

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/robbadshaw>

LECTURE IV.

Fourth argument of Daillé. Vagueness of it. The Fathers disposed of in the same way by Priestley. Paucity of MSS. Antiquity of some of the Versions. Improbability that the Fathers previous to Cyprian have been tampered with by the Romanists. Discussion of passages claimed as favourable to Romish views. The writings of Irenæus full of evidence against them. His appeal to tradition the same as that of the Church of England. The writings of Clemens occasionally corrupt. Discussion of passages in them claimed by the Romanists. Germ of Romish errors discoverable in Clemens. The same remark true of Tertullian. But neither his writings nor those of Hippolytus in a condition satisfactory to a Romish interpolator.

DAILLE has been hitherto chiefly contemplating entire spurious works as distinguished from such as are genuine; and has been expatiating upon the difficulty even in this case of discriminating the false from the true; but he has not yet done with this argument of forgery, and the plea it affords for damaging the credit of the Fathers. Accordingly he now proceeds to another branch of it, and contends that if it is difficult to decide even upon the genuineness of whole books (which was the consideration we were dealing with in the last Lecture), how much more, upon all the component parts of even unsuspected books, what has been interpolated, and what expunged in them¹; yet, until this has been done, the real sentiments of the author can never be attained; not to speak of the errors of transcribers in the copies that have been made during ten or a dozen centuries, and the depredations on the manuscripts occasioned by moths, worms, decay.

I notice all this, for the same reason I before noticed his array of fictitious works (works which everybody allows to be fictitious), simply in order to show the *animus* of the man, and the determinate exaggeration with which he states his case against the Fathers. For who does not see that most or all of these objections bear, if not with equal strength yet certainly with great strength, against the genuineness of all an-

¹ Daillé, pp. 59, 60.

cient books whatever, even of the Scriptures themselves, and reduce one to principles of universal scepticism ? Nothing is more easy than to throw out a charge that a book is interpolated, when the subject-matter of it does not happen to suit our taste ; and in the case of an ancient book, nothing is more difficult than to disprove the objection by any distinct evidence. The expedient may serve the turn of Daillé, in order to dispose of testimony on the Romish question, which he might fancy was inconvenient, and those who think with him might feel inclined to favour his temerity ; but the same expedient might serve the turn of a Priestley equally well, and was in fact employed by him to extinguish evidence which the same quarter supplies on the Socinian question and the Divinity of the Son, so that it is a dangerous edge-tool to use. “ We find nothing like Divinity ascribed to Christ before Justin Martyr,” says Dr. Priestley.¹—But the Epistle of Barnabas is against you ?—Yes, but the text and translation of that Epistle are interpolated. And the Epistle of Clemens Romanus ? But the manuscript of Clemens is faulty. And the Epistles of Ignatius ? But the numerous passages in which the Divinity of Christ is clearly confessed in those Epistles are foisted in, every one of them. “ Having by this compendious process,” says Mr. Wilson in his “ Illustration of the method of explaining the New Testament by the early opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ,”² “ reduced the Apostolical Fathers to his own theological standard, he next actually reckons on their *silence*, a silence of his own creation, in favour of his own opinions ; and confidently affirms that ‘we find nothing like Divinity ascribed to Jesus Christ before the time of Justin Martyr.’ ” “ The most extraordinary method,” adds Mr. Wilson, “ of conducting an historical inquiry that ever was adopted.” The remarks of Daillé, however, ultimately settle on the question, not of accidental, but of fraudulent interpolation or mutilation of ecclesiastical authors.³

The manuscripts of the early Fathers are in general few in number,⁴ so that we cannot find any strong argument against

¹ History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. i. p. 32.

² Wilson, pp. 282, 283. Cambridge. 1838.

³ Daillé, pp. 63, 65, *et seq.*

⁴ I perceive almost all the editors complain of this.
In summâ quâ laborant Patres Apost.

those who throw out charges of interpolation or mutilation from the universal consent of a multitude of manuscripts ; but then we have, in several instances, the check of early translations of these Fathers. We have nearly the whole of Barnabas both in the Greek and Latin—the Latin barbarous enough, no doubt, and occasionally defective, but early ; at least before the year 900, when the corruptionists, according to Dailé, had scarcely begun their work.¹ We have the Shepherd of Hermas in a Latin version only ; but that version most ancient, probably the one through which the work itself was known to the Latin writers of the Primitive Church² ; and we have very many passages of the original Greek text preserved in other authors as fragments, by which the fidelity of the old translation may in general be tested. We have again a very ancient version of the Epistles of Ignatius, the history of which, indeed, very remarkably illustrates the argument I am now using, and

tolici Codicum manu scriptorum penuria, utpote quorum non nisi singulis Clementis et Ignatii uti liceat, &c.—Jacobson, Patres Apostol. Monitum, p. vi.

Nolite vero oblivisci codicum manuscriptorum usu destitutum me id tantum egisse, ut, &c.—Hefele, Patres Apostol. Pref. p. 1.

Valde est dolendum quod pauci tantum supersunt in bibliothecis codices operum Justinianorum manu scripti.—Otto, Justin. Martyr. Prolegom. p. xxxi. And again—Interdum vero destitutus codicum manuscriptorum auxilio—hoc maxime accidit in Apologiis et in Dialogo, quorum, quod sane dolendum, non extant nisi duo codices scripti iisque recentiores ac sibimetipsis consimillimi, &c.—Hefele, Patres Apostol. Pref. pp. xlviij. xlxiij.

It should appear from Archbishop Potter's address to the Reader that he had met with few MSS. of Clemens Alexandrinus. Manu scripta, quaecunque reperi potui, exemplaria diligenter perlegi. And these consisted of a MS. of the Cohortatio and of the two last books of the Pædagogue in New College Library, a MS. of the three books of the Pædagogue in the Bodleian, and another, almost the same, in the King's Library. Scriptum Stromatum exem-

plar nullum oculis meis perlustrare hactenus licuit. But Bernard Montfaucon had sent him a list of various readings, non solum ex Ottoboniano, qui eorum prolixiora quadam Fragmenta, sed ex Parisiensi etiam codice, qui integrum Stromatum opus complectitur.

The MSS. used in Priorius' edition of Tertullian, which has for its basis that of Rigaltius, are the Codices Claudi Puteani et Petri Pithæi, and the Fuldensian, the Codex Agobardi, the Codex Fulvii Ursini, the Codex Divisionensis. But these appear to have been the MSS. of parts of Tertullian, not of his entire works.

The MSS. of Irenæus seem to be more numerous for the Latin version than for the Greek text : Non minor in recognoscendâ eâ parte Graeci textûs, que extat, cura fuit adhibita, quamvis deficitibus MSS., minori successu.—Pref. ad Edit. Benedict. p. viii.

The MSS. of Cyprian are numerous. Baluzius who furnished the text chiefly or altogether of the Benedictine edition, præter codices MSS. qui Pamelio, Rigaltio et Anglis usui fuerant, alias circiter triginta in subsidium sibi adhibuit.—Pref. ad Edit. Benedict. p. iv.

¹ Preface to Russel's Ed. p. viii.

² Russel, p. 126. Cotelerius' Opinion.

shows by example the singular value of these early translations in preserving the original text entire. For this version having been discovered before any copy of the Greek text of the shorter Epistles of Ignatius had come to light, on being compared with the Greek text of the Interpolated Epistles, which was already known, served to detect the interpolations, and enabled Usher, in a new edition, to weed them all out, and expose them by printing them in red ink. His corrections, thus obtained, were confirmed by the discovery of the Greek text of the shorter Epistles soon afterwards at Florence. We may, however, observe in passing, that these interpolations bear no mark of having been made for the purpose of upholding any Romish articles of faith or practice ; nor is it easy to find that any principle of any kind guided their contrivers in the fabrication of them.

Of Justin Martyr we have no early Latin translation to refer to ; but Justin bears no marks of having been tampered with by the Romanists. There is only one passage in his works which could be even suspected of having been submitted to their manipulation¹—a passage which has certainly been produced by Romanists as favouring the worship of angels, but it has no appearance whatever of interpolation—the argument is consecutive and unbroken—and if in reply to heathens who charged the Christians with atheism, Justin, in his zeal to show that they were no atheists, should say, not only that they worshipped God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but also *ex abundanti* should touch upon their belief in angels, what wonder ? But if the Romanists had introduced the paragraph respecting the angels in order to cover their practice of worshipping them, would they not have so worded it, as to make the meaning they intended to impart to it, clear ? Whereas, the fact is, that many scholars, as Grabe, Cave, and Le Nourry, though a Benedictine, consider the passage to admit of a translation perfectly consistent with the Protestant doctrine, punctuation having much to do with it² ; and Bishop Bull, who discusses it at great length,³ so far from contending that it is corrupt, rests his interpretation mainly on its relation to the context, which the Romanists, he considers, had not

¹ Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 6.

² See the note in Chevallier's translation of the Apology, p. 178, and

Bishop Kaye's, in p. 53 of his Justin

Martyr.

³ Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 2, c. iv. § 8.

taken sufficiently into their consideration ; a line of argument, as it will be at once perceived, utterly opposed to any notion of interpolation. Moreover, if the Romanists adulterated this passage, how came they to leave untouched another in Justin, occurring in the same *Apology*, and within a few pages of the first,¹ the parallel to it and comment upon it, a passage which clearly limits the objects of Christian worship to the three Persons of the Trinity ? Or how happened they to permit another passage to stand in the “*Legatio pro Christianis*” of Athenagoras, which is almost the counterpart of this of Justin —the same objection encountered, the same answer supplied, the three Persons of the Trinity still the objects of the Christian worship, and the Christian belief asserted besides (just in the manner it is done by Justin according to the Protestant and Bishop Bull’s rendering), in the existence of angels ?² How did this passage escape their mischievous pains, especially as Justin’s genuine, as well as reputed works, are usually found, more or fewer of them, comprised in the same manuscript as the work of Athenagoras ?³ On the other hand, if the Romanist was busy with Justin’s writings, how came he to leave in them passages to his own confusion ? Thus in opposition to any doctrine of Transubstantiation, he speaks of the elements in the Eucharist as food liquid and solid⁴—as memorials of Christ’s Body and Blood⁵—as oblations (if oblations) of fruits of the earth.⁶ In opposition to the Communion in one kind only, he expressly asserts that both the bread and the wine were administered to all present.⁷ In opposition to a Service of the Church in an unknown tongue, he bears clear testimony to that of the Primitive Church being in a tongue understood of all—“We all rise up together, and offer up our prayers in common.”⁸ In opposition to the doctrine of Purgatory, he represents it as a saying of Jesus, “In whatsoever state I shall find you, in that shall I judge you ;” *i. e.* find you at the day of death ; as the context plainly proves.⁹ And in another place, when declaring the freedom of the will, by which all creatures, who enjoy it, are rendered responsible, he says, “We

¹ Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* I. § 13.

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

³ See Otto, *Prélégom.* p. xxxi. *et seq.* De Justinī codicibus manu scriptis.

⁴ Justin Martyr, *Dialog.* § 117.

⁵ § 70.

⁶ § 41.

⁷ *Apolog.* I. § 65.

⁸ § 67.

⁹ *Dialog.* § 47.

men (and the same is true of angels) shall be self-condemned, if we transgress, unless we forestall our condemnation by repentance in time ;”¹ as though the work of penitence was to be finished here. And in opposition to vows of celibacy, clerical, conventional or monastic, occurs a paragraph scarcely consistent with the exaction or recognition of such vows at that time : “There are many, both men and women, sixty and seventy years of age, who, having been Christians from their childhood (an incidental argument, by the by, for *Infant Baptism*), still continue undefiled.”² The term “many,” could hardly have been used, had the fact been that whole classes of persons had been living all their days in celibacy by the very condition of their calling.

The passages in Irenæus, to which any such suspicions as these, which Daillé is starting, would be most likely to attach, are very few—one which the Romanists certainly claim as favouring the pretensions of the supremacy of the Church of Rome, and one or two others which they claim also as favouring the adoration of the Virgin.³ The first is the well-known phrase, “ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principaliatatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam.”⁴ But I explained in ample detail in my second Lecture, that no such doctrine as that of the supremacy of the Church of Rome, as asserted in modern times, is conveyed in this phrase ; the drift of the argument being against it, and other passages of Irenæus inconsistent with it. I shall not, therefore, repeat what I then said, but content myself with remarking, that Romish interpolators must have been very ill fitted for the task they had imposed on themselves, if they did their work in such a manner as to leave the paragraph they had to deal with, after all, not only capable of receiving an interpretation against them, but naturally disposed to receive it ; and moreover allowed other passages in the same author to remain unerased and unmodified, which are not to be reconciled with the doctrine they were attempting to fasten on Irenæus in one instance ; not to say that anybody accustomed to the style of that most ancient, but most bald and barbarous translation, in which the writings of Irenæus for the most part survive, as they do in the case

¹ Εὰν μὴ φθάσαντες μεταθώμεθα.—
Dialog. § 141.

² Apolog. I. § 15.

³ See Pref. to Benedict. Ed. of Irenæus.

⁴ Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 2.

before us, would not see any intrusive patch here, anything which is not of a piece with the rest. Monkish Latin was, no doubt, often bad Latin enough; but you want here not only bad Latin, but bad Latin of a very peculiar character; antiquated, and at the same time hobbling under the constraint of a close translation of an author not easy to be translated even with latitude, and made by one whose vocabulary appears to be very limited and unequal to the business before him. The principal one of the passages to which I alluded is as follows, —it is a parallel between the Virgin Eve and the Virgin Mary. “For as she (Eve) was seduced by the discourse of the angel to fly from God, and disobey his word, so the latter (Mary) was instructed by the discourse of the angel to bear (portaret) God, and be obedient to his word. And if the one was disobedient to God, the other was induced to obey God, that the Virgin Mary might become the *advocate of the Virgin Eve*. And as the human race was delivered up to death by a virgin, by a virgin it is saved, the scales being even, a virgin’s disobedience and the obedience of a virgin.”¹ Irenæus is here engaged in refuting certain heretics, who maintained that the God who created the world and gave the law, was not the same as the Supreme God who gave the Gospel. He therefore shows that their identity is evident from the constant connection which is maintained between the Old Testament and the New, and the close relation which the one bears to the other. Thus, as sin was brought into the world by the disobedience of a virgin (Eve), according to the Old Testament—Eve being supposed a virgin when she ate of the tree—so according to the New Testament was it abated to the world by the obedience of a virgin (Mary) who was made to bear God incarnate in her womb, and by so doing became the advocate of Eve, not that she was herself the intercessor of Eve in heaven, but simply that by having given birth to the Saviour, she became the repairer of all the damage that Eve had done to herself and to mankind. Another passage, which is nearly to the same effect, occurs in Bk. III. c. xxii. § 4; and if rightly interpreted, con-

¹ Et si ea inobedierat Deo; sed hæc suasa est obedire Deo, uti virginis Eve virgo Maria fieret advocata. Et quemadmodum adstrictum est morti genus humanum per virginem, salvatur per virginem, sequâ lance dispositâ, virginâ-

lis inobedientia per virginalem obedienciam. (I take the reading as given in the Benedictine edition, the variae lectiones not affecting the argument.)—Irenæus, V. c. x. § 1.

veys the same meaning ; viz. that the Virgin Mary was the remote cause of the salvation of the human race, herself amongst the number, by having given birth to the Saviour. And the same meaning is to be assigned to a third paragraph of a similar description, which, however, the Romanists do not claim for the Virgin, thinking the term *virgo*, in this instance, applies to the Church, as it possibly does.¹ Whilst on the other hand, Irenæus, on another occasion, shows himself so far from an idolater of the Virgin, that he makes an incident in her history not flattering to herself, expressly tributary to his argument, and treats it in a manner rather calculated to depress than to exalt unduly her character and name. For when urging against the Gnostics, who separated Jesus from Christ, the identity of the two as manifested by the precision with which Jesus Christ executed at the proper time and opportunity the will of the Father, a precision which could not have had effect if there had been a division in his Person, Irenæus illustrates as follows :—“ For nothing is done by him out of order and season, even as nothing is done impertinently by the Father. For all things are foreknown by the Father, and are wrought out by the Son, as time and circumstance suit. Accordingly, when Mary was making too much haste towards the wonderful miracle of the wine, and was desirous to partake of the cup created on the instant (*compendii poculo*²) before the time, the Lord checked her unseasonable hurry, and said, ‘ What is that to me and to thee ? mine hour is not yet come.’ ”³ What I mean to observe is, that had Irenæus been impressed with those feelings for the Virgin which have prevailed and still do prevail in the Church of Rome, he would not have gone out of his way to choose this scene in her life for the exemplification of his argument, when so many other particulars recorded of our Lord would have served his turn equally well, or having done so, he would not have volunteered a description of it in terms of some aggravation.

Besides, had the Romanists meddled to any extent with the writings of Irenæus, would they have left them, after all, full of evidence against themselves ? for so they are. I have already produced a passage from them entirely inconsistent with the doctrine of Transubstantiation⁴ ; others, with the use of the

¹ Quæ est ex virgine per fidem, regenerationem.—Irenæus, IV. c. xxxiii. § 4.

² III. c. xi. § 5.

³ c. xvi. § 7.

⁴ Lecture II. p. 33.

secret Confessional¹; another with that of images in the Service of the Church.² I may now add, that jealous as the Romanist has been and is of the free circulation of the Scriptures, had he been modelling Irenæus to his taste, he would not have overlooked in him the following paragraph, “ Of every tree of the garden ye shall eat, saith the Spirit of God, i. e. feed on every Scripture of the Lord’s.”³ Or, scandalized as the ecclesiastical power of Rome was, even in early times, by the title of Antichrist given to it by its enemies, he would scarcely have allowed the conjecture with respect to the name of this mysterious agent to stand unmolested in the text of Irenæus; I mean that which intimated that it might be *Λατεῖνος*, a name that answered to the number 666, and was that of the last of the Prophetical kingdoms, the kingdom then subsisting⁴; liable as such a conjecture evidently was to be made use of against the Church. Would the same party, being an interpolator as well as amputator of this author, have suffered Irenæus to touch repeatedly, as he does, on the intermediate state between death and judgment, the receptacle and the condition of departed spirits, without the remotest hint offered of a purgatory?⁵ It might have happened, no doubt, that the absence of all allusion to a purgatory would have furnished no ground for the argument I am maintaining; there might have been no call or opportunity for making it, but when his subject most naturally, and almost necessarily, led him to speak of the doctrine, had he entertained it, his silence becomes expressive, and we cannot but believe that the interpolator, had there been one, would have taken care to break it. Again, would he have permitted any passage to stand, which might testify that the Holy Communion was administered in both kinds in the days of Irenæus, whilst his own Church administered it only in one kind? And yet we find Marcus, the heretic, represented as exciting in all present an eager desire to *taste the cup*; his own administration being, no doubt, a caricature of that of the Church, and reflecting its several features.⁶ Would he have left untouched a paragraph

¹ Irenæus, I. c. xiii. §§ 5. 7.

² c. xxv. § 6.

³ V. c. xx. § 2.

⁴ Nihil de eo affirmamus. Sed et *Λατεῖνος* nomen habet sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum: et valde verisimile est, quoniam novissimum reg-

num hoc habet vocabulum. Latini

enim sunt qui nunc regnant.—V. c.

xxx. § 3.

⁵ See Irenæus, V. c. xxxi. § 2; IV. c. xxii. § 1; c. xxvii. § 2; c. xxxiii. § 1; I. c. xxvii. § 3.

⁶ I. c. xiii. § 2.

which speaks of a certain Deacon of the brethren in Asia having his *wife* seduced¹: and another, which numbers among the tenets of the heretical Ἐγκατεῖς, or Continents, the *prohibition of marriage*²; his own Church all the while showing itself inimical to the marriage of ecclesiastics, and in general the unscrupulous abettor of vows of celibacy? Would he have found no cause in the practice of his own Church with respect to the invocation of angels and saints for suppressing or altering the text of Irenæus in many places in relation to this subject? Would the following passage have been left alone? “Neither does the Church do anything by the *invocation of angels*, nor by incantations, nor by any other evil and curious art; but directing her prayers to the Lord who made all things, chastely, purely, openly; and invoking the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, she performs her great acts for the benefit, not the seduction of mankind.”³ Or this other? “The Father had no need of angels to make the world, and to fashion man for whom the world was made. Neither, again, had he any need of their services for the formation and arrangement of the things pertaining to man. For he had an ample and unutterable ministration (in himself). For his own Progeny, his Word and Similitude, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the Word and Wisdom, *whom all angels serve and are subject unto*, are his ministers.”⁴ For though, possibly, the Church of Rome might subscribe to the literal terms of this paragraph, yet the spirit of it is adverse to the very prominent position she assigns to angels in her system: as are other paragraphs in Irenæus, which ascribe whatever knowledge the angels and even archangels possess of the Father to the disclosure of it made to them by the Son,⁵ from whom all such knowledge is entirely derived.⁶ Whilst with respect to saints, would he not at any rate have introduced the term itself more frequently into his author? For so far from any indication of the worship of saints transpiring in Irenæus, it is remarkable how very sparing he is even in the designation. In quoting even the Apostles, for instance, (an observation which may be extended to the early Fathers in general,) his manner is almost always, “Paulus ait,” or “Petrus ait,” or occasionally “Paulus Apos-

¹ Irenæus, I. c. xiii. § 5.

² c. xxviii. § 1.

³ II. c. xxxii. § 5.

⁴ IV. c. vii. § 4.

⁵ II. c. xxx. § 9.

⁶ IV. c. vi. § 7.

tolus," once ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος,¹ but even this a singular expression for Irenæus, and one that attracts our attention as being such; and though he does make use of the epithet sometimes, and in connection with the Apostles, it is for the most part in a general way, *οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι*,² and very rarely as a prefix to the name of an individual.

Again on the question of tradition; it is not a phrase or two in Irenæus, that rises up to censure the Romanist, but a considerable portion of his work. Several of the early chapters of his third book are employed in discussing it, his controversy with the heretics bringing the limits, use, and abuse of it under examination; and so little favourable is the whole tenour of his argument to Romish views, that it is impossible to believe a Romish interpolator could have suffered it to stand as it does. Irenæus first speaks of the Apostles preaching the Gospel by word of mouth; but as this manner of publishing it would come to an end with their lives, he says they further committed it to writing. Matthew, γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου. Mark, τὰ . . . κηρυσσόμενα . . . ἔγγραφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Luke, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. John, ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.³ And these permanent documents, he tells us, were to be thenceforward *the pillar and ground of our faith*.⁴ In case, therefore, of a debate arising as to what the faith or the truth was, Scripture is thus represented as the authority to appeal to. But the heretics, against whom Irenæus was contending, disputed that authority; alleged that Scripture sometimes contradicted itself, and that truth could not be come at, unless tradition were resorted to.⁵ Irenæus describes the Church as not shrinking from this reference to tradition, but on the contrary as accepting the challenge, only demanding that the tradition be genuine. For the abuses to which tradition is liable, he exposes in another place. "The tradition of the elders," says he, "which they pretended to keep in accordance with the Law, was really

¹ Irenæus, V. c. ii. § 3.

² III. c. iii. § 3.

³ c. i. § 1.

⁴ Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præeonaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, funda-

mentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum.—Ibid.

⁵ Cum ex Scripturis arguantur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non rectè habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia variè sint dictæ, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his, qui nesciant traditionem.—III. c. ii. § 1.

contrary to the law as given by Moses. And therefore Isaiah exclaims, ‘Caupones tui miscent vinum aquâ,’¹ i. e. your elders mix the water of tradition with the pure Word of God, adulterating the Law and resisting it, as the Lord made manifest, saying to them, ‘Why do ye transgress the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition?’ And not only did they make the Law of God of none effect by their prevarication, mingling water with wine, but they established their own law instead, which is still called the Pharisaical. By which they take something from the Law ; something they add to it ; and something of it they interpret after a fashion of their own.”² Thus alive to the value of tradition, but aware of the defects which attach to it, Irenæus represents the Church as respecting it, but first demanding a scrutiny into its character. Now the tradition to which the heretics appealed, was a secret tradition delivered by the Apostles *per vivam vocem* (as they pretended) to a favoured few, the τέλειοι ; of which tradition they were themselves in exclusive possession ; and this tradition, it is needless to add, coincided with their heretical opinions. On the other hand, Irenæus describes the Church as rejecting this tradition, not because it was tradition, but because it was tradition that had no marks of being genuine.³ He, with the Church, maintained that the Apostles were not likely to exercise any reserve towards their own successors at least in the Churches, men of their own choice, selected to be governors of the Churches in their own stead ; that they would surely have imparted to them not only the truth, but the whole truth : that accordingly in investigating tradition, the tradition of the Churches of which the Apostles had been themselves the founders should be preferred ; its correct transmission should be guaranteed by the succession of its keepers being thoroughly known, and capable of being traced, one after another, to the time being ; that such correctness would be rendered further satisfactory, if it could be shown that the descents through which it had passed were few, as could be done, for instance, in the Church of Ephesus, where John died at a very advanced age, so as to render the interval between his death, and Irenæus’ writing, inconsiderable ; or, as could be done in the Church of Smyrna, where Polycarp, who was

¹ Isaiah i. 22.

² Irenæus, IV. c. xii. § 1.

³ Comp. Papias ap. Routh. Reliq.

Sacr. vol. i. p. 8; and Eusebius’ quota-

tion of Clemens Alexandrinus, Eccles.

Hist. v. c. 11.

John's disciple, lived to such a period, that Irenæus himself could actually remember him and the words he used ; and though in the case of the Church of Rome, the series of Bishops between Peter and Paul, and the time of Irenæus, was longer, yet it was thoroughly well known, not a link of it wanting, whilst the conspicuous position and character of that Church, situated in the metropolis of the civilized world, the great central exchange, as it were, to which the traditions of all other Churches would be likely to converge, and be there compared, were eminently calculated to give certainty and consistency to the tradition which obtained in it. To these three Churches, therefore, Irenæus chooses to refer when in search of sound tradition ; and thus does he fence his tradition about by various safeguards, by examining into its locality, whether Apostolical ; into its transmission, whether through few descents, and those well ascertained ; into its uniformity, whether identical in divers and distant Churches. To such tradition as this he will appeal as fearlessly as to Scripture against the heretics ; and accordingly he does appeal to it on the questions at issue between the Gnostics and the Church, very cardinal questions of faith and doctrine, no doubt, as he would also have done on any other questions, had any others been at issue, however inferior in importance to these ; for he expressly says, that "even if the dispute were concerning any small matter, recourse must be had to the oldest Churches."¹ Now from all this it seems to me that the Romanists occupy the ground taken up by the early heretics on the subject of tradition, as the Church of England, for I leave the defence of the foreign Protestant Churches to Dailé, occupies that taken up by the Primitive Church ; and that it would be impossible for a Romish interpolator to be satisfied with the general tenour of the reasoning and of the testimony of Irenæus, or with the position in which it placed his own Church. For let us very briefly recapitulate. The heretics did not renounce the authority of the Scriptures, but contended that they did not yield out the truth to such as were ignorant of tradition ; and accordingly to tradition they appealed. The Romanists say and do the same. The early Church did not object to the heretics' appeal to tradition, but only required that it should be genuine, testing its genuineness by starting

¹ Et si de aliquâ modicâ quæstione | simas recurrere ecclesias.—Irenæus,
disceptatio esset, oporteret in antiquis. | III. c. iv. § 1.

it from Apostolical sources ; by tracing it through the steps of its descent, where the steps were few in number ; and by comparing it in several independent Churches. Neither does the Church of England reject the Romanist's appeal to tradition, but adopts the principle herself ; only she must have it free from all suspicion of being spurious ; and accordingly she looks for it in the age nearest the Apostles ; she has respect unto it only or chiefly for a few generations after the Apostles, and as manifested in the primitive Fathers, not in those of later date and corrupted times, her watchword being every-where in the Homilies and elsewhere, "Scripture and the Primitive Church;" and she further is careful to gather it from the *consent* of those Fathers, as independent witnesses in several unconnected Churches. To the tradition *per vivam vocem*, of which the heretics represented themselves as the exclusive possessors, the Church of Irenæus demurred, as not standing the tests by which the Church tried tradition. To the tradition *per vivam vocem*, of which the Romanists regard themselves as the keepers, the Church of England objects, and upon the same grounds. It may be added, as a general remark, and without reference to the controversy between the Churches of England and Rome merely, that the subject on which tradition was called in to judge between the parties, in the case before us, was doctrines ; and the shape, in which it showed itself as the witness of those doctrines, was in a creed.¹ The Church of England uses it still for the same purpose, and under the same form, viz. for the purpose of defining doctrines, and under the form of creeds. But it appears from one passage we have had before us from Irenæus, that tradition would have been called in by the early Church quite as readily, and with quite as much propriety, had circumstances required it, in lesser matters ; such, we may presume, as in the cases of discipline, rite, or ceremony ; and the Church of England does accordingly avail itself of tradition in this province also, agreeably to such precedent. On the whole, it is surely not to be expected that a Romish manufacturer of Irenæus would have been satisfied to present his article in a condition so acceptable to the Reformer, at least the English Reformer, and so far otherwise to the Church for which he was preparing it.

¹ Irenæus, III. c. iv. § 2.

With respect to Clemens Alexandrinus, I think no one could read him attentively and suppose that his text had been unfairly meddled with by the Romanists at least. It is probably often corrupt ; and this corruption no doubt adds greatly to the natural obscurity and mysticism of the writer ; but what is there in all his works even as they now stand, which would seem to betray the hand of the Romanist ? There are some four places, I think, not more, which might be supposed to hint at a purifying discipline to which the soul must be subjected, if not before death, after it ; but they are so far from explicit, that one is scarcely sure of their meaning. For instance, “the faithful man, even if he should escape from the flesh (*κἀν ἐξέλθῃ τὴν σάρκα*), must put away his passions in order to be able to proceed to his own abiding place.”¹ Again, “the Gnostic withdrawn from such matters by the hope that is in him, does not taste of the good things of this world ; despising all things here ; pitying those who have to be disciplined after death, and brought to confession against their will through punishment inflicted on them.”² Again, after disparaging the offerings made to the gods, of which the poets speak, offerings of fleshless bones, and burnt gall (*χολῆς πυρουμένης*), which our days would reject, and which were supposed to conciliate favour for the parties, even though they were pirates or thieves, he proceeds, “but we say that fire sanctifies not the flesh, but the sinful soul—fire that is, not which is mechanical and consumes, but which is discriminating (*φρόνιμον*), and pervades the soul, which passes through it.”³ However, in another place, it may be remarked, Clemens speaks of knowledge (*γνῶσις*) nearly in the same terms, as he speaks of this *πῦρ φρόνιμον* ; which I mention as indicating the mystical nature of this purgation or discipline, whatever it was. “Knowledge, therefore, is quick to purify, and qualified to work the change for the better, wherefore it easily translates the man to the divine and holy principle, which is congenial to the soul : and by a certain peculiar light passes him through the stages of initiation, until it sets him upon the crowning point of his rest, pure in heart ; and teaches him to behold God with understanding and comprehension face to face. For this is the perfection of a Gnostic soul, that having made

¹ Clem. Alex. Stromat. VI. § xiv. p. 794.

² VII. § xii. p. 879.
³ § vi. p. 851.

its way through purification and ministration, it should be with the Lord, and so be proximately subject to him.”¹ It is possible, nay probable, from the general principle, which rules the writings of Clemens, viz. a disposition to communicate, as far as may be, to the heathens the Gospel through the medium of heathen philosophy, that one of the popular notions of that philosophy suggested to Clemens the idea here in question. But there is no reason to suppose for a moment that any *Romish* interpolator had been tampering with his text. A Romish interpolator meaning to uphold the doctrine of Purgatory would have been much more explicit than this. Neither, in general, would he have allowed so many other passages to keep their places in Clemens, which are utterly against his own faith or practice; which oppose, for instance, his most vital doctrine of all, that of Transubstantiation, over and over again, as I shall show when I come to speak of the Eucharist²; or which touch upon rites and ceremonies of heathen temples in a manner so greatly reminding us of some in his own Churches.³ The truth is, that in the writings of Clemens may be detected the germ of several customs or opinions, which eventually became corrupt as exercised in the Romish Church; but which, as presented to us in him, are generally little more than unauthorized, yet still serve to intimate to us the use from which the abuse proceeded—*secret confession* from the *ἐξομολόγησις* or *public confession* of sins—the *Disciplina arcani* from the deep and *spiritual meaning*, which the Gnostic was taught to find in Scripture, as distinguished from the superficial sense, which was all that was discernible in it to the vulgar eye—the undue *exaltation of Saint Peter* above the other Apostles from such a casual expression applied to him in an early age, as “the blessed Peter, the elect, the chosen, the first of the disciples, for whom only and for himself the Saviour paid the tribute.”⁴ But the general plan and character of Clemens’ works would render them extremely unpropitious to interpolation. What affects the Romanist at all, whether for good or harm, is incidental, inferential, unobtrusive. Nobody would know, from the complexion of the

¹ Clem. Alex. Stromat. VII. § x. p. 865. | 252; Stromat. V. § vii. pp. 670, 671.

² See Lecture XII. Second Series.

³ Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. ii. p.

⁴ Quis dives salvetur. § xxi. p. 947.

whole volume, where to look in it for a syllable to the purpose of such a controversy.

These latter remarks also hold with respect to Tertullian. We should find in him several traces of the future characteristics of the Church of Rome—mostly the unauthorized beginnings of customs or sentiments, which grew up to a vicious excess, and the eventual mischief of which could not be then foreseen (*magnæ cunabula Romæ*) ; few or none of these harbingers of future corruptions introduced in a way which a Romish interpolator would have propounded ; some of them in a way which would have been positively offensive to him. We have the frequent use of the sign of the Cross¹ both on the person and even on the furniture ; which was even then, it seems, liable to be mistaken (though hitherto a mistake it was, which could scarcely be said in the case of the Romish Church), for the worship of that emblem²—Prayers and offerings for the dead, and oblations in honour of the martyrs on the anniversaries of their martyrdom³ ; usages, which grew at length into mortuary masses and the actual sacrifice of the Host—Unwritten tradition, then recent, urged to the confusion of heretics, who mutilated or denied Scripture⁴ ; and urged, too, in support, not to the disparagement of Scripture⁵ ; which eventually grew to tradition as a rival of Scripture and a substitute for it—The intercession of martyrs in prison with the Church in behalf of persons suffering under its censure, to which the Church was disposed to listen with favour⁶ (an indulgence, which even Tertullian, as a Montanist indeed, already regarded with jealousy⁷) ; which in time ripened into the merit of the works of supererogation of the saints—Celibacy and bodily mortifications, here perhaps commended⁸ ; which, by degrees, became the forced *vows* of the monk and nun, and produced, in fact, the crimes to which Tertullian himself points as the natural consequence of such vows, if they were compulsory⁹—The impossibility that the Churches (Ec-

¹ Tertullian, *De Coronâ*, c. iii.; *Ad Uxor.* II c. v.

² *Apolog.* c. xvi.

³ *De Coronâ*, c. iii.; *De Exhortat. Castitat.* c. xi.; *De Monogam.* c. x.

⁴ *De Coronâ*, c. iii.

⁵ *De Prescript. Haret.* c. xxv.

⁶ *Ad Martyres*, c. v.

⁷ *De Pudicitâ*, c. xxii.

⁸ *De Patientiâ*, c. xiii.; *De Cultu Fœminar.* II. c. ix.; *De Resurrec. Carnis*, c. viii.

⁹ *De Virgin. Veland.* c. xiv.

clesias) should *all* fall into error, that is, that there should be an universal defection from the faith, asserted¹; which in process of time was magnified into the infallibility of the Church of Rome—The mitigated sufferings, which are to be endured for the purgation of small offences (expressed by the uttermost farthing in the parable) between death and judgment intimated²; a notion, which, in due season, was enlarged into the whole apparatus of purgatory—The power of the keys conferred on Peter, and through him on the Church; on the Church, which thenceforth could give absolution³; in course of time exaggerated into Saint Peter and the successors of Saint Peter in the Papal chair, having the exclusive possession of those keys—a case which Tertullian even contemplates in order to deride, and compares to that of Janus of old⁴—The Church of Rome described as deserving of great respect, as possessing the very chairs of the Apostles, perhaps the auto-graph letters, certainly authentic copies of them, as the scene of the martyrdom of the Apostles, as in the enjoyment of a pure creed, as combining the Law and the Gospel⁵; these reasonable claims to regard urged to the confusion of heretics, who would not hold the traditions thus guaranteed to be safe; eventually puffed into unreasonable and arrogant pretensions of the Church of Rome to govern the faith of the whole world, ages after her traditions had become to a considerable degree unworthy of trust. The Romanist would hardly have contented himself with interpolations after this fashion, had he interpolated at all, especially as several of these seeds of Romish usages present themselves in the tracts of Tertullian, written when he had evidently become a Montanist; which is not the field the Romanist would have made choice of, in which to sow his tares, had he meditated doing his Church a service by clandestinely foisting his own peculiar tenets into the writings of this primitive author: much less would he leave in them passages which strongly reflect on his own proceedings and principles—passages over and over again occurring, which contradict *e. g.* the doctrine of Transubstantiation⁶: which refute the superiority of St. Peter, who is ac-

¹ De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxviii.

² De Animâ, c. lviii.

³ Scorpiae, c. x.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxxvi.

⁶ De Oratione, c. vi.; De Resurr. Carnis, c. xxxvi.; Contra Marcion. I. c. xiv.; III. c. ix. xix.; IV. c. xl.; De Animâ, c. xvii.

tually vindicated in one place as not inferior to St. Paul, as it might be supposed he was from St. Paul rebuking him, for that he was made equal with Paul by his martyrdom¹: which ascribe the doctrine, that worship is to be paid to angels, actually to Simon Magus; and represent it as condemned by the Apostle Peter²: which are opposed to the adoration of the Virgin; so far from any undue reverence being assigned to her by Tertullian, such as is her right is scarcely conceded to her; her belief in the Saviour questioned³; her standing at the door desiring to speak with him construed into a disregard of his teaching whilst it was going on in the house⁴: which do not favour the multiplication of sacraments, the two of Baptism and the Eucharist being produced by themselves, and as if standing apart from all others⁵: which animadvert upon the practices of religious mendicants among the heathen in a manner which would be most unsatisfactory to the friars of the Church of Rome⁶: which actually designate Rome as the Babylon of St. John, great, proud, and the destroyer of saints⁷: which deny the necessity of the celibacy of the clergy⁸—this last, I will add, a fact the more to my purpose, because the Romanists actually took some pains to show, in the teeth of Jerome's assertion to the contrary, that Tertullian was not a Presbyter of the Church; his treatise “to his Wife” proving him at any rate to be married, and thus his example, if Jerome's testimony be admitted, opposing the Church of Rome in the restriction she lays upon the clergy—but still the Romanists endeavour to establish their point by argument, which is all fair; by producing certain paragraphs out of his works, which they contend (not, however, successfully), prove him to have been a layman⁹; but they make no attempt whatever to suppress the tract “Ad Uxorem,” nor yet many other passages in him, which clearly testify against themselves, and sanction clerical marriage. These surely are not indications of an author who had been dishonestly handled by Romanists.

¹ De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxiv.

² c. xxxii.

³ De Carne Christi, c. vii.

⁴ Adv. Marcion. IV. c. xix. See also De Carne Christi, c. xxiii.

⁵ Adv. Marcion. IV. c. xxxiv.

⁶ Apolog. c. xiii.

⁷ Contra Judæos, c. ix.; De Cultu

Fœminar. II. c. xiii.

⁸ Ad Uxor. I. c. iii. vii.; De Monog. c. xii.; De Exhort. Castitat. c. vii.

⁹ De Exhort. Castitat. c. vii.; De Monogam. c. xii.; but he may here be considered to identify himself with his clients rhetorically.

In the works of Hippolytus again, however they may want sifting and re-editing, there is nothing to lead us to suppose that the Church of Rome has been particularly busy with them. In the treatise "concerning the End of the World and concerning Antichrist," imputed to him, occurs an expression with regard to the Eucharist—that the priest sacrificed every day Christ's precious Body and Blood¹;—but such an expression would be very far from establishing the doctrine of Transubstantiation or excluding the use of *figurative* interpretation; especially whilst in an exposition of Proverbs ix., which is another of Hippolytus' works not disputed, he speaks on this same subject in such language as the following:—"She (Wisdom) hath furnished her table, *i. e.* Christ the Wisdom of God, hath furnished his table; to wit, (supplied) the knowledge of the sacred Trinity, which had been promised, and his precious and unpolluted Body and Blood, which, in the *mystical* and divine table, are daily sacrificed in *remembrance* of that first and ever-memorable table of the mystical supper"²—the furniture of the table being the *knowledge* of the Trinity, and the precious and unpolluted Body and Blood of Christ—the knowledge of the Trinity certainly a spiritual not a material viand—the precious and unpolluted Body and Blood, therefore, thus coupled with it, also spiritual and not material. There is another passage in Hippolytus which seems to imply the absence of such a doctrine as Purgatory from the mind of that Father.³ And again, another,⁴ in which the notable conjecture is hazarded that the name of the future Antichrist might be *Λατεῖνος*, a conjecture in which Irenæus, as we have seen, indulged before him, but one which, at any rate, so far as it conveys any meaning at all, would not be such as a member of the Latin Church would tolerate, but would be rather likely, if he meddled with the work at all, to suppress.

¹ Hippolytus, De Consummat. Mundi et Antichristo, § 41.

Ed. Fabric.

² Comment. in Prov. ix. 1. p. 282,

³ Adversus Græcos, pp. 220–222.

⁴ De Christo et Antichristo, § 1.