptures afterwards admitted into the Canon. It was so with respect to some (these works of Hermas and Barnabas among the number), afterwards excluded from it. Clemens was amongst those who, when he wrote, thought them

authoritative, or at least written by the disciples to whom they were ascribed. Modern scholars as great as Daillé have done the same. Isaac Vossius and Hammond both defend the epistle of Barnabas. Usher and Bull both respect it; the latter of whom also repels the exceptions taken against the Shepherd of Hermas.¹ And perhaps a still greater name than any of them, Bishop Pearson, does the same.² And possibly one reason why Daillé and those of his school attack the authority of these two works with such acrimony is (as Bishop Bull suggests of Blondel's dealing with Hermas), the testimony one of them at least supplies against him on the subject of Episcopacy³; as the other also does on the subject of the freedom of the will⁴; and that which both of them bear to the life-giving or regenerating power of Baptism.⁵ We may suspect this the rather, because though the same Clemens quotes on two occasions the epistle to the Corinthians of his name-sake of Rome, and ascribes it in terms just as express to the Apostolic Clemens,⁶ and though at least as much might have been made by a perverse interpretation of the reference to the phoenix contained in that epistle,⁷ as is made by him of the reference to the Sibyl found in Clemens Alexandrinus; yet inasmuch as the epistle of Clemens Romanus is not calculated to alarm so much any of Daillé's prejudices or those of his persuasion, he suffers this peccadillo of his author to escape scot-free, and accounts it, apparently, no matter of charge, that Clemens should give his sanction to this primitive document.

We may the more freely draw this inference, from the turn his argument now takes against another primitive author, who would, of all others, be the most natural object of his aversion, as being the most opposed to all his ecclesiastical notions, Ignatius.⁸ His attack upon this Father is made with all the dexterity of a polemic. He endeavours to excite an evil impression of the genuineness of the Letters in the first instance,

¹ Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 1, c. ii. §§ 2, 3.

² Vind. Ignat. Part I. c. iv.

³ "Ii sunt Apostoli et Episcopi et Doctores et Ministri."—Hermas, Vis. iii. § 5.

⁴ "Ὁ γὰρ ταῦτα ποιῶν, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοξασθήσεται ὁ ἐκείνα ἐκλεγόμενος μετὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ συναπολείται."—Barnabas, § xxi.

⁵ "Quoniam vita vestra per aquam salva facta est, et fiet."—Hermas, Vis. iii. § 3. Μακάριοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐλπίσαντες, κατέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ.—Barnabas, § xi.

⁶ Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § vii. p. 339; IV. § xvii. p. 609.

⁷ Clem. Rom. Ad Cor. I. § xxv.

⁸ Daillé, p. 57.

by devolving upon them the suspicion attached to all antiquity whatever, which he had excited in the minds of his readers by an accumulation of the examples it supplies (many of those which he names very far-fetched) of fiction or fraud. Having created, therefore, this prejudice against the Epistles of Ignatius *in limine*, as he might against any ancient document whatever, and given them a bad name, he feels the way paved for the introduction of a specific objection, founded on the silence of the ancients with respect to them; confessing indeed (for he will be candid), that it is possible for one or even many Fathers to be ignorant of a previous writer, or knowing him, through inadvertence or design to make no mention of him; but still contending that, if a grave and learned author was altogether silent respecting the writings of one who was prior to him in date, when there was good reason for his not being silent about them, when those writings were celebrated either on account of the name of the writer or the subject of his argument, the probability is that no such writings were then in existence. He then applies this reasoning to the case of Ignatius, and maintains, that had the Epistles of which Eusebius speaks been extant in the time of Irenæus, he must have known of them; and treating, as he did, of the Godhead of the Creator, and the verity of Christ the Son, he would have produced out of them evidence against the heretics; as he actually does make use of Clemens' Epistle to the Corinthians, and Polycarp's to the Philippians; whereas he never mentions these at all. Neither would these Epistles, if they had been genuine, have escaped the notice of Clemens Alexandrinus, who frequently quotes even apocryphal books, nor of Tertullian; neither of whom speaks of them.¹

But what if Irenæus does refer to them? What if the following paragraph occurs in that Father—the original Greek of Irenæus preserved, too, in Eusebius in this instance, which is important²;—“Even as one of our brethren said, when condemned to the wild beasts, through the witness which he bare unto God, I am the corn of God, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread—*σπίτος εἰμι Θεοῦ καὶ δι' ὀδόντων θηρίων ἀλήθωμαί, ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος*

¹ Daillé, p. 58.

² Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 26; | Irenæus, V. c. xxviii. § 4.

εὐρεθῶ.” And what if the very same passage, word for word, is found in our present copies of Ignatius’ Epistle to the Romans,¹ showing that the “one of our brethren,” the *τις τῶν ἡμετέρων*, as the Greek runs, was Ignatius? Oh! writes Daillé, I am aware of that passage; but it was introduced into the Epistle by the forger of it, to give it a colouring of truth. Ignatius is not named in it; and, moreover, it does not say, ut *scripsit* quidam de nostris, or ut in Epistolâ aliquâ dixit, but simply, ut dixit. But how gratuitous is this! The genuineness of the Epistles is denied because Irenæus does not quote them. He does quote them, is the reply. Yes, is the rejoinder; but as I insist that the Epistles are spurious, the quotation must have been made by the forger from Irenæus; not by Irenæus from the Epistles. Surely this is a begging of the question. With respect to the use of the expression, “said,” instead of “wrote,” as though the former term implied that Irenæus did not quote from any *written* document, but was merely recording a hearsay; that must be felt to be an objection which none would have raised but one who was greatly pressed for an argument; for who does not know that the word “said” is as often used to introduce a citation from a book as the word “wrote,” or indeed much oftener? Nor is this all. Daillé is evidently not aware that any other reference to Ignatius can be supposed to exist in the writings of Irenæus besides this one. And he may be well excused in the supposition; for Bishop Pearson is under the same impression. Bishop Bull, however, who gleans after Bishop Pearson, has produced another passage in Irenæus,² which he thinks looks to one in the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp. The paragraph in Irenæus runs thus: “that it was a strange doctrine to the Gentiles that there was one God, and that his Word, naturally invisible, was made palpable and visible amongst men, and that he descended to death, even the death of the Cross.”³ The paragraph in Ignatius, which Bishop Bull considers to correspond to this, is, “Be more zealous than thou art; study the times; be in expectation of Him who is above time, not of time, invisible, yet visible to us, impalpable,

¹ Ignatius, Ad Romanos, § iv.

² Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 4, c. iii. § 6.

³ Et hujus Verbum naturaliter quidem invisibilem, palpabilem et visibilem

in hominibus factum, et usque ad mortem descendisse, mortem autem crucis. —Irenæus, IV. c. xxiv. § 2.

impassive, though a sufferer for us!"¹ Moreover the coincidence here, if one there is, is not of the same kind as the other, or liable to the same objection (such as it is) which Daillé advances; for Irenæus does not here quote, but simply alludes, in the way a man might do, who, having read the Epistles, found a phrase in them cleaving to his memory, which he took the liberty of adopting, without considering it necessary to make any formal acknowledgment of having done so.

But the nature of Irenæus' book, which was against heresies, pursues Daillé, would have caused him to find in Ignatius that which might have been turned to account; and therefore it is the more extraordinary that he should not speak of those Epistles. The heresies, however, on which these Epistles touch, are very simple; merely that which denied the Divinity, and that which denied the Humanity of Christ; whilst those with which Irenæus deals are most elaborate and complicated. Besides, why should it be more extraordinary that he should not dwell on Ignatius (for allude to him, we have seen, he does) than that he should not once even refer to Barnabas, to Quadratus, to Aristides, to Melito, and numbers more whose works might have been known to Irenæus, or rather must have been known, for many of them were very famous in the Church, and some of them might have supplied him with matter quite as much to his purpose as Ignatius?

But the case does not after all rest on any such narrow ground as one quotation or one allusion in Irenæus. Polycarp, in his Epistles to the Philippians, an authority rather earlier than Irenæus, speaks expressly of the Epistles of Ignatius as having been sent to him by Ignatius himself²; which is decisive against Daillé and his "said," instead of "wrote;" and proves that written Epistles there were for Irenæus to read. And not only does Polycarp give a general description of their contents, but uses many phrases and peculiar forms of speech, which have a close relation to others found in the Epistles, and in our present copies of them. As, for instance, Polycarp in his Epistle speaks of Ignatius and his companions, as persons bound in bonds such as become saints (*τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι δεσμοῖς*), and are unto them diadems (*αὐτὰ ἐστὶ διαδήματα*).³

¹ Τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὄρατον, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆν, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν.—Ad Polycarpum, § iii.

² Polycarp, Ad Philipp. § xiii.

³ § i.

Ignatius speaks of his being bound *θεοπρεπεστάτοις δεσμοῖς*,¹ of wearing bonds which are spiritual jewels (*τοὺς πνευματικὸς μαργαρίτας*).² From whence it would seem that in these cases Polycarp was adopting, without any formal profession of it, the phraseology of Ignatius, of whom he was speaking. This is the kind of concurrence in expression which is to be detected on a comparison of their writings. Bishop Pearson will furnish you with other examples of it.³

But Clemens Alexandrinus, continues Daillé, never quotes these Epistles, and he was in the habit of citing even apocryphal books. What reasoning, however, is this! that because he quotes some books, it must be expected of him to quote all then in circulation; and that it must be concluded those which he did not quote did not exist! Undoubtedly Clemens, as I have said already, was one of those people that struggle with whole libraries; and numerous are the authors which he quotes or mentions; but there are very many whose works are known to have been then in being, whom he passes over in silence. He refers to the Epistle of Barnabas⁴; to the Shepherd of Hermas⁵; to the Epistle of Clemens Romanus⁶; to Irenæus, though not by name⁷; to Tatian⁸: but I do not believe he has a single allusion to Justin, to Athenagoras, to Theophilus, to Apollinarius, to Hegesippus, and to many more distinguished writers who had preceded him, whom it would be very easy to enumerate.

Tertullian, again, gives no token of knowing him, continues Daillé, and Bishop Pearson acquiesces in this; at least he brings no instance to the contrary. Yet there is a passage in Tertullian which very much resembles one in Ignatius. It is in the "De Carne Christi," and is as follows:—Tertullian is speaking of the nature of Christ—"Wherefore, the possession of both the one substance and the other exhibited Him as Man and God: on the one hand, born; on the other, not born: on the one hand, carnal; on the other, spiritual; on the one hand, weak; on the other, exceedingly strong: on the one hand, dying; on the other, alive."⁹ Now certainly the phraseology, as well as the antithesis, very much resembles

¹ Ignatius, Ad Smyrn. § xi.

² Ad Ephes. § xi.

³ Vind. Ign. Part I. c. v.

⁴ Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xx. pp. 489, 490.

⁵ I. § xvii. p. 369.

⁶ I. § vii. p. 339.

⁷ I. § xxii. p. 410.

⁸ III. § xii. p. 547.

⁹ Tertullian, De Carne Christi, c. v.

a passage in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians. "There is one Physician, bodily and spiritual; created and not created; God in the flesh; a real life in death; both of Mary and of God; at first capable of suffering, then incapable."¹ The resemblance, I mean, is such as would be very naturally accounted for by the supposition, that Tertullian wrote the paragraph with a recollection on his mind of having read such a passage in Ignatius.

And why should Daillé stop suddenly short at Tertullian?² Why should he not go on to Origen, the next Father in order, and being also prior to Eusebius, just as important to produce as the others he had named? Can it be because Origen not only bears testimony, but bears direct and repeated testimony to the Epistles of Ignatius, not to the *sayings* in this case, but, I repeat, to the Epistles of Ignatius; quoting on two occasions passages now found in our copies? Surely the suppression of so material a witness, of whom he must have been cognisant (because he happens to be against him), may be the proceeding of one who has determined to support a cause right or wrong, but cannot be that of one who is in the honest search of truth. The first of these passages is in Origen's Prologue to his Commentary on the Canticles. "Finally, we recollect that a certain one of the saints, Ignatius by name, said of Christ, 'My love is crucified;' nor do I think him deserving of reproof for this." Accordingly, we find in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans the expression, 'Ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται.'³ It is true that his Commentary on the Canticles now only exists in the Latin; and in a work of Daillé's subsequent to this one on the use of the Fathers,⁴ a work in which he investigates the question of the authority of the Epistles of Ignatius at length, and to which Bishop Pearson's "Vindiciæ Ignatianæ" was a reply,⁵ he examines the testimony of Origen (his subject in this instance forcing him to do so, and making suppression impossible), and denies that the Commentary on the Canticles was written by Origen, or was ever written in Greek at all. I cannot here stay to give you Bishop Pearson's refutation of this gratuitous supposition of Daillé's: suffice it to say, that he produces in de-

¹ Ignatius, Ad Ephes. § vii.

² Daillé, p. 58.

³ Ignatius, Ad Rom. § vii.

⁴ De Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areo.

pagitæ et Ignatii Antiocheni nominibus circumferuntur libri duo. 4to. Genevæ, 1666.

⁵ Vind. Ign. Proœm. c. i.

tail the several characteristics of Origen's style, which is quite peculiar, and shows that the Commentary bears all the marks of it—whilst the other part of the supposition, equally gratuitous, that the Commentary never was composed in Greek at all, receives a complete refutation from a fragment of the original Greek still preserved in the Philocalia,¹ and which perfectly corresponds to a passage (freely rendered) in the second book of this disputed translation of the Commentary.² The other passage in Origen which bears testimony to the Epistles of Ignatius is in a homily on St. Luke. "I meet with an elegant expression in the Epistle of the same martyr," (not in this instance again, "a saying,") "I mean Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, second after Peter, and who suffered persecution by having to fight with wild beasts at Rome, 'the virginity of Mary escaped the knowledge of the Prince of this world.'" And accordingly the very sentence is found in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, as we have it.³ But here, again, the passage of Origen, like the other, was only known to exist in the Latin; which again caused Daillé, in the treatise I before alluded to, and which was subsequent to this book of his, which we are now upon, to demur to its authority, as before. Bishop Pearson replies to the objection again in a manner perfectly satisfactory. But it has happened *ex abundantia* that since Bishop Pearson's time the very passage in question was discovered as a fragment by Grabe in the *Greek*, and was communicated by him to the Benedictine editor of Origen's works, where it now appears.⁴ This argument to the confirmation of Bishop Pearson, and further confusion of Daillé, is noticed by Dr. Routh in his preface to the "Reliquiæ Sacræ."⁵

The manner in which Daillé expresses himself in the part of the "De Usu Patrum," which I am now examining, does not warrant us in supposing that he disputed our copies of

¹ A collection of questions and answers made from different books of Origen by SS. Basil and Gregory, printed at the end of the Cambridge Ed. of Origen against Celsus.

² Sed pro rebus aut materiis subjacentibus, (Sol) aut illuminat aliquid luce, aut infuscat et obdurat aliquid ardore. Secundum hæc ergo fortassis et indurasse dicitur Deus cor Pharaonis, &c.—Origenis Comment. in Canticum Canticorum, vol. iii. p. 51, Bened. Ed.

Πρόσχευς δὲ καὶ τούτοις, ὅτι ὁ ἥλιος λευκὸς καὶ λαμπρὸς ὢν, δοκεῖ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχειν τοῦ μελανοῦν, οὐ παρ' ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸν, ὡς ἀποδεδόκαμεν, μελανοῦμενον· οὕτω δὲ καὶ μὴ ποτε σκληρύνει Κύριος τὴν καρδίαν Φαραώ, κ.τ.λ.—Origenis Philocal. c. xxvii.

³ Ignatius, Ad Ephes. § xix.

⁴ Origen. Homil. vi. in Lucam. vol. iii. p. 938.

⁵ Rel. Sacr. vol. i. pp. xxi. xxii.

these Epistles being the same which Eusebius at least saw.¹ Indeed, he admits in his subsequent work that they are the same,² as though Eusebius, a consideration which Bishop Pearson presses on him with very great force, was not competent to detect the imposture³—Eusebius, whose knowledge of Greek literature was most conspicuous, *πολυμαθέστατος ἴστωρ*, as Sozomen calls him; the intimate friend of Pamphilus, who was the greatest collector of ecclesiastical authors of his time; the correspondent to whom Constantine applies for manuscript copies of the Scriptures, when he wanted them for his library at Constantinople; the scholar who wore his life out amongst books and parchments; as though he was taken in by these forgeries, and it was reserved for Daillé to find them out. Accordingly, his argument spends itself in damaging their credit before the time of Eusebius, in showing that those with which Eusebius was conversant were spurious. There is no need, therefore, to enter into the proofs which the language of Eusebius affords, that his copies at any rate are ours⁴: to describe how he speaks of them at length, and in detail; tells us where each of the Epistles was written (for they were written in more places than one); who were the Bishops at the time of the several Churches to which they are addressed; quotes long passages from them: thus furnishing many data by which we can institute a comparison between the Epistles known to Eusebius and those in our own possession—the result of which is, that they appear to be the same. There is no need, I say, on the present occasion to pursue this matter further. Enough has been said to show that Daillé deals out his denunciations of forgery with much too liberal a hand, and that the readers of his book “*De Verbo Usu Patrum*” need not lose all heart about the study of ecclesiastical antiquity because they find him representing it as so little to be trusted. Let them explore the question for themselves, by mastering for themselves the primitive documents which are of good repute, and I undertake to say that they will then rise from the perusal of Daillé very often, perhaps generally, with a feeling that he is a special pleader, and has a cause to make good.

¹ His words are, “*Quo exemplo non minus validè argumentamur supposititias esse eas epistolas, quæ jam ab Eusebii seculo Ignatii nomine circum-* feruntur.”—p. 58.

² *Vind. Ign. I. c. ii.*

³ c. viii.

⁴ Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 36.*