

LECTURE XIII.

Use of the Fathers in unfolding the *meaning* of Scripture: II. Their testimony opposed to the Calvinistic scheme, 1°. On the freedom of the will. The assertion of it by the Fathers distinct and emphatic. 2°. On the degree of human corruption. The consequences of the Fall recognised by the Fathers, but not in a manner satisfactory to the Calvinist. Their language upon this point dubious and conflicting. Cause of their embarrassment. Illustrations. Vindication of the Fathers from the charge of Pelagianism. Their teaching on the necessity of Divine grace for the recovery and restoration of man.

II.

IT is a further matter of much consequence in our interpretation of Scripture, whether we are disposed to adopt as a general principle the Calvinistic system or not. I mean that the bias on our minds which this system impresses would insensibly make itself felt in the turn we give to our exposition of a great number of texts, the meaning of which admits of debate. Thus as the effect of the former bias discovered itself in the Annotations of Grotius, so the effect of this bias discovers itself in Beza's translation of the New Testament, and through that, in some degree on our own. Now I do not say, that the early Fathers are to decide us peremptorily on this question, but I do think that their testimony upon it, and especially if that testimony be unanimous, is entitled to great consideration. But unanimous it is against the leading doctrines of Calvin. I could produce pages after pages from the early Fathers in support of this assertion, but must confine myself to a few references; a sample from a whole magazine.

§ 1.

On the Freedom of the Will.

Thus Justin Martyr maintains the doctrine of the *freedom of the will*, against the doctrine of necessity, over and over

again. He talks of man "making choice of the better part according to that freedom of will which belongs to him."¹ He insists upon such freedom being requisite in order that man should be rendered accountable for his actions. "If it were decreed that one man should be good and another bad, the former would not be a subject for praise, nor the latter for censure ;"² with much to the same effect in other places ; for the antinomianism of some of the early heretics led the Fathers to express themselves more fully upon this point than perhaps they otherwise would have done.

Irenæus is equally explicit. He maintains the justice of man's condemnation, if condemned he is, on the ground of his will being free.³ A considerable part of the thirty-seventh chapter of the fourth book is occupied in a discussion of this subject. He argues that they who do good or who do evil, will properly receive reward or punishment, because they respectively had it in their power to do otherwise : that the Scriptures urge men to act right, as if it rested with themselves to do so : and he infers from such texts that God encourages to obedience, but does not force.⁴

Tertullian repeatedly expresses himself to the same purport. "It is not the part of a sound faith," says he, "to refer everything to God's will after such a manner as this ; and flatter ourselves that nothing is done without his consent, as though we had no power in ourselves ; for at that rate every crime would have its excuse God sets before us what is and what is not his will, and then we have full choice to follow the one or the other."⁵ "God hardened Pharaoh's heart," says he in another place, "but then Pharaoh had *deserved* his ruin to be thus prepared for him, because he had denied God, and repeatedly rejected his ambassadors."⁶ I could multiply extracts from him to a great extent, but refrain for the sake of brevity.

Those which Clemens Alexandrinus furnishes of the same character are still more numerous. "God is not to be blamed for the offence of him, who will not choose the best. It is the business of the one party (those who preach) to put out

¹ Justin Martyr, De Monarchiâ, § 6.

² Apol. I. § 43.

³ Irenæus, IV. c. iv. § 3 ; c. xv. § 2.

⁴ IV. c. xxxvii. §§ 2, 3, 4.

⁵ Tertullian, De Exhortatione Castitatis, c. ii.

⁶ Adversus Marcionem, II. c. xiv.

his word to interest ; it is the business of the other party (those who hear) to prove it, and choose it or not ; but by their own judgment will they be judged.”¹ “To them which are called, both Jews and Gentiles, (we preach) Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God :” on which again Clemens remarks, “All mankind then being called, they who *are willing to obey*, are named the called : for there is no unrighteousness with God : but they of either race, who believe, are his peculiar people.”²

Origen is of the same mind. Celsus has suggested that the moral world, like the physical, is made up of a series of revolutions ; the positive amount of evil in it being a constant quantity. In reply to this, Origen contends that such a theory would be destructive of the principle of free-will : that in such case it became a matter of *necessity* that Socrates should philosophize, and be accused of introducing new Gods, and of corrupting the youth ; and that Anytus and Melitus should bring the charge against him ; and the Areopagus condemn him to death ; and in like manner, that when the cycle came round, Phalaris should play the tyrant, and so on : under which circumstances, adds Origen, “I know not how our volition can be secured, or how there will be any room for praise or blame.”³ “Take away volition,” says he, “from virtue and you take away its very essence.”⁴ In his treatise on prayer he has an express dissertation on the freedom of the will ; naturally led to it by his subject, and the necessity of showing that the effect of prayer was not destroyed, as it would be by fixed decrees.⁵ Numerous other extracts might be produced from this Father of a similar kind ; but it may suffice to refer once for all to the first chapter of the third book “De Principiis,” of which the Greek is preserved (and therefore the evidence above suspicion) in the Philocalia ; the title of the chapter being, “Concerning the freedom of the will, with a solution and explanation of those passages in Scripture which may seem to deny it ;” and the character of it to be gathered from the following paragraph, “Since then there are myriads of texts in Scripture which very clearly set

¹ Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § i. p. 318.

² Stromat. I. c. xviii. p. 371.

³ Origen, Contra Celsum, IV. § 67.

⁴ Ὅτι ἀρετῆς μὲν ἐάν ἀνέλῃς τὸ

ἐκούσιον, ἀνεῖλες αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν.

—§ 3.

⁵ De Oratone, §§ 5, 6.

forth the freedom of the will ; but at the same time there are certain expressions in the Old and New Testament which tend to the contrary, that is to say, imply that it does not rest with ourselves to keep the Commandments and be saved, or to transgress them and perish ; let us produce several of these, and consider the solution of them : that so, in like manner, any man may understand for himself the solution of all those which seem to extinguish the freedom of the will.”¹

Cyprian is no less decided on the question than the others. “What wonder is it,” writes he to Cornelius, “that the Lord’s minister, the Bishop, should be forsaken, when the Lord himself was, who said to his disciples, ‘Will ye also go away?’ where he had regard to that law by which a man, left to his liberty, and established in *his own free-will*, chooses for himself either death or salvation.”² “The Apostle John,” says he again, “execrates and reproves those who depart from the Church—‘They went out from us, but they were not of us ; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us’—but the Lord permits these things, by reason that our own free-will subsists, in order that whilst the test of truth is applied to our minds, the sound faith of such as are approved may be made manifest.”³ Much more I could add to our purpose from this same Father ; but let this suffice.

§ 2.

On the Degree of the Corruption of Human Nature.

Such emphatic enunciation of the freedom of the will is in itself enough to prove that the early Fathers did not hold the *total corruption* of human nature, in the Calvinistic sense, as the result of the Fall. Other arguments, however, to the same effect, are not wanting ; though it is to be observed that nothing can be less systematic or less organized than their notions on this subject : I might say, often even contradictory ; such inconsistency partly, perhaps, arising from the point never having been canvassed by men with any care, as

¹ De Principiis, III. c. i. §§ 6, 7. | on Gen. i. 14.
 Origen has also a dissertation on the |
 freedom of the will in his commentary | ² Cyprian, Ep. Iv. § 7.
³ De Unitate Ecclesiæ, §§ ix. x.

it eventually was by controversialists of a later day—a remark which applies to many other theological topics as handled by the Fathers—and partly from the embarrassment of their position; for whilst Scripture and self-experience compelled them to admit the grievous corruption of our nature, they had perpetually to contend against a powerful body of heretics who made such corruption the ground for affirming that a world so evil could not have been created by a good God, but was the work of a Demiurgus. The embarrassment itself, and the nature of it, is very perceptible in Tertullian's treatise against Marcion; the Marcionites disparaging the creation, which Tertullian undertakes to defend¹; as well as in several passages of the Stromata of Clemens.²

Accordingly Barnabas represents the heart of the natural man as “a house of devils”³; but then he also represents the natural man as being still “the image of God.”⁴

Tatian considers the soul to have been created of two principles; the one called *ψυχή*, which was material, being a portion of the material substance which pervaded the universe⁵; the other not material, called “the image and likeness of God,”⁶ the “holy spirit,”⁷ the “perfect spirit.”⁸ He maintains that man, by the abuse of his free-will (for with freedom of will he was created⁹) *lost* this latter spirit¹⁰; or retained *only as it were a spark of it*¹¹: that his soul consequently became mortal through privation of the spirit; that hence it gravitates downwards towards matter, itself material; dies, and is dissolved with the body, but will rise again at the end of the world and receive punishment eternal¹²; that this natural tendency of the deserted soul downwards is aggravated by matter which seeks to subdue it to itself, and by demons who would willingly prevent its ever rising towards heaven again; nevertheless, that man *has it in his power to recover the spirit*, to unite the soul with it again; when, if the body

¹ See especially *Adversus Marcionem*, I. c. xiv. *Postremo te tibi circumfer, intus ac foris considera hominem, etc.*

² See Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* IV. § vii. p. 584. *ἵνα μὴ ὡς Μαρκίων ἀχαρίστως ἐκδέξηται τις τὴν δημιουργίαν κακῆν.* And IV. § xiii. p. 605. *Τὸ δὲ ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς ἐχθρούς, οὐκ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ κακὸν λέγει.* And V. § xiv. p. 731. *Αἰτία ἐλομένον· Θεὸς ἀνάιτιος.*

³ Barnabas, § xvi.

⁴ § xx.

⁵ Tatian, *Oratio contra Græcos*, § 12.

⁶ *Ibid.* ⁷ § 15. ⁸ § 20.

⁹ § 7, 11.

¹⁰ *Ἀπολωλέκαμεν.*—§ 15.

¹¹ *Ὡσπερ ἔναυσμα τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.*—§ 13.

¹² §§ 13, 17.

be kept clean, the spirit will dwell in it, as in a temple; that it is open to all thus to recover this spirit; and to revert to man's ancient estate.¹

Athenagoras gives token, whenever his argument leads him to touch on the question, that his ideas of the corruption of our nature are anything but those of Calvin—indeed are very unsettled, very imperfect. Thus in one place he says, that man, “according to the determination of his own reason, and the operation of the *ruler who has obtained dominion over him*, and of the attendant demons, is carried in different directions, though the power of reasoning is common to all.”² When it is considered that by this ruler, who had obtained dominion over man, Athenagoras meant (as he defines him elsewhere³) the spirit who is opposed to God and his good designs, we must regard him as having here in contemplation the Fall and its fatal effects. Nevertheless, he elsewhere contends, that man not being called into existence for a time, but for eternity, must accordingly have his nature permanently secured; his nature, which consists of body as well as soul; the two together forming *man*; in this respect distinguished from animals, as he is distinguished from them “by bearing in himself the image of his Maker; by being endued with understanding, and by partaking of reason and judgment.”⁴ And again, that “if the understanding and reason are given to man for the discernment, not of substances merely, but of ideas too; of the goodness, for instance, the wisdom, the justice of the Giver; it follows that whilst those objects remain, on account of which the rational faculty of discrimination was given, the faculty itself, so given, will remain. But this cannot remain, unless the nature which is its receptacle remain; but the receptacle of the mind is the man; therefore the man must remain, compounded as he is of both parts; but that cannot be without a resurrection.”⁵ The reasoning evidently turns on the presumption that certain moral perceptions are to be found in the souls of all mankind; or, in other

¹ Tatian, Oratio Contra Græcos, §§ 15, 16, 11, 20.

² Κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἴδιον ἑαυτοῦ λόγον καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐπέχοντος ἄρχοντος, καὶ τῶν παρακολουθούντων δαιμόνων ἐνεργείαν ἄλλος ἄλλως φέρεται καὶ κινεῖται. — Athenagoras, Legatio pro

Christianis, § 25.

³ Ibid. See also Bishop Kaye's Justin Martyr, p. 105.

⁴ Athenagoras, De Mortuorum Resurrectione, § 12.

⁵ § 15.

words, that the corruption of our nature is not total. Indeed, in one passage, written however probably without much thought, he seems to overlook original in actual sin; and asserts that infants will not be brought to judgment, seeing that they have done neither good nor evil.¹

Theophilus describes the Fall as causing "blindness of soul and hardness of heart in man;"² and postpones the conception of Cain to a period later than that event³: yet he teaches that every one who pleases (*ὁ βουλόμενος*) may attain everlasting life⁴: and tells Autolycus, that, if he wishes it, he may be healed.⁵

Irenæus speaks repeatedly of the image and likeness of God having been "lost" at the Fall⁶; "cast away;"⁷ of the Fall having "alienated" us from God⁸; of man being "vanquished and demolished" by the Fall⁹; of the recovery from the Fall being altogether owing to God, "man having by his own nature nothing incorruptible about him, no natural similitude to God."¹⁰ And yet elsewhere we find him extenuating the disastrous effects of the Fall; quoting with approbation, for instance, against Tatian and those who maintained that Adam perished for his sin, even in spite of the advent of Christ, the remark of an ancient writer, that God devolved the curse upon the ground in order that it might not rest on man; and adding that Adam and Eve had their troubles in the toil to which the one, the pains of childbirth to which the other was subjected, and in the death which was awarded to them both, but that the weight of the curse fell on the serpent; that Adam was still in a condition to feel at once strong compunction for his sin; become

¹ Εἰ γὰρ μόνον τὸ κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν δίκαιον τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἦν αἴτιον, ἐχρῆν δῆπου τοὺς μηδὲν ἡμαρτηκότας, ἢ καπορθώσαντας, μηδ' ἀνίστασθαι, τουτέστι τοὺς κομιδῆ νέους παιδας. Ἐξὸν δὲ πάντας ἀνίστασθαι, τοὺς τε ἄλλους, καὶ δὴ καὶ τοὺς κατὰ τὴν πρῶτην ἡλικίαν τελευτήσαντας.—Athenagoras, De Mortuorum Resurrectione, § 14.

² Theophilus, Ad Autolycum, I. § 7.

³ II. § 28.

⁴ II. § 27.

⁵ I. § 7.

⁶ Ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id est, secundum imaginem et similitudi-

nem esse Dei, hoc in Christo Jesu reciperemus.—Irenæus, III. c. xviii. § 1.

⁷ Διὰ τοῦτο δὴ καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν ῥαδίως ἀπέβαλεν.—V. c. xvi. § 2.

⁸ Et quoniam injuste dominabatur nobis apostasia, et quum naturá essemus Dei omnipotentis, alienavit nos contra naturam.—V. c. i. § 1.

⁹ Victus et elisus per inobedientiam.—III. c. xviii. § 2.

¹⁰ Nec unquam de Deo contrarium sensum accipiat homo, propriam naturaliter arbitrans eam, quæ circa se esset, incorruptelam, et non tenens veritatem, inani supercilio jactaretur, quasi naturaliter similis esset Deo.—III. c. xx. § 1.

penitent; submit himself to sharp penance; and so to obtain mercy.¹ In the same spirit we perceive him on another occasion applying the language of St. Paul in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, descriptive of the struggle between the will and the conscience, apparently to the natural or unregenerate man, as though there were virtue enough left in him, even since the Fall, to be productive of this conflict.² And again, when speaking of the mysteries which mankind must expect to encounter in the Scriptures from their incapacity to fathom writings dictated by the Word of God and his Spirit, his phrase is, “inasmuch as we are defective and *very far removed* from the Word of God and his Spirit”³—an obscure sentence certainly in the Latin, and the Greek is lost, but still not calculated to convey the extremest notions of the amount of damage caused by the Fall.

If we turn to Tertullian, we shall discover him evidently recognising on the whole the evil consequences of the Fall, but not in a manner satisfactory to the Calvinist—indeed, his trumpet, like that of the other Fathers, giving an uncertain sound. On the one hand he tells us that man had “departed” from a good God⁴: that man was at first circumvented by Satan, “the corrupter of the whole world; so that he transgressed the command of God, and was therefore consigned to death; and thence made the whole human race, now contaminated by being sprung from his seed, partakers also of that condemnation which befell him;”⁵ as offsets are partakers of the properties of the stock—it is not easy for words to convey a more ample acknowledgment of original or birth-sin than this, or one more thoroughly Anti-Pelagian—that at the Fall man was lost wholly and not merely in part, “since the transgression which was the cause of his being lost was committed both by a desire of the mind and by an act of the flesh, and so made the *whole* man fully deserve per-

¹ Irenæus, III. c. xxiii. §§ 3, 4, 5.

² III. c. xx. § 3.

³ Nos autem secundum quod minores sumus et novissimi a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus, secundum hoc et scientiâ mysteriorum ejus indigemus.—II. c. xxviii. § 2.

⁴ Ideo malum hominem, quia a Deo bono abscesserit.—Tertullian, De Tes-

timonio Animæ, c. ii.

⁵ Quem (sc. Satanam) nos dicimus malitiæ angelum, totius erroris artificem, totius sæculi interpolatorem, per quem homo a primordio circumventus, ut præceptum Dei excederet, et propterea in mortem datus, exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum, suæ etiam damnationis traducem fecit.—c. iii.

dition,"¹—the latter clause serving to explain the sense in which *wholly* is to be here understood ; namely, that the Fall affected both the soul and body of man—that the enemy of God, the destroyer, “when he succeeded in casting man down from his innocence at first, the image and workmanship of God as he was, and the possessor of the universe, *changed also his entire substance*, which was created pure as his own, into perverseness against his Maker, like his own : ”² that “man departed from his Maker both in body and soul : ”³ that “the devil transfigured the spirit of man by his malice : ”⁴ that we cannot safely take nature for our guide, seeing that “the devil has corrupted the whole creation which ministers to man’s use, together with *man himself* ; for the Apostle speaks of the creation as made subject unto vanity : ” that “accordingly touching spectacles, the world is abused by those who maintain that all the component parts of these spectacles are of God ; forgetting all the while that all things have been changed by the devil : ”⁵ that “man had been innocent, the close friend of God, the inhabitant of paradise ; but that when he once gave way to impatience ” (this passage occurs in the tract “De Patientiâ”) “he ceased to be wise unto God ; he ceased to be able to sustain heavenly things ; henceforth man was given to the earth, an outcast from the sight of God ;

¹ Imprimis, cum ad hoc venisse se dicit, uti quod perit, salvum faciat, quid dicas perisse? Hominem sine dubio. Totumne, an ex parte? Utique totum: siquidem transgressio, quæ perditionis humanæ causa est, tam animæ instinctu ex concupiscentiâ, quam et carnis actu ex degustatione commissa, totum hominem elogio transgressionis inscripsit, atque exinde merito perditionis implevit.—De Resurrectione Carnis, c. xxxiv.

² Nos igitur qui, Domino cognito, etiam æmulum ejus inspicimus, qui, institutore comperto, etiam interpolatorem unâ deprehendimus, neque mirari, neque dubitare oportet, quum ipsum hominem, opus et imaginem Dei, totius universitatis possessorem, illa vis interpolatoris et æmulatoris angeli ab initio de integritate dejecerit, universam substantiam ejus pariter cum ipso integritati institutam, pariter cum ipso in perversitatem demutarit adversus institutorem.

—De Spectaculis, c. ii.

³ Ipse homo omnium flagitiorum auctor, non tantum opus Dei, verum etiam imago est, et tamen et corpore et spiritu descivit a suo institutore.—Ibid.

⁴ Is est diabolus. Nam quis corpus mutare monstraret, nisi qui et hominis spiritum malitiâ transfiguravit?—De Cultu Fœminarum, II. c. v.

⁵ Quæris an conditioni ejus fruendæ natura nobis debeat præire, ne illâ rapiamur quâ Dei æmulus universam conditionem certis usibus homini mancipatam, cum ipso homine corrupit, unde eam et apostolus invitam ait vanitati succidisse, vanis primum usibus, tam turpibus, et injustis, et impiis, subversam? Sic itaque et circa voluptates spectaculorum infamata conditio est ab eis qui naturâ quidem, Dei omnia sentiunt, ex quibus spectacula instruuntur; scientiâ autem deficient illud quoque intelligere, omnia esse a diabolo mutata.—De Coronâ, c. vi.

and began to be made subservient, through impatience, to whatever would offend God : ”¹ that the image and likeness of God was taken away at the Fall by the devil² ; was ruined³ ; was destroyed⁴ ; was lost by sin⁵ ; was stolen by the serpent.⁶ And yet, on the other hand, this same Tertullian writes, “Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s ; that is, Cæsar’s image, which was on the money, to Cæsar ; God’s image, which is in man, to God.”⁷ Again, after man had been driven out of Paradise, “God,” says he, “made a covenant to pardon his handiwork, his image.”⁸ Again, the treatise “De Animâ” clearly recognises the existence of virtue, more or less, in the natural man. Tertullian is here disposed to admit Plato’s division of the substance of the soul into the rational and the irrational, though not to assign both parts to it in its original creation : maintaining that, rational in its first constitution, the irrational portion was added to it at the Fall, and coalesced with it as completely as if it had belonged to it from the beginning⁹ ; that, since the Fall, it has ever been brought into existence of this mixed character ; and being besides waylaid at its birth by the evil spirit, sustains further damage in that shape¹⁰ ; nevertheless, that there is virtue in it still ; what came from God not so much extinguished as overshadowed ; the worst soul having in it some good, the best some evil ; that it is the remains of its primitive nature, which prompts it to bear witness of God by sudden and involuntary exclamations, such as “God is good ;” “God sees ;” “I commend it unto God ;”¹¹ that hence even heathen philosophy

¹ Innocens erat, et Deo de proximo amicus, et Paradisi colonus. At ubi semel succidit impatientiæ desivit Deo sapere, desivit cœlestia sustinere posse. Exinde homo terræ datus, et ab oculis Dei ejectus, facile usurpari ab impatientiâ cœpit in omne quod Deum offenderet.—De Patientiâ, c. v.

² A diabolo captam.—De Carne Christi, c. xvii.

³ Tu imaginem Dei, hominum, tam facile elisisti.—De Cultu Fœmiarum, I. c. i.

⁴ Abierat in perditionem.—De Carne Christi, c. xvii.

⁵ Recipit enim illum Dei spiritum, quem tunc de afflatu ejus acceperat,

sed post amiserat per delictum.—De Baptismo, c. v.

⁶ Ille (sc. serpens) a primordio divinæ imaginis prædo.—Adversus Valentinianos, c. ii.

⁷ Reddite, ait, quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei, Deo ; id est imaginem Cæsaris Cæsari, quæ in nummo est, et imaginem Dei Deo, quæ in homine est.—De Idololatriâ, c. xv.

⁸ Rescissâ sententiâ irarum pristinarum, ignoscere pactus operi et imagini suæ.—De Pœnitentiâ, c. ii.

⁹ De Animâ, c. xvi.

¹⁰ cc. xxxix. xli.

¹¹ Quod enim a Deo est, non tam extinguitur, quam obumbratur. Potest

presents sometimes elements of the true faith.¹ Much of this argument for the qualified corruption of the soul in its natural state is repeated in other of Tertullian's treatises; in the "De Resurrectione Carnis;"² in the "De Testimonio Animæ;"³ in the tract against Marcion⁴; and in the "Apology;"⁵ with references to which I shall content myself. But there is one passage more on the same side, to which I cannot help adverting more explicitly, because its inconsistency with so many other places in Tertullian, several of which I have already adduced, is flagrant. It occurs in his tract "De Baptismo,"⁶ where he recommends delay in administering that Sacrament, in the case of children especially, and adds, "Why should an innocent age (*i. e.* infancy) be in haste for the remission of sins?" as though he had entirely forgotten that there was such a thing as original sin—he, the same Tertullian, who had elsewhere urged our Lord's declaration, that "'unless a man is born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,' *i. e.* cannot be holy; every soul being numbered in Adam, until it is numbered anew in Christ, and filthy until it is thus numbered anew."⁷ It has been supposed with some probability that Tertullian might be here influenced by a strong feeling of the moment as to the irremissible nature of heinous sins committed after Baptism; and so overlooked the alternative which he had elsewhere so fully admitted, that provision has to be made for the remission of original sin, in contemplation of early death.⁸ But, however that may be, it is evident that Tertullian's views were not, on the whole, Calvinistic.

Clemens Alexandrinus stands in nearly the same position as those before him with regard to this question; recognising the Fall, and the corruption of our nature which ensued from it; but in no such manner as to satisfy the Calvinists; expressing himself elsewhere in terms which necessarily qualify any conclusion which they could draw from detached pas-

enim obumbrari, quia non est Deus; extingui non potest, quia a Deo est . . . Sic et divinitas animæ in presagia erumpit, ex bono priore, et conscientia Dei in testimonium prodit: Deus bonus! Deus videt, et Deo commendo.—c. xli.

¹ c. ii.

² De Resurrectione Carnis, c. iii.

³ De Testimonio Animæ, cc. ii. iii. iv. v.

⁴ Adversus Marcionem, I. c. x.

⁵ Apol. c. xvii.

⁶ De Baptismo, c. xviii.

⁷ De Animâ, cc. xxxix. xl.

⁸ See Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, pp. 422, 423. 3rd Ed.

sages ; and on the whole, giving evidence, perhaps, more than any previous Father, that the question itself, destined to be such a crux for future polemics, had not yet been technically determined, or even carefully examined ; very far from it. Thus he quotes and adopts the expression of Barnabas, that before conversion to the faith, the heart is “ a house of devils, wherein everything is done that is opposed to God.”¹ He affirms that we are “ *not by nature* the children of God ; so that it is the chief proof of all the goodness of God, that whilst we behave ourselves towards him as we do, and are *by nature utterly estranged* from him, he cares for us :”² that the language of Christ to man is this, “ born as thou unhappily wast *unto death* through the world, I gave thee a new birth, set thee free, healed, ransomed thee, will show thee the face of thy good Father ; let the *dead* bury their dead, follow thou me :”³ that “ we are by nature fitted for virtue, *not indeed so as to have it from our birth*, but so as to be fitted for acquiring it :”⁴ that “ the Advent of the Saviour was necessary in order that our nature might be able to *shine again* :”⁵ that “ none but the Word is without sin ; for that *to sin is planted in all, and common to all* ; but to recover after sin is not the act of an ordinary, but of an extraordinary man.”⁶ On the other hand, when animadverting on the heretics who applied texts of Scripture to the disparagement of marriage, this amongst the number, “ No one is clean from defilement,” says Job, “ even though his life be but one day,”⁷ he observes, “ let them tell us where it was that the new-born child committed fornication ? or how that which had done nothing, fell under *the curse of Adam* ? It rests with them, as it should seem, in order to make their assertion logical, (to

¹ Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xx. p. 490.

² Κήδεται ἡμῶν, μήτε μορίων ὄντων αὐτοῦ, μήτε φύσει τέκνων. Καὶ δὴ ἡ μεγίστη τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθότητος ἐνδειξις αὐτῆ τυγχάνει ὅτι οὕτως ἐχόντων ἡμῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ φύσει ἀπηλλοτριωμένων παντελῶς, ὁμῶς κήδεται.—§ xvi. p. 468.

The Fall is not here directly referred to, and the reasoning might be at first supposed to turn on the mere dissimilarity which subsisted between the essence of God and of man. Yet the

context contemplates the sin of man as entering into that difference.

³ Ἐγὼ μεν ἀνεγέννησα, κακῶς ὑπὸ κόσμου πρὸς θάνατον γεγεννημένον, κ.τ.λ.—Clem. Alex. Quis dives salvetur, § xxiii. p. 948.

⁴ Φύσει μεν ἐπιτήδαιοι γεγόναμεν πρὸς ἀρετὴν ὃ μὴ ὥστε ἔχειν αὐτὴν ἐκ γενετῆς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ κτήσασθαι ἐπιτήδαιοι.—Stromat. VI. § xi. p. 788.

⁵ Stromat. V. § i. p. 645.

⁶ Pædag. III. c. xii. p. 307.

⁷ Job xiv. 4, 5. LXX.

prove) that generation, not of the body only, but of the soul too, is an evil.”¹ And then he proceeds to argue, “And when David says, ‘in sin did my mother conceive me,’ he considered *Eve his mother by anticipation*. Yet Eve was the mother of all *living*; and though he was conceived in sin, he was not in sin himself, nor was he himself sin.”² Nothing can be more perplexed than the reasoning in this passage, or indicate greater vacillation on the question of original sin; carping, as it does, at an opinion of Basilides, elsewhere more distinctly expressed,³ which affirmed that doctrine—affirmed it, no doubt, for heretical purposes of his own—and yet admitting it in the case of David, by explaining his confession as relating to the debasement occasioned to her race by the lapse of Eve; and again qualifying this concession by the supposition that still Eve was the mother of all *living*. On the whole, we have here a very notable example of that embarrassment felt by the Fathers when dealing with this question, that arose, as I have said, out of a fear of giving an advantage to the heretics; and which certainly is the key to most of their inconsistencies upon it. Again, when tracing the origin of idolatry, Clemens tells of “a certain *primitive communion* with heaven planted in man, darkened, indeed, by ignorance, but suddenly in some way creeping forth from the darkness, and again shining out.”⁴ Once more, denouncing the lustful appetites which the heathen cherished in themselves by the emblems of their gods, he exclaims, “O what violence ye do to man! even offering up to reproach *whatever there is of divine* in the creature.”⁵ Again, “man is an animal that loves God.”⁶ Again, “man is by nature a high and lofty animal that seeks after what is good, as being the workmanship of the One.”⁷ Again, “God hath made us *by nature social and just*; so that justice must not be said to come of

¹ Λεγέτωσαν ἡμῖν, ποῦ ἐπόρευσεν τὸ γεννηθὲν παιδίον; ἢ πῶς ὑπὸ τῆν τοῦ Ἀδάμ ὑποπέπτωκεν ἄρὰν τὸ μηθὲν ἐνεργήσαν; κ.τ.λ.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. III. § xvi. p. 556.

² Ibid.

³ Stromat. IV. § xii. p. 600.

⁴ Ἦν δέ τις ἔμφυτος ἀρχαία πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώποις κοινωνία, ἀγνοία μὲν ἐσκοτισμένη, ἀφῆν δέ που διεκθρώσκουσα τοῦ σκότους, καὶ ἀναλάμπουσα.—Cohortatio ad Gentes, § ii.

p. 21.

⁵ Ὡ βιασάμενοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὸ ἔνθεον τοῦ πλάσματος ἐλέγχει ἀπάρξαντες—§ iv. p. 53.

⁶ Τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ δημιουργηθέντων, καὶ φιλόθεον ζῶον.—Pædag. I. c. viii. p. 135.

⁷ Φύσει γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὑψηλὸν ἐστὶ ζῶον καὶ γαῦρον, καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ζητητικὸν, ἅτε τοῦ Μόου δημούργημα.—III. c. vii. p. 276.

position" (to be the creature of circumstances), "but must rather be considered the good which belonged to our original creation, quickened by precept; the soul trained by education to a desire of choosing the best."¹

Turn we next to Cyprian. He speaks of the Divine image having been *lost* by the Fall.² And after remarking on the death of the combatants in the arena being sometimes demanded as a gratification to the spectators, he ejaculates, "as though man's own nature were not cruel enough, and had to be taught brutality in public."³ Yet he elsewhere contents himself with such moderate estimate of man's corruption as the following, "the mind of man is itself *prone* to vice, what then will it do if it have the example before it? If the nature of the body be so unsteady as to fall of its own accord, what will it do if it is impelled?"⁴

The language of Origen on this subject is of the same conflicting character, but still on the whole clearly opposed to that of Calvin. Thus, in his treatise against Celsus, "Celsus," says he, "has not shown how transgression is connected *with our very generation*: nor has he pointed out what he wishes himself, and so given us an opportunity of comparing his system with ours. Whereas the prophets intimating that view of the circumstances even of our generation which is the wise one, say that sacrifice is offered for sin, even the *sin of those just born*, as though *even then they were not free from sin*: for it is written, 'I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin did my mother conceive me:' and again, as sinners they were 'estranged even from their mother's womb;' so extraordinary an expression used as this, 'they go astray from the womb, they speak lies.'⁵ Again, in the same, "Celsus

¹ Φύσει δ' αὐ κοινωτικούς καὶ δικάτους ὁ Θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐδημιούργησεν, ὅθεν οὐδὲ τὸ δίκαιον ἐκ μόνης φαίνεσθαι τῆς θέσεως ῥητέον ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἀναξωपुरείσθαι τὸ τῆς δημιουργίας ἀγαθὸν νοητέον, μαθήσει παιδευθείσης τῆς ψυχῆς ἐθέλειν αἰρεῖσθαι τὸ κάλλιστον.—Stromat. 1. § vi. p. 336.

² Si similitudo divina, quam peccato Adam perdidit, manifestetur.—Cyprian, De Bono Patientiæ, § v.

³ Inter voluptates spectantium quorundam mors erogatur, ut per cruentum spectaculum sævire discatur, quasi

parum sit homini privata sua rabies, nisi illam et publice discat.—De Spectaculis, § v.

⁴ Nam, cum mens hominis ad vitia ipsa ducatur, quid faciet, si habuerit exempla? natura corporis caduca, quæ sponte corrui, quid faciet, si fuerit impulsus? reading natura instead of naturæ.—§ viii.

⁵ Ὁ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἐσαφήνισε πῶς μετὰ γενέσεώς ἐστι πλάνη οὐδὲ παρέστησεν ὁ, τι περ ἐβούλετο ἵνα κατανοήσωμεν συγκρίνοντες τὰ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἡμετέροις. Οἱ δὲ προφῆται αἰνιττόμενοι ὁ, τι περὶ τῶν γενέσεως

mischievously represents us as saying, that God will receive the unrighteous man, if he humble himself under his iniquity; but that he will not receive the righteous man if he should virtuously look up to him from the very first. Whereas we say that it is impossible for man to look up to God virtuously from the very first; for that wickedness must needs be in man at the first.”¹ Again, “Celsus often scoffs at the resurrection which he does not comprehend; but not content with that, he says that we talk of a resurrection of the flesh from the tree; misunderstanding, I presume, what is spoken figuratively, that as *by the tree came death*, so did life come by the tree—death in Adam—life in Christ:”² the effect of the Fall balanced by the effect of the Passion: the effect of the latter event, therefore, being the recovery of man, the effect of the former must be here represented to be his ruin. But indeed there is no need to establish this conclusion by inference; since, in another place, where Origen is meeting an objection made by Celsus against the Mosaic account of the creation—that Moses exhibits God so powerless as to have been unable to secure the obedience even of a single man whom he had himself created—he replies that “in the Hebrew Adam means man; and that Moses, when he speaks of Adam, speaks, in fact, of the nature of man; inasmuch as all died in Adam, and were condemned under the similitude of Adam’s transgression; and that accordingly Scripture, in relating this event, does not so much speak of the individual as of the whole species; for that the curse of Adam, which in the history is described as that of an individual, is, in fact, common to all mankind.”³ Yet this same Origen writes, “Man loves life, having a persuasion that *the rational soul has something in its essence akin to God*. For both are intellectual and invisible; and as reason irresistibly shows, incorporeal. And why did he who fashioned us, put into us a desire of piety and of communion with him; a desire which

πραγμάτων σοφὸν, θυσίαν περὶ ἁμαρτίας λέγουσιν ἀναφέρεισθαι, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀρτι γεγεννημένων, ὡς οὐ καθαρῶν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας. Φασὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ, ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσθησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου. Ἄλλὰ καὶ ἀποφαίνονται ὅτι ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀπὸ μητρῶν, παραδόξως λέγοντες καὶ τὸ, ἐπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ

γαστρῶν, ἐλάλησαν ψευδῆ.—Origen, Contra Celsum, VII. § 50.

¹ Ἀδύνατον γὰρ φαμεν εἶναι ἀνθρώπων μετ’ ἀρετῆς ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἄνω βλέπειν. Κακίαν γὰρ ὑφίστασθαι ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον ἐν ἀνθρώποις.—III. § 62.

² VI. § 36.

³ IV. § 40.

even in those who have gone astray, *preserves some traces of the Divine will*; if it was not possible for beings thus rational to attain unto that which they *naturally* desire?"¹ Again, the following passage, like the last, seems to recognise some remains of the original character of man as having survived the Fall. "But if any one dares assign essential corruption to a being who was made in the image and likeness of God, in my opinion he includes in this impious charge, even the Son of God himself; for he, too, is called in Scripture the image of God. At least, let him who entertains this opinion, question the authority of Scripture, which says that man was made in the image of God—man, in whom *indications of the Divine image are clearly discovered*, not by the figure of the body which is corrupted, but by prudence of mind, by justice, by moderation, by virtue, by wisdom, by discipline, by a whole company, in short, of virtues, which, existing essentially in God, may exist also in man by industry and imitation of God."²

But in order to prevent mistakes, and the imputation of mere Pelagianism to the Fathers, a charge which has sometimes been made against them by partial and desultory readers, I shall suspend, for a moment, the prosecution of the subject immediately before us, to remark that peremptory as we see the Fathers are on the question of free-will, and far as they are from giving countenance to the sentiments of Calvin on that of human corruption, they still entertain such a sense of the effects of the Fall on the soul of man, as to teach the absolute necessity of the active influence of the Holy Spirit upon it, for its recovery and restoration. At the same time they regard that influence as a persuasive, not a compulsive principle; a fact determined both by their doctrine of the freedom of the will, and by express assertions to that purpose; a reference to some of which, in due season, will again bring us back to the topic I am pursuing. There is, indeed, no absolute call to produce an array of testimonies

¹ Ἐτι δὲ καὶ φιλοζωεῖ ἄνθρωπος, πείσμα λαβὼν περὶ οὐσίας λογικῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς ἐχούσης τι συγγενὲς Θεῷ. Νοερὰ γὰρ ἑκάτερα καὶ ἀόρατα· καὶ ὡς ὁ ἐπικρατῶν ἀποδείκνυσι λόγος, ἀσώματα. Τί δὲ καὶ ὁ κατασκευάζων ἡμᾶς ἐνεποίει πόθον τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν

εὐσεβείας καὶ κοινωνίας, ὃς τις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐσφαλμένοις ἔχη τινα σῶζει τοῦ θεοῦ βουλευμάτων, εἶπερ μὴ ἦν δυνατὸν τὸ φυσικῶς ποθοῦμενον τοῖς λογικοῖς καταλαβεῖν;—Exhortatio ad Martyrium, § 47.

² De Principiis, IV. § 37.

from the Fathers, in order to prove that they believed in the doctrine of grace, and in the necessity fallen man is under of seeking its aid. The single fact of their holding that of regeneration in Baptism, as we have found them doing, and yet admitting Infant-Baptism, being enough in itself to establish the other conclusion. For where was the need to be "born again" (a very strong expression), even where no actual sin had been committed by the parties, unless there was understood to be very gross evil in the first birth? And how could a spiritual evil, as this must be, have been supposed to find a remedy, except in a spiritual agency?—the Fathers themselves perfectly alive to this inference, as is evident from a remarkable passage in Tertullian already cited.¹ Waiving, however, this argument, I will proceed to prove my point by other evidence in detail.

Thus Barnabas, having described the way of good, and the way of evil, of light and of darkness, goes on to apprise him who would walk in the better path, that "he must be simple in heart, and must *abound in the Spirit* . . . that he must not rule his servants with austerity, seeing that both he and they hope in the same God, who came not to call them with respect to persons, but even as the Spirit had prepared them."²

Hermas advises to test those who profess to be in possession of the Holy Spirit by their life and works³; as though our virtues were to be ascribed to the presence of that Holy Spirit within us.

Clemens Romanus, though announcing no formal opinion on the subject, uses language which shows plainly enough, that the doctrine of spiritual influence was familiar to his mind. As thus, "Let us cleave to those to whom grace has been given by God."⁴ And in a prayer at the close of his epistle he says, "The all-seeing God, and Master of spirits, and Lord of all flesh, who hath chosen the Lord Jesus Christ and us through him for a peculiar people, grant to every soul that calls upon his great and holy Name, faith, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, continence, chastity, temperance, that they may be acceptable in his sight, through our High Priest and Advo-

¹ Tertullian, *De Animâ*, c. xli.

² Barnabas, § xix.

³ Hermas, II. *Mandatum* xi.

⁴ Clem. Rom. *Ad Corinthios*, I. § xxx.

cate Jesus Christ,"¹ as though the graces here enumerated were not of ourselves, but of God.

I will content myself with one passage from Ignatius, but that a most remarkable one; for though expressing the doctrine we are investigating under a figure the most homely and mechanical, it is undeniable as to its meaning. He is commending the Ephesians for not having allowed themselves to be led astray by certain false teachers who had been among them. Against these, says he, "Ye stopped your ears, so as not to entertain the mischievous seed they scattered about; feeling yourselves to be stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for the building of God the Father, drawn up aloft by the engine of Jesus Christ, even the cross, *using the Holy Spirit for your rope, your faith the pulley.*"²

Justin Martyr recognises the doctrine in various places. Thus, in his "Cohortatio ad Græcos," when tracing many of Plato's statements to his knowledge of Revelation, he represents those on virtue as derived from what he had read in the prophets respecting the Spirit. "For fearing to call this gift of God the Holy Ghost, lest by following the doctrine of the prophets he should seem to be an enemy to the Greeks, he confesses, indeed, that it comes down from above from God, but thinks it best to call it virtue, and not the Holy Ghost. For in his dialogue with Meno on the subject of memory, after many preliminary inquiries concerning virtue, whether it could be acquired by instruction, or by use, or by neither, but came to men by nature, or by some other means, he expresses himself in the following terms. 'If, then, in the course of this dissertation we have conducted our investigation well, and worded it rightly, virtue would appear to come neither by nature, nor by instruction; but to present itself to those who enjoy it, by a Divine allotment independent of the understanding.'"³ Whatever we may think of Justin's notion,

¹ Clem. Rom. Ad Corinthios, I. § lviii.

² Ignatius, Ad Ephesios, § ix.

³ Justin Martyr, Cohortatio ad Græcos, § 32. Bishop Kaye doubts the genuineness of this work, pointing out several passages in it which present discrepancies when compared with other works of Justin, of which the authority is above suspicion. But would such discrepancies be found greater than those which

exist amongst his several genuine writings? Compare *e. g.* the prophecy of Gen. xlix. 10, as given in Apol. I. § 32, and in Dial. § 52; or Psalm cx. 1-3, as quoted in Dial. § 32, and in § 83. And is close consistency to be expected in a writer exhibiting such marks of carelessness, or possibly want of leisure, opportunity, or books (for the times in which he lived were troubled) as Justin?

that Plato gained his idea of virtue from the prophetic descriptions of the Holy Ghost, this at least must be admitted, that the argument proves Justin himself to have had no doubt about the active energies of the Holy Ghost among men. This, however, further appears from other passages in Justin's works: as, that the grace of God is necessary to make us fully understand the words and deeds of the prophets¹; that he was himself indebted to it for whatever sound knowledge of the Scriptures he possessed²; that we should pray, above all things, to have the gates of light opened to us, for that (the truth) is not to be perceived or comprehended by any, save by those to whom God and his Christ gave the faculty of perceiving and comprehending it³: that it is by the help of those gifts which Christ promised he would send to mankind after his ascension, that he (Justin) hopes to convince Trypho.⁴

Tatian's sentiments on this subject, so far as they are intelligible, were involved in his notions of the corruption of our nature, and have already been noticed; the sum of them being, that the Holy Ghost which was lost at the Fall, and which constituted the soul's life, must be recovered before the soul can rise again to its lofty estate, and find its wings.⁵

Athenagoras, in his short works, does not happen to have occasion to speak of the ordinary effects of the Spirit, but he is so explicit on the extraordinary, that we cannot doubt he held both; representing the Holy Ghost to breathe into the prophets, as a piper into his reed.⁶

Theophilus attributes his own conversion to the prophetic Scriptures,⁷ which the Holy Ghost dictated through their authors.⁸ He prays God to give him *grace* to declare the truth; and to Autolytus (to whom he writes) and his other readers, *grace* to receive and follow it⁹; and he speaks of the Christian being one whom *grace* preserves.¹⁰

As we proceed, we discover the Fathers to become more

See e. g. his errors of chronology, Apol. I. § 31; his misquotation of names, Apol. I. § 51; Dial. § 12; his mistakes about historical facts, Dial. § 86; not to speak of the indications he affords of having forgotten in one place what he had said in another.

¹ Dial. § 92.

² §§ 58. 119.

³ § 7.

⁴ § 39.

⁵ Tatian, Oratio contra Græcos, §§ 13. 15. 20.

⁶ Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, §§ 9, 10.

⁷ Theophilus, Ad Autolytum, I. § 14.

⁸ II. § 9.

⁹ III. § 23.

¹⁰ III. § 15.

and more copious on this great article of faith; insomuch that it is even difficult to compress their declarations of it within any reasonable compass. Such is the case with Irenæus. He makes frequent confession of it whenever he is invited to do so by the course of his argument. The seventeenth chapter of his third book is almost entirely occupied with it. The Gnostics, by understanding the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus at his baptism, as recorded in the Gospel, to be that of their Æon Christ, upon the man Jesus, had virtually excluded the Holy Ghost from their system¹; a defect in it of which Irenæus proceeds to point out the magnitude, and in so doing necessarily is led to describe the offices of that Holy Spirit. "It works in the human race the will of the Father, and renews them from their old estate to the newness of Christ."² "It prepares them for God."³ "As the flour cannot be consolidated and formed into a loaf without moisture, so we, being many, cannot be made one with Christ Jesus without the water which is from heaven: and as the parched earth brings forth no fruit, if it receives no dew; so we, being dry trees at first, should never bear the fruit of life without *rain freely imparted from above*. For our bodies derive that union (with Christ) unto immortality through the laver; but our souls through the Spirit."⁴ "This dew of God," Irenæus afterwards adds, "is necessary for us, that we be neither burned up, nor unfruitful, and that where we have an accuser we may have also an Advocate;"⁵ an Advocate of such power, too, that at his coming, Satan fell like lightning.⁶ Nor is this all: in that taste for seeing typical meanings in everything, to which I have already adverted as characteristic of the Fathers, Irenæus discovers, in

¹ Spiritum quidem interimunt, alium autem Christum et alium Jesum intelligunt.—Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 4. See also, c. xi. § 9. Ut donum Spiritus frustrentur.

² Voluntatem patris operans in ipsis et renovans eos a vetustate in novitatem Christi.—III. c. xvii. § 1.

³ Qui nos aptaret Deo.—§ 2.

⁴ Sicut enim de arido tritico massa una fieri non potest sine humore, neque unus panis: ita ne nos multi unum fieri in Christo Jesu poteramus sine aquâ, quæ de cælo est. Et sicut arida

terra, si non percipiat humorem, non fructificat: sic et nos, lignum aridum existentes primum, nunquam fructificaremus vitam sine supernâ voluntariâ pluvîâ. Corpora enim nostra per lavacrum illam, quæ est ad incorruptionem, unitatem acceperunt; animæ autem per Spiritum.—Ibid.

⁵ Quapropter necessarius nobis est ros Dei, ut non comburamur, neque infructuosi efficiamur, ut ubi accusatorem habemus, illic habeamus et Paracletum.—§ 3.

⁶ Ibid.

the two imperial coins which the good Samaritan gave to the innkeeper, "the image and superscription of the Father and the Son, which the Spirit imparts to us, that we may profit withal;"¹ as though all our holy impressions were derived from the influence of the Spirit. And when explaining the text, "for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and taking it out of the hands of the Gnostics, he proceeds, "For since *without the Spirit of God we cannot be saved*, the Apostle exhorts us by faith and a chaste conversation to cherish that Spirit of God, that we may not fall short of the kingdom of heaven through not being partakers of the Spirit of God, and so he exclaims, 'but flesh and blood cannot of itself enter into the kingdom of God.'"² And in a short prayer, into which on one occasion he is betrayed, he cries, "O Lord God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob, . . . I beseech thee, by our Lord Jesus Christ, give unto me the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and grant that all who read these writings of mine, may acknowledge thee the only God; may be steadfast in thee; and turn away from every heretical, godless, and impious thought;"³ a clear testimony to the need we have, both teacher and taught, of the Spirit of God, to direct and purify the heart.

Clemens Alexandrinus, given as he is to philosophize, still furnishes ample proof that the doctrine of grace was recognised by him also. Having said that the advent of the Word, and the sacred virtues he diffused, had superseded all other teaching, that even of Athens and Greece merged in it; he continues, "Wherefore, so to speak, Christ is whole and not divided; there is neither barbarian, nor Jew, nor Greek, neither male nor female, but a new man, transfigured by the Holy Spirit of God."⁴ And shortly afterwards follows the illustration, "As, if there were no sun, the other stars would leave all in night; so, if we did not know the Word, and were not enlightened by it, we should be in the condition of fowls put up to feed, which are fattened in the dark, and

¹ Dans duo denaria regalia, ut per Spiritum imaginem et inscriptionem Patris et Filii accipientes, fructificemus creditum nobis denarium.—Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 3.

² Ἐπεὶ ἄνευ Πνεύματος Θεοῦ σβῆναι οὐ δύναμεθα, προτρεπόμενος

ἡμᾶς ὁ ἀπόστολος, κ.τ.λ.—Irenæus, V. c. ix. § 3.

³ III. c. vi. § 4.

⁴ Καινὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος, Θεοῦ Πνεύματι ἅγιον μεταπεπλασμένος.—Clem. Alex. Cohortatio ad Græcos, § xi. p. 87.

nourished for death. Let us receive the light that we may receive God.”¹ Again, the quickening and purifying power of the Spirit is confessed in the following sentiment, “Wherefore, he who commits fornication dies altogether unto God, and is left by the Word, *as well as by the Spirit, lifeless.*”² Again, whilst objecting to cosmetics for the face, Clemens adds a sentence expressing in strong terms the doctrine of spiritual influence: “But the best beauty is that of the soul, as we have often declared, when it is adorned with the Holy Ghost, and is breathed into by those graces which proceed from the Spirit—righteousness, wisdom, fortitude, prudence, goodness, modesty; never was there a complexion more beautiful than this.”³ Again, “since some are unbelieving and some contentious, all do not attain unto the perfection of goodness, for it is not possible to attain unto it without a disposition to do so. Nevertheless it does not altogether depend on our own will, how it will turn out; for *by grace are we saved*: not, however, without good works, but being born for what is good we must feel a zeal for it; and we must possess ourselves, too, of a sound mind, such as will not draw back in its pursuit of goodness. To which end we have great need of *Divine grace*, and of right instruction, and of holy and sensitive affections, and of the *Father to draw us unto himself.*”⁴ Again, of his Gnostic, or perfect Christian, Clemens asserts, that “real good, the good which appertains to the soul, is what he prays may belong unto him, and abide with him. For this cause he covets nothing which he has not, being content with what he has: for he is not wanting in goods of his own, seeing he has that which suffices for

¹ Clem. Alex. Cohortatio ad Græcos, § xi. p. 87.

² Διὸ καὶ πάντως ὁ πορνεύων ἀπέθανεν Θεῷ, καὶ καταλείπεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου, καθάπερ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος, νεκρός.—Pædag. II. c. x. p. 230.

³ Κάλλος γὰρ ἄριστον, πρῶτον μὲν τὸ ψυχικόν, ὡς πολλάκις ἐπέσημημάμην· ὅτ' ἂν ἢ κεκοσμημένη ψυχὴ ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τούτου ἐμπνεομένη φαιδρύσμασι, δικαιοσύνη, φρονήσει, ἀνδρίᾳ, σωφροσύνη, φιλαγαθία τε, καὶ αἰδοίᾳ ἧς οὐδὲν εὐανθέστερον χρώμα ἑώραται πάποτε.—Pædag. III. c. xi. p. 291.

⁴ Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ μὲν ἄπιστοι, οἱ δὲ

ἐριστικοὶ, οὐ πάντες τυγχάνουσι τῆς τελειότητος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. Οὔτε γὰρ ἄνευ προαιρέσεως τυχεῖν οἶόν τε· οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τῇ ἡμετέρα κείται· οἷον τὸ ἀποβησόμενον χάριτι γὰρ σωζόμεθα· οὐκ ἄνευ μόντοι τῶν καλῶν ἔργων· ἀλλὰ δεῖ μὲν πεφυκότας πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθόν, σπουδὴν τινα περιποιήσασθαι πρὸς αὐτὸ· δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὴν γνώμην ὑγιᾶ κεκτῆσθαι, τὴν ἀμετανόητον πρὸς τὴν θήραν τοῦ κυλοῦ· πρὸς ὅπερ μάλιστα τῆς θείας χρῆζομεν χάριτος, διδασκαλίας τε ὀρθῆς, καὶ εὐπαθείας ἀγνῆς, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὀλκῆς.—Stromat. V. § i. p. 647.

himself, through the *Divine grace*, and through knowledge: but being satisfied, and having no wants, acquainted with the Almighty Will, in what he has, and in what he prays for, he cleaves to the Power Omnipotent, and striving to be spiritual, through unbounded love, to the *Spirit he is united*.”¹ Once more, the same doctrine discovers itself in the following paragraph; he is commenting on the text, “If thou wilt be perfect:”²—“Divinely does that expression, ‘if thou wilt,’” says Clemens, “indicate the freedom of will of the soul who was conversing with (Jesus), for in man, as being free, subsists the *choice*, but to God, as Lord, belongs the *gift*; and he gives to those who wish it, and who desire it earnestly, and who intreat him for it, that so salvation may be still their own.”³ Indeed, the Gnostic, or true Christian, as presented to us in the portraiture of Clemens, exhibits one perpetually going on unto perfection under the guidance and influence of the Spirit: so that to produce passages which testify to the doctrine of spiritual influence would be to transcribe a great part of the “*Stromata*.” Thus, to take him at his devotions; “he prays every hour internally, familiarizing himself with God through love. And first of all, he will ask for remission of his sins; then that he may sin no more; then that he may be able to do good, and to comprehend the whole creation and dispensation of the Lord; and that becoming pure in heart by the knowledge which he has through the Son of God, he may be initiated into the blessed spectacle face to face, listening to the Scripture which saith, Fasting together with prayer is good.”⁴ It is evident that language of this kind could not be held by one who did not acknowledge in a very unequivocal manner the doctrine of grace. And though it is true that the phraseology of Clemens is often borrowed from the schools of philosophy, yet that is to be regarded as his peculiar nomenclature; Christianity, as I have before said, being with him philosophy of the sublimest kind.

Tertullian was so far from disallowing the doctrine of the influence of the Spirit, that probably his zeal for it partly prepared him for the reception of the errors of Montanus;

¹ *Stromat.* VII. § vii. p. 857.

² *Matt.* xix. 21.

³ *Quis dives salvetur*, § x. p. 940.

⁴ *Stromat.* VI. § xii. p. 701; *Tobit*, xii. 8.

errors in which this very subject was deeply involved. For the Paraclete of Montanus appears to have been understood of no other being than the Holy Ghost; the same who inspired the Apostles, though in a lower degree than Montanus.¹ Accordingly, in his tract "De Spectaculis," Ter-

¹ Bishop Kaye, who investigates the precise nature of the pretensions of Montanus, remarks that Mosheim appears at different times to have held different opinions on the subject. In his *De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum* (*Sæculum secundum*, c. 66) he considers Montanus to have asserted himself to be inspired by the same Holy Spirit as the Apostles: in his *Ecclesiastical History* (*Century ii. c. 5*, p. 237, note) to have pretended to be himself the Paraclete; the Paraclete promised by the Saviour, and distinct from the Holy Spirit which spake by the Apostles. Bishop Kaye coincides with the former opinion, and gives his reasons for thinking that Mosheim misunderstood Tertullian, when he imputed to him the other. It is certainly difficult to read the writings of Tertullian—those, I mean, evidently composed after his accession to the Montanists, and in which the expression "nova prophetia," or the like, occurs, marking their date in this respect with precision—it is difficult, I say, to read these writings, and fail to perceive that Tertullian, when penning them, was unconscious of his creed being inconsistent with the fundamental articles of the Catholic faith. And yet this sentiment he scarcely could have entertained, had he swerved from it so widely, as to hold that there were two Holy Ghosts, the one the Spirit who animated the Apostles, the other Montanus himself. Moreover, in his treatise, *De Jejuniis*, § 1, written as a Montanist, he boldly accuses the orthodox, or animalists (*psychicos*), as he calls them, of "raising a debate about the Paraclete, and resisting the new prophecy, not because Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla, preached any other God than the true, or rejected Jesus Christ, or overturned any rule of faith or hope; but simply because they taught, it was better to fast than to marry;" words which would surely seem to imply a confidence in his own *substantial* orthodoxy, as well as in that of his sect. Fur-

thermore, in some of his treatises clearly composed after he turned Montanist, he is as free as possible in his animadversions on *heretics*; plainly showing that he felt no imputation of that kind could fairly rest on himself. Thus in his *De Resurrectione Carnis*, c. iii. he classes them with heathens. In his *De Carne Christi*, c. xv., another of his tracts written after his lapse, he speaks of them in the same language, as well as accuses them of mutilating Scripture, c. ii. And in his *Scorpiace*, a third, still written after the same event, he designates them as "scorpions," the very title, indeed, of the treatise being, an antidote against their poison, c. i. And yet, on the other hand, in his *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. lii., a work, I think, certainly composed by him whilst he was an acknowledged member of the Church, he apparently does ascribe to the Montanists the very doctrine which I before said it seems hardly possible that any one could hold and yet suppose that he was true to the Catholic Church, viz. that there were two Holy Ghosts; or in other words, that the Holy Ghost was one, and the Paraclete another. "There are other heretics," says he in the passage in question, "after the manner of the Phrygians, as it is called; but they differ one from another. . . . They hold one blasphemy, however, in common, that the Apostles had the Holy Ghost, but had not the Paraclete; and that the Paraclete revealed more through Montanus than Christ through the Gospel." "Accesserunt alii hæretici, qui dicuntur secundum Phrygas; sed horum non una doctrina est. Sunt enim qui *κατὰ* Proclum dicuntur, sunt qui secundum Æschinem pronuntiantur. Hi habent aliam communem blasphemiam, aliam blasphemiam non communem, sed peculiarem suam: et communem quidem illam, quâ in Apostolis quidem dicant Spiritum Sanctum fuisse, Paracletum non fuisse: et quâ dicant Paracletum plura in Montano dixisse, quam

tullian expresses himself thus :—“ God hath commanded us to use the Holy Spirit with gentleness and meekness, in quiet and in peace, seeing that from the excellency of its own nature, it is tender and delicate ; and not to disturb it by rage or ill-humour, by anger or grief. Now how does this comport with attendance at the shows ?”¹ The reference here made to Ephes. iv. 30, “ Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God,” proves that Tertullian, when writing thus, had the third Person of the Trinity in contemplation ; and the passage affirms the doctrine of spiritual influence. Again, in his “ De Virginibus Velandis,” he describes the several offices of the Paraclete, there, too, identified with the Holy Ghost. Having briefly recited the substance of the primitive creed, he continues, “ This rule of faith, then, remaining fixed, other matters, touching discipline and deportment, admit of corrective innovations, for the grace of God operates and improves even unto the end of time. For how could it be that, whilst the devil is always at work, and adding every day to his schemes of mischief, the operations of God should either expire or cease to advance ? Whereas God sent the Paraclete for this very thing, that as the moderate capacity of man could not receive all things at once, it might by degrees be guided and ordered, and perfected by discipline, through the Holy Ghost, who was to be in the Lord’s stead. ‘ I have yet

Christum in Evangelio protulisse.” Here, I say, Tertullian asserts that the Montanists made a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete ; and calls such distinction blasphemy. Yet we have seen, that when a Montanist himself he had not ceased to regard himself as substantially orthodox ; nor felt his hands tied from denouncing heretics. A recollection of passages on both sides of this question probably perplexed Mosheim, and caused him to hold one opinion upon it at one time, and another at another. Might not the inconsistency of Tertullian (for inconsistency I think I have shown there is) have arisen from this ; that when he charges the Montanists with holding a Paraclete distinct from the Holy Ghost, and which sentiment he calls a blasphemy, he was a Churchman, and was attacking the Montanists without having more than a general knowledge of

their reputed principles : but that when he identifies the Paraclete with the Holy Ghost, and claims for the Montanists substantial soundness of doctrine, he was himself a Montanist, and so more accurately informed in their opinions ? And it may be added, that those opinions admitted of being correctly ascertained, inasmuch as they were committed to writing ; references to such documents occurring in three treatises of Tertullian ; that De Resurrectione Carnis, c. xi. ; that De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. ix. ; and that De Pudicitia ; all of them, it may be remarked, written after Tertullian became a Montanist ; and thus confirming my notion, that after his conversion he had studied the tenets of the sect more carefully, and was accordingly better able to pronounce with truth upon them, and more interested in seeing that justice should be done them.

¹ Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. xv.

many things to say unto you,' he exclaimed, 'but ye cannot bear them now. When he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will lead you into all truth, and he will show you things to come.'¹ And he had before spoken of his office. What, then, is the business of the Paraclete but this, to *direct discipline, to open the Scriptures, to reform the understanding, to make the world better.*"² Elsewhere he gives several clauses of the creed as follows: "On the third day he (Jesus Christ) rose again; ascended into heaven; sat at the right hand of God; and sent the vicarious influence of the Holy Ghost to actuate the faithful."³ And again, in other places, he designates the Holy Ghost as the Vicar of Christ, "Christi Vicarius;" the Steward of God, "Dei Villicus;" and asks whether it is credible that he will allow the Churches to fall into error, being sent to lead them into all truth⁴; surely a very ample assertion of the doctrine we are in search of.

Cyprian bears witness to the same article of the faith. Advocate as we saw he was, like the other Fathers, for the freedom of the will, he nevertheless writes, when explaining the clause of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven;" "here we pray that God's will may be done by us; in order to which we must have God's will in us, that is, his help and protection, seeing that *no one is strong in his own strength, but is only strong in the indulgence and compassion of God.*"⁵ Again, his "Testimonies against the Jews," a summary of Christian doctrines and precepts succinctly collected by Cyprian out of Scripture, at the request and for the benefit of Quirinus, furnishes the following apothegm: "the grace of God is a free gift."⁶ And that the grace of God is not here to be understood irrespectively of the Holy Ghost, is plain from the first text of Scripture cited by Cyprian in support of his proposition, namely, St. Peter's rebuke to Simon, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money."⁷ And once more, where, as in the last

¹ John xvi. 12.

² De Virginibus Velandis, c. i.

³ De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, c. xiii.

⁴ c. xxviii.

⁵ Oramus et petimus, ut fiat in nobis voluntas Dei, quæ ut fiat, in nobis opus est Dei voluntate, id est ope ejus et

protectione: quia *nemo suis viribus fortis est, sed Dei indulgentiâ et misericordiâ tutus est.*—Cyprian, De Oratione Dominicâ, § xiv.

⁶ Testimoniorum, III. cap. c.

⁷ Ibid.

quotation, not merely the doctrine of spiritual influence is recognised, but the freedom with which it is vouchsafed to all who seek it. "As the sun shines freely, the day disperses its light, the fountain its waters, the shower its dew, so doth *the heavenly Spirit infuse* itself. When the soul, looking up to heaven, hath learned to know its Author, then it is that, higher than the sun, more sublime than any or every power upon this earth, it begins to be that which it believes it is. Only do thou, whom the heavenly warfare hath enlisted by its mark into the spiritual camp, cleave to its discipline, uncorrupt as it is, and sober as it is, with every religious virtue. Pray or read without ceasing. Now converse with God; now God converses with thee. Let him instruct thee in his precepts, let him dispose of thee. Whom he hath made rich, none can make poor. He can feel no poverty, whose breast the heavenly banquet has satisfied once for all. Roofs adorned with gold, houses empanelled with slabs of precious marble, will be mean in thy sight, for thou wilt know rather that it is thyself which is to be dressed, thyself to be ornamented, that thou hast in thyself a better house, a house in which the Lord hath seated himself, instead of a temple, and in which the Holy Spirit hath *begun to dwell.*"¹ Again, "Patience, brethren beloved, not only guards the good, but repels the evil. *Secoding the Holy Spirit*, and allying itself with the divine and heavenly principle, in opposition to the deeds of the flesh and body, by which the soul is vanquished and taken captive, it struggles in the defence of its own virtues."²

Origen bears testimony to the same truth. Thus he explains John xiv. 12, "Greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father," by the spiritual effects on the souls of men which the disciples were to be enabled to accomplish—effects far more striking than the physical miracles wrought by Jesus—thus, "the eyes of those who were blind in soul were to be opened; the ears of those who had been deaf to the accents of virtue were to be made to listen with eagerness to the things pertaining unto God and everlasting life with him; those who were lame in the inner man were not only to leap, but to leap like a stag, an animal hostile to serpents, and which the poison of vipers cannot hurt," and so

¹ Epist. i. §§ 14, 15.

² De Bono Patientiæ, § xiv.

on.¹ Again, in commenting on the text, "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power,"² he says, "What is spoken, however true and worthy of all belief, is not competent of itself to reach the human soul, unless *a certain power from God* be vouchsafed the speaker, and *grace* give a beauty to what he utters; such grace as must come from God, in order to render the speaker effective. . . . Accordingly, if it should seem to be granted that in some particulars the same sentiments are expressed by the Greeks and by the Christians" (which was what Celsus had asserted), "still their effect would not be the same; so as to lead and dispose men's souls to the same ends."³ Once more, in another of his works, "He who is not aware of his own weakness, and of the *divine grace*, not having proved himself, nor condemned himself; such an one, even if he should receive the blessing, will suppose that the virtue vouchsafed him from the *heavenly grace* is, in fact, his own. And this supposition, puffing him up, will be the cause of a fall. . . . Know then that divine things are hidden from the wise and prudent, that, as the Apostle says, no flesh may glory before God; and they are revealed unto babes, who have advanced beyond their infancy, and are mindful that they have arrived at the point of blessedness they have reached, not so much through *any power of their own*, as through the unspeakable goodwill of God."⁴ And again, in the same treatise, "So that neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase. And we could not say with reverence that an abundant harvest is the doing of him who plougheth, or of him who watereth; but must confess it to be the work of God. And in like manner therefore our perfection is not brought about, whilst we are ourselves altogether inactive, neither *again is it consummated by ourselves; but God works out the chief part of it.*"⁵ And again, in another of his treatises, that on prayer, "If no one knows the things of God, save the Spirit of God, it is impossible for man to know the things of God. And yet learn how this impossibility is rendered possible; 'now we have

¹ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, II. § 48.

² 1 Cor. ii. 4.

³ *Contra Celsum*, VI. § 2.

⁴ *De Principiis*, III. c. i. § 12.

⁵ § 18.

received not the spirit of the world,' says the Scripture, 'but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.'"¹ And once more in the same, "I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."² For our understanding cannot pray, unless the Spirit precede it in prayer, and do so, as it were, within hearing of it."³

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 12; Origen, De Oratione, § 1.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 15.

³ De Oratione, § 2.