

works contain no allusion to the practice of auricular confession.

At the end of the chapter on the Government of the Church, Mosheim gives a short account of the ecclesiastical authors who flourished during the century of which he is treating. The notices which the writings of Tertullian supply on this point are very few in number. He alludes to the *Shepherd of Hermas* in a manner which shows that it was highly esteemed in the Church, and even deemed by some of authority; for he supposes that a practice, which appears to have prevailed in his day, of sitting down after the conclusion of the public prayers, owed its origin to a misinterpretation of a passage in that work.¹ In his later writings, when he had adopted the rigid notions of Montanus respecting the perpetual exclusion of adulterers from the communion of the Church, he speaks with great bitterness of the *Shepherd of Hermas* as countenancing adultery;² and states that it had been pronounced apocryphal by every synod of the orthodox Churches. Yet the opinions expressed in the treatise *de Pœnitentiâ*, written before Tertullian became a Montanist, appear to bear something more than an accidental resemblance to those contained in the *Shepherd of Hermas*.³

We have seen that Tertullian mentions Clemens Romanus as having been placed in the see of Rome by St. Peter; and Polycarp in that of Smyrna, by St. John.⁴

In speaking of the authors who had refuted the Valentinian heresy,⁵ he mentions Justin, Miltiades,⁶ and Irenæus. To them he adds Proculus, supposed by some eminent critics to be the same as Proclus, who is stated by the author of the brief *Enumeration of Heretics*,⁷ subjoined to Tertullian's treatise *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, to have been the head of one of the two sects into which the Cataphrygians or Montanists were

¹ *De Oratione*, c. 12.

² "Sed cederem tibi, si Scriptura Pastoris, quæ sola mœchos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidi; si non ab omni Concilio Ecclesiarum etiam vestrarum inter Apocrypha et falsa judicaretur; adultera et ipsa et inde patrona sociorum." *De Pudicitia*, c. 10. Again in c. 20: "Illo Apocrypho Pastore mœchorum."

³ Compare *de Pœnitentiâ*, cc. 7, 8, 9, with the *Shepherd of Hermas*, Mand. iv. c. 3.

⁴ *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 32, quoted in p. 116.

⁵ *Adversus Valentinianos*, c. 5.

⁶ See Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* l. v. c. 17.

⁷ C. 52.

divided. He appears to have made a distinction between the Holy Ghost and the Paraclete ; the former inspired the apostles, the latter spoke in Montanus, and revealed through him more numerous and more sublime truths than Christ had delivered in the gospel. Proclus did not, however, like Æschines, the head of the other division of the Cataphrygians, confound the Father and the Son. Eusebius,¹ and after him Jerome² and Photius,³ mention a Proclus or Proculus, who was a leader of the sect of Cataphrygians, and held a disputation at Rome with Caius, a distinguished writer of that day. There is therefore no doubt, as Lardner justly observes,⁴ that a Montanist of the name of Proculus or Proclus lived at the beginning of the third century ; but whether he was the author mentioned by Tertullian has been doubted. The expression *Proculus noster*, which is applied to him, inclines me to think that he was. Tertullian speaks of Tatian as one of the heretics who enjoined abstinence from food,⁵ on the ground that the Creator of this world was a Being at variance with the Supreme God, and that it was consequently sinful to partake of any enjoyments which this world affords.

From the manner in which Tertullian speaks of the visions seen by the martyr Perpetua, I infer that a written account of her martyrdom had been circulated among the Christians.⁶ Some have supposed that Tertullian was himself the author of the account still extant of the *Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas*.⁷

CHAPTER V.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

WE now come to a more important and more extensive branch of our inquiries—to the information which the writings of Tertullian supply respecting the doctrine of the Church in his day.

¹ *Eccl. Hist.* l. vi. c. 20.

² *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum.* Caius.

³ *Bibliotheca,* Cod. 48.

⁵ *De Jejuniis,* c. 15.

⁴ *Credibility of the Gospel History,* c. 40.

⁶ *De Animâ,* c. 55. "Quomodo Perpetua, fortissima Martyr, sub die passionis in revelatione Paradisi, solos illic commartyres suos vidit?"

⁷ Lardner, *Credibility,* c. 40.

In treating this part of our subject, we do not think that we can adopt a better course than to consider the different doctrines in the order in which they occur in the Articles of the Church of England. For the present, however, we shall pass over the first and second Articles, which relate to the Trinity and to the person and offices of Christ, because a more convenient opportunity for considering them will present itself when we come to the last of Mosheim's divisions—the heresies which disturbed the peace of the Church during the latter part of the second and the earlier part of the third century. With respect to that portion of the first Article which asserts the unity of God, and describes His nature and attributes, the reader will find a statement of Tertullian's faith in a passage already quoted from the seventeenth chapter of the *Apology*.¹

Let us therefore proceed to the third Article, the subject of which is Christ's descent into hell.

In order to put the reader in possession of our author's opinion on this Article, it is necessary to premise that he speaks of four different places of future happiness or misery—the Inferi, Abraham's Bosom, Paradise, and Gehenna.

The Inferi he defines to be a deep and vast recess in the very heart and bowels of the earth.² He sometimes distinguishes between the Inferi and Abraham's Bosom;³ at others,⁴ includes under the name of Inferi both the place in which the souls of the wicked are kept in a state of torment until the day of judgment, and Abraham's Bosom, the receptacle prepared for the souls of the faithful, where they enjoy a foretaste of the happiness which will afterwards be their portion in heaven. For neither can the

¹ See chap. iii. note 4, p. 89.

² "Nobis Inferi, non nuda cavositas nec subdivalis aliqua mundi sentina creduntur; sed in fossâ terræ, et in alto vastitas, et in ipsis visceribus ejus abstrusa profunditas." *De Animâ*, c. 55.

³ "Aliud enim Inferi, ut puto, aliud quoque Abrahæ sinus." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 34.

⁴ "Cæterum vester Christus pristinum statum Judæis pollicetur ex restitutione terræ; et post decursum vitæ, apud Inferos, in sinu Abrahæ, refrigerium." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 24. This passage applies to the peculiar notions of Marcion. See note 7 on opposite page. "Igitur si quid tormenti sive solatii anima præcepit in carcere seu diversorio Inferum, in igne, vel in sinu Abrahæ." *De Animâ*, c. 7. "Nam et nunc animas torqueri foverique penes Inferos, licet nudas, licet adhuc exules carnis, probabit Lazari exemplum." *De Res. Carnis*, c. 17. See also *de Idololatriâ*, c. 13; *de Animâ*, c. 9, *sub fine*.

full reward of the good be conferred, nor the full punishment of the wicked inflicted, until the soul is re-united to the body at the day of judgment.¹ There is, however, as we shall hereafter have occasion to observe, some inconsistency in Tertullian's language respecting the purposes for which the soul is kept in a separate state *apud Inferos*.² The Bosom of Abraham, though not in heaven, was yet elevated far above the place in which the souls of the wicked were confined.³

Tertullian defines Paradise to be a place of divine pleasantness, appointed for the reception of the spirits of the saints.⁴ While the souls of the rest of mankind were detained *apud Inferos*, in the intermediate state just described, it was the peculiar privilege of the martyrs that their souls were at once transferred to Paradise; ⁵ for St. John, in the Apocalypse, saw the souls of the martyrs, and of the martyrs only, under the altar.⁶ According to Marcion, they who lived under the law were consigned to the Inferi, there to receive their reward or punishment; while heaven was reserved to the followers of Christ.⁷

Gehenna is,⁸ as Tertullian expresses himself, a treasure of sacred fire beneath the earth, destined for the punishment of the wicked.

These preliminary observations will enable us fully to compre-

¹ See *de Res. Carnis*, c. 17, quoted in the preceding note, where Tertullian says that the soul suffers the punishment of evil thoughts and desires in the intermediate state.

² See *de Animâ*, c. 58, and *de Res. Carnis*, c. 42. "Ne Inferos experiatur, usque novissimum quadrantem exacturos."

³ "Eam itaque regionem sinum dico Abrahæ, etsi non cœlestem, sublimiorem tamen Inferis, interim refrigerium præbituram animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium plenitudine mercedis expungat." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 34.

⁴ "Et si Paradisum nominemus, locum divinæ amœnitatis recipiendis Sanctorum spiritibus destinatum, maceriâ quâdam igneæ illius zonæ a notitiâ orbis communis segregatum." *Apology*, c. 47. Tertullian appears to identify it with the Paradise in which Adam and Eve were placed. *De Res. Carnis*, c. 26, *sub fine*.

⁵ *De Animâ*, c. 55; *de Res. Carnis*, c. 43. "Nemo enim peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum nisi ex martyrii prærogativâ, scilicet Paradiso, non Inferis deversurus."

⁶ C. 6, v. 9.

⁷ "Sed Marcion aliorsum cogit" (Tertullian is speaking of the parable of Lazarus); "scilicet utramque mercedem Creatoris, sive tormenti, sive refrigerii, apud Inferos determinat iis positam, qui Legi et Prophetis obedierint; Christi vero et Dei sui cœlestem definit sinum et portum." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 34.

⁸ "Gehennam si comminemur, quæ est ignis arcani subterraneus ad pœnam thesaurus." *Apology*, c. 47. See *de Pœnitentiâ*, cc. 5, 12; *de Res. Carnis*, cc. 34, 35.

hend Tertullian's notions respecting Christ's descent into hell. We have seen that he defines death to be the separation of the soul from the body.¹ Christ really died:² His soul was therefore separated from His body; and as the soul does not sleep but remains in a state of perpetual activity, in the interval between Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, *His* soul descended to the general receptacle of departed souls, and there rendered the patriarchs and prophets capable of sharing in the benefits which His mission was designed to communicate. Pearson, in his remarks upon the fifth Article of the Creed, has correctly stated Tertullian's opinion; but has not explained how it is to be deduced from the passage which he quotes, and in which there is no mention of the soul of Christ. That which Pearson proposes as the second end of Christ's descent into hell is stated by Tertullian in the form of an objection to his own opinions. "Sed in hoc, inquiunt, Christus Inferos adiit, ne nos adiremus."³ Pearson's words are—"Secondly, by the descent of Christ into hell all those which believe in Him are secured from descending thither: He went into those regions of darkness that our souls might never come into those torments which are there."

Tertullian's opinions respecting Christ's resurrection, the subject of our fourth Article, may be learned from the treatise entitled *de Carne Christi*, which he wrote in confutation of certain heretics, who denied the reality of Christ's flesh, or at least its identity with human flesh.⁴ They were apprehensive that if they admitted the reality of Christ's flesh, they must also admit His resurrection in the flesh, and consequently the resurrection of the human

¹ Chap. iii. p. 105.

² "Quid est autem illud quod ad inferna transfertur post divortium corporis, quod detinetur illic, quod in diem iudicii reservatur, ad quod et Christus moriendo descendit, puto, ad animas Patriarcharum?" *De Animâ*, c. 7. "Siquidem Christo in corde terræ triduum mortis legimus expunctum, id est, in recessu intimo, et interno, et in ipsâ terrâ operto, et intra ipsam clauso, et inferioribus adhuc abyssis superstructo. Quod si Christus Deus, quia et homo, mortuus secundum Scripturas, et sepultus secundum easdem, huic quoque legi satisfacit, *formâ humanæ mortis apud Inferos functus*, nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cœlorum, quam descendit in inferiora terrarum, ut illic Patriarchas et Prophetas compotes sui faceret," etc., c. 55. He died according to the fashion of the death of man, in that His soul was separated from His body. Tertullian, therefore, agrees with Pearson respecting the first end of Christ's descent into hell. "I conceive that the end for which He did so was, that He might undergo the condition of a dead man as well as living." P. 250, ed. fol. 1683.

³ *De Animâ*, c. 55.

⁴ "Præterea et nos volumen præmisimus de carne Christi, quo eam et solidam probamus adversum phantasmatis vanitatem, et humanam vindicamus adversus qualitatis proprietatem." *De Res. Carnis*, c. 2.

body after death.¹ Some, therefore, as Marcion, denied the reality both of Christ's birth and of His flesh:² others, as Apelles, denied the former, but admitted the latter;³ contending that, as the angels are recorded in Scripture to have assumed human flesh without being born after the fashion of men, so might Christ, who, according to them, received His body from the stars.⁴ Others, again, assigned to Christ an animal flesh, *caro animalis*, or carnal soul, *anima carnalis*; their notion was that the soul, *anima*, being invisible, was rendered visible in the flesh, which was most intimately united with it, or rather absorbed in it.⁵ Others affirmed that Christ assumed the angelic substance;⁶ Valentinus assigned Him a spiritual flesh;⁷ others argued that Christ's flesh could not be human flesh, because it proceeded not from the seed of man;⁸ and Alexander, the Valentinian, seems to have denied its reality, on the ground that if it was human flesh, it must also be sinful flesh, whereas one object of Christ's mission was to abolish sinful flesh.⁹ Should the reader deem the opinions now enumerated so absurd and trifling as to be altogether undeserving of notice, he must bear in mind that from such an enumeration alone can we acquire an accurate idea of the state of religious controversy in any particular age.

¹ *De Carne Christi*, c. 1.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ C. 6. Tertullian's answer is, that the angels did not come upon earth like Christ to suffer, be crucified, and die in the flesh; there was consequently no necessity why they should go through the other stages of human being, or why they should be born after the fashion of men.

⁵ Cc. 10, 11, 12, 13. The reader will perceive that the word *animal* is not here used in its ordinary sense, but means *that which is animated by a soul*.

⁶ Tertullian asks in reply, to what end did Christ assume the angelic substance, since He came not to effect the salvation of angels? c. 14.

⁷ C. 15.

⁸ Tertullian's answer is, that on the same ground we must deny the reality of Adam's flesh, c. 16, *sub fine*.

⁹ I say *seems*, for I am not certain that I understand the objection. The words of Tertullian are, "Insuper argumentandi libidine, ex formâ ingenii hæretici, locum sibi fecit Alexander ille, quasi nos adfirmemus, idcirco Christum terreni censûs induisse carnem, ut evacuet in semetipso carnem peccati." The orthodox, according to Alexander, affirmed that Christ put on flesh of earthly origin in order that He might in His own person make void or abolish sinful flesh. If, therefore, Alexander contended, Christ abolished sinful flesh in Himself, His flesh could no longer be human flesh. Tertullian answers, We do not say that Christ abolished sinful flesh, *carnem peccati*, but sin in the flesh, *peccatum carnis*: it was for this very end that Christ put on human flesh, in order to show that He could overcome sin in the flesh; to have overcome sin in any other than human flesh would have been nothing to the purpose. Tertullian, referring to St. Paul, says of Christ, "Evacuavit peccatum in carne;" alluding, as I suppose, to Rom. viii. 3. But the corresponding Greek in the printed editions is *κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί*. Had Tertullian a different reading in his Greek MSS.? or did he confound Rom. viii. 3 with Rom. vi. 6, *ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας*? Jerome translates the Greek *καταργέω* by *evacuo*, c. 16. See *adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 14.

In opposition to these various heretical notions, our author shows that Christ was born,¹ lived, suffered, died, and was buried in the flesh. Hence it follows that He also rose again in the flesh. "For the same substance which fell by the stroke of death and lay in the sepulchre was also raised.² In that substance Christ now sits at the right hand of the Father,—being man, though God ;³ the last Adam, though the primary Word ; flesh and blood, though of a purer kind than those of men,—and according to the declaration of the angels, He will descend at the day of judgment, in form and substance the same as He ascended, since He must be recognised by those who pierced Him. He who is called the Mediator between God and man is entrusted with a deposit from each party. As He left with us the earnest of the Spirit, so He took from us the earnest of the flesh, and carried it with Him into heaven, to assure us that both the flesh and the Spirit will then be collected into one sum."

Towards the end of the treatise, Tertullian mentions various strange notions respecting the session of Christ at the right hand of God.⁴ Some heretics supposed that His flesh sat there, devoid of all sensation, like an empty scabbard ; others that His human soul sat there without the flesh ; others His flesh and human soul, or in other words, His human nature alone.

On account of the intimate connexion between the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and that of Christ's resurrection, we will take this opportunity of giving a short account of Tertullian's treatise *de Resurrectione Carnis*. The heretics,

¹ Tertullian contends that, if Christ's birth from the Virgin is once proved, the reality of His flesh follows as a necessary consequence ; it being impossible otherwise to assign any reasonable cause why He should be born. See cc. 2, 3, 4, 5, 20, 21, 22, 23.

² "Ipsum enim quod cecidit in morte, quod jacuit in sepulturâ, hoc et resurrexit, non tam Christus in carne, quam caro in Christo." *De Res. Carnis*, c. 48.

³ *De Carne Christi*, c. 16 ; *de Res. Carnis*, c. 51. "Quum illic adhuc sedeat Iesus ad dexteram Patris ; homo, etsi Deus ; Adam novissimus, etsi Sermo primarius ; caro et sanguis, etsi nostris puriora ; idem tamen et substantiâ et formâ quâ ascendit talis etiam descensurus, ut Angeli affirmant (Acts i. 11) agnoscendus scilicet iis, qui illum convulneraverunt. Hic, *sequester Dei atque hominum* appellatus (1 Tim. ii. 5), ex utriusque partis deposito commisso sibi, carnis quoque depositum servat in semetipso, arrabonem summæ totius. Quemadmodum enim nobis arrabonem Spiritûs reliquit, ita et a nobis arrabonem carnis accepit et vexit in cœlum pignus totius summæ, illuc quandoque redigendæ." We shall see what our author meant by flesh and blood of a purer kind than those of men when we speak of the tract *de Resurrectione Carnis*.

⁴ C. 24. "Ut et illi erubescant, qui affirmant carnem in cœlis vacuum sensu, ut vaginam, exempto Christo sedere ; aut qui carnem et animam tantundem ; aut tantummodo animam ; carnem vero non jam." See Pearson, Article vi. p. 272.

against whom it is directed, were the same who maintained that the Demiurge, or God who created this world and gave the Mosaic dispensation, was opposed to the Supreme God. Hence they attached an idea of inherent corruption and worthlessness to all His works—among the rest, to the flesh or body of man; affirming that it could not rise again, and that the soul alone was capable of inheriting immortality.¹ Tertullian, therefore, in the first place endeavours to prove that God cannot deem that flesh beneath His notice, or unworthy to be raised again, “which He framed with His own hands in the image of God;—which He afterwards animated with His own breath, communicating to it that life, of which the principle is within Himself;—which He appointed to inhabit, to enjoy, to rule over His whole creation;—which He clothes with His sacraments and His discipline, loving its purity, approving its mortifications, and ascribing a value to its sufferings.”²

Having thus removed the preliminary objections founded on the supposed worthlessness of the flesh, our author proceeds to prove that the body will rise again;³ and first asserts the power of God to rebuild the tabernacle of the flesh, in whatever manner it may be dissolved. If we suppose even that it is annihilated, He who created all things out of nothing can surely raise the dead body again from nothing. Nor is there any absurdity in supposing that the members of the human body, which may have been destroyed by fire or devoured by birds or beasts, will nevertheless at the last day be re-united to it.⁴ Such a supposition, on the contrary, is countenanced by Scripture.⁵ Ter-

¹ Cc. 4, 5. The reader will find what appears to be more than an accidental resemblance between this treatise and the fragments of a tract on the same subject, ascribed to Justin Martyr. See Grabe's *Spicilegium*, tom. ii.

² See c. 9, where Tertullian sums up the arguments advanced in the preceding chapters. “Igitur ut retexam, quam Deus manibus suis ad imaginem Dei struxit—quam de suo adflatu ad similitudinem suæ vivacitatis animavit—quam incolatui, fructui, dominatui totius suæ operationis præposuit—quam sacramentis suis disciplinisque vestivit—cujus munditias amat—cujus castigationes probat—cujus passiones sibi adpreciat—hæccine non resurget, totiens Dei?” Tertullian's notion was, that when God said, “Let us make man *in our image*,” He alluded to the form which Christ was to bear during His abode on earth. “Quodcunque enim limus exprimebatur, Christus cogitabatur homo futurus, quod et limus, et Sermo caro, quod et terra tunc. Sic enim præfatio Patris ad Filium, *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram. Et fecit hominem Deus. Id utique quod finxit, ad imaginem Dei fecit illum, scilicet Christi,*” c. 6. Compare *adv. Praxeam*, c. 12.

³ C. 11. Compare the *Apology*, c. 48.

⁴ C. 32. Compare Pearson, Article xi. p. 374.

⁵ Tertullian's words are, “Sed ne solummodo eorum corporum resurrectio videatur prædicari quæ sepulchris demandantur, habes *scriptum* ;” then follows a

tullian further contends that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is rendered credible by innumerable instances of a resurrection in the natural world.¹ The passage has been translated and adopted by Pearson in his *Exposition of the Eleventh Article of the Creed*.² He does not, indeed, appear to have been aware that some of the instances alleged are nothing to the purpose—such as the changes of day and night, of summer and winter. If any inference is to be drawn from them, it would rather be in favour of an alternate dissolution and restoration of the same bodies. Among other illustrations, the instance of the phoenix is brought forward, of which the early Fathers appear to have been fond.³

Having established the power of God to raise the dead body, Tertullian next inquires whether any reasons exist which should induce Him to exert that power.⁴ As He intends to judge mankind, and to reward or punish them according to their conduct in this life, it is evident that the ends of justice will not be attained, unless men rise again with the same bodies which they had when living.⁵ The body co-operated with the soul in this world; it carried into effect the good or evil designs which the soul conceived; it ought therefore to be associated with the soul in its future glory or misery. Tertullian further contends that the very term *resurrection* implies a resurrection of the body: for that alone can be raised which has fallen, and it is the body, not the soul, which falls by the stroke of death.⁶ The same inference may be drawn from the compound expression *resurrectio mortuorum*; “for man,” as Pearson,⁷ who urges both this argument and the preceding, paraphrases the words, “man dieth, not in reference to his soul, which is immortal, but his body.”

The arguments of the heretics against the resurrection of the body were deduced either from general reasoning or from passages of Scripture. Of the former description were the following. “The body, you say, in the present life is the receptacle or instrument of the soul by which it is animated.

passage which in Semler's Index is stated as a quotation from Revelation xx. 13; but if our author had that passage in view, he has strangely altered it.

¹ C. 12. Compare the *Apology*, c. 48.

² P. 376.

³ C. 13.

⁴ Cc. 14, 15.

⁵ Compare *Apology*, c. 48. Pearson, Article xi. p. 376. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 12.

⁶ C. 18. Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. v. cc. 9, 14.

⁷ Article xi. p. 382.

It has itself neither will, nor sense, nor understanding. How then can it be a fit subject of reward or punishment? or to what purpose will it be raised? Why may not the soul exist in the next world, either wholly divested of a body, or clothed in an entirely different body?"¹ Tertullian replies that, although the principle of action is in the soul, it can effect nothing without the body.² It thinks, wills, disposes; but in order to carry its designs into execution, it needs the assistance of the body, which is also the medium of sensation. The soul, it is true, might by means of its corporeal substance suffer the punishment due to sinful desires; but unless it shall hereafter be reunited to the body, sinful actions will remain unpunished.

"If then," the heretics rejoined, "the body is to be raised, is it to be raised with all the infirmities and defects under which it laboured on earth? Are the blind, the lame, the deformed, those especially who were so from their birth, to appear with the same imperfections at the day of judgment?"³ "No," replies Tertullian: "the Almighty does not His work by halves. He, who raises the dead to life, will raise the body in its perfect integrity. This is part of the change which the body will undergo at the resurrection. For though the dead will be raised in the flesh, yet they who attain to the resurrection of happiness will pass into the angelic state and put on the vesture of immortality;⁴ according to the declaration of St. Paul, that 'this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality'—and again, that 'our vile bodies will be changed that they may be fashioned like unto the glorious body of Christ.'" We must not, however, suppose that this change is incompatible with the identity of the body.⁵ Continual changes take place in the substance of man from his birth to his death: his constitution, his bulk, his strength is perpetually changing; yet he remains the same man. So, when after death he passes into a state of incorruption and immortality, as the mind, the memory, the conscience which he now has will not be done away,⁶ so neither will his body. Otherwise he would suffer in a different body from that in which he sinned; and the dispensations of God would appear to be at variance with His justice, which evidently requires that the same soul should be re-united to the same body at the last day. Never-

¹ Cc. 16, 17.

³ Cc. 4, 57.

⁵ Cc. 55, 56.

² Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 24; l. v. c. 10.

⁴ Compare cc. 36, 42, and 55.

⁶ The corresponding Latin word is *aboleri*, c. 56.

theless, in consequence of this change, the flesh will no longer be subject to infirmities and sufferings, or the soul be disturbed by unruly passions and desires.¹

“The body, therefore,” the heretics replied, “after it is risen will be subject to no sufferings, will be harassed by no wants; what, then, will be the use of those members which at present administer to its necessities? what offices will the mouth, the throat, the teeth, the stomach, the intestines have to perform, when man will no longer eat and drink?”² We have said, answers Tertullian, that the body will undergo a change; and as man will then be free from the wants of this life, so will his members be released from many of their present duties. But it does not therefore follow that they will be wholly without use: the mouth, for instance, will be employed in singing praises to God. Nor will the final retribution be complete, unless the whole man stands before the judgment-seat of God—unless man stands there with all his members perfect.

When the heretics argued from Scripture, they sometimes said in general that “the language of Scripture is frequently figurative, and ought to be so considered in the present instance.³ The resurrection of which it speaks is a moral or spiritual resurrection—a resurrection of the soul from the grave of sin—from the death of ignorance to the light of truth and to the knowledge of God.⁴ Man, therefore, rises again, according to the meaning of Scripture, in baptism.” Aware, however, that they might shock the feelings of those whom they wished to convert by an abrupt and total denial of the resurrection, they practised a verbal deception, and affirmed that every man must rise again, not in *the* flesh generally, *in carne*, but in *this* flesh, *in hâc carne*; tacitly referring to their moral resurrection, and meaning that man must in this life be initiated into their extravagant mysteries. Others again, in order to get rid of the

¹ C. 57. “Ita manebit quidem caro etiam post resurrectionem, eatenus passibilis qua ipsa, qua eadem; ea tamen impassibilis qua in hoc ipsum manumissa a Domino, ne ultra pati possit,” etc.

² Cc. 60, 61, 62, 63.

³ C. 19.

⁴ Pearson calls this a Socinian notion. Article xi. p. 382. One of King Edward's Articles, entitled “Resurrectio mortuorum nondum est facta,” is directed against it. “Resurrectio mortuorum non adhuc facta est, quasi tantum ad *animum* pertineat, qui per Christi gratiam a morte peccatorum excitetur.” The article then proceeds, in exact conformity with our author's opinion, to state that the souls of men will be re-united to their bodies at the last day, in order to receive the final sentence of God.

resurrection of the flesh, interpreted the resurrection to mean the departure of the soul either from this world, which they called the habitation of the dead, that is, of those who know not God; or from the body, in which, as in a sepulchre, they conceived the soul to be detained. These objections afford Tertullian an opportunity of making some pertinent observations upon the marks by which we must determine when the language of Scripture is to be figuratively understood.¹ In this case, he says, we cannot so understand it, because the whole Christian faith hinges upon the doctrine of a future state; and surely God would not have made the gospel rest upon a figure.² Christ, moreover, in the prophecy in which He at once predicted the destruction of Jerusalem and the final consummation of all things, connected the resurrection with His second coming;³ and we trace the same connexion in many passages of St. Paul's Epistles,⁴ as well as in the Apocalypse. What, then, becomes of those figurative interpretations, according to which the resurrection is already past?⁵ At least, Tertullian adds, the heretics ought to be consistent with themselves, and not to put a figurative construction on all that is said of the body, while they interpret literally whatever is said of the soul.⁶ Our author, however, is not content with proving the figurative interpretation to be inapplicable in the present instance: he is determined to fight his adversaries with their own weapons, and produces passages of Scripture, equally or even more inapplicable, in which he finds the resurrection prefigured and typified.⁷ He dwells particularly on the vision of dry bones in Ezekiel, and urges it in proof of the resurrection of the body.⁸ By the heretics it was referred to the captivity of the Jews, and their subsequent restoration to their native land.⁹ We learn incidentally from Tertullian's interpretation, that in his opinion the doctrine of the resurrection had been previously revealed to the Jews, and that the design of the vision was to confirm their wavering belief.¹⁰

¹ C. 20. In c. 33 are some good remarks upon the mode of distinguishing between what is to be understood literally, and what to be regarded as mere illustration in our Saviour's parables.

² C. 21.

³ C. 22.

⁴ Cc. 23, 24, 25.

⁶ C. 32.

⁵ 2 Tim. ii. 18.

⁷ Cc. 26, 27, 28. See, for instance, the interpretation of Isaiah lviii. 8. in c. 27.

⁸ C. 29. In speaking of this chapter of Ezekiel (xxxvii.), Tertullian falls into a chronological error: he supposes that Ezekiel prophesied before the Captivity, c. 31.

⁹ C. 30. Pearson appears to have thought that the vision had no reference to the resurrection of the body. Article xi. p. 372.

¹⁰ C. 31. Compare c. 39.

The passages of Scripture on which Tertullian rests his proof of the resurrection of the body are such as the following. Christ said that He came to save what was lost.¹ What, then, was lost? The whole man, both soul and body. The body, therefore, must be saved as well as the soul; otherwise the purpose of Christ's coming will not be accomplished. Christ also, when He enjoined His hearers to fear *Him* only who can destroy both soul and body in hell, evidently assumed the resurrection of the body;² as well as in His answer to the question of the Sadducees respecting the woman who had been seven times married.³ Of the other arguments urged by Tertullian, I will mention only one, which possesses at least the merit of ingenuity. The Athenians, he observes, would not have sneered at St. Paul for preaching the doctrine of the resurrection, in case he had maintained a mere resurrection of the soul, since that was a doctrine with which they were sufficiently familiar.⁴

Both parties appealed to the miracle performed by Christ in raising Lazarus.⁵ Tertullian contended that He performed it in order to confirm the faith of His disciples, by exhibiting the very mode in which the future resurrection would take place. The heretics described it as a mere exercise of power, which could not have been rendered cognizable by the senses had not the body of Lazarus been raised as well as the soul.

"St. Paul," the heretics further argued, "speaks of an outward man that perishes, and of an inward man that is renewed from day to day, evidently alluding to the body and soul, and intimating that the latter alone will be saved."⁶ Tertullian answers that this passage is to be understood of what takes place, not in a future, but in the present life—of the afflictions to which the bodies of Christians are subjected in consequence of their profession of the gospel, and of their daily advancement in faith and love through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. In like manner when St. Paul distinguished between the old and the new man, expressions which the heretics also interpreted of the body and soul, he meant to speak of a difference, not of substance, but of character.⁷ The old man was the Jew or Gentile, who walked in the lusts of the flesh; the new man the Christian, who, being renewed in the spirit of his mind, led a life of purity and holiness.

¹ C. 34. Luke xix. 10.

² C. 35. Matt. x. 28.

³ C. 36.

⁴ C. 39.

⁵ Cc. 39, 53.

⁶ Cc. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44. 2 Cor. iv. 16.

⁷ Cc. 45, 46, 47. Eph. iv. 22.

So, when the apostle says that they who are in the flesh cannot please God,¹ he condemns not the flesh, but the works of the flesh; for he shortly afterwards adds that they who by the Spirit mortify the deeds of the flesh, shall live.²

But the passage on which the heretics principally relied was the declaration of St. Paul, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.³ "Here," they said, "is no figure, but a plain and express assertion that the body cannot be saved." To this objection Tertullian gives a variety of answers. He first states the circumstances which led the apostle into that particular train of thought, and shows very satisfactorily that, as St. Paul makes Christ's resurrection the foundation of our hope of a resurrection, the necessary inference is that we shall rise as He did, that is, in the flesh. He then borrows a weapon from the armoury of his opponents, and says that the expression *flesh and blood* is figurative, and means carnal conversation, which certainly excludes man from the kingdom of heaven.⁴ "But if," he proceeds, "the expression is understood literally, still it contains no direct denial of the resurrection of the body.⁵ We must distinguish between the resurrection of the body and its admission into the kingdom of heaven. The same body is raised in order that the whole man may stand before the judgment-seat of God; but before he can be received into the kingdom of heaven, he must be changed⁶—must be made partaker of the vivifying influence of the Spirit, and put on the vesture of incorruption and immortality. Death is the separation of the soul from the body: the body crumbles in the dust, the soul passes to the Inferi, where it remains in a state of imperfect happiness or misery according to the deeds done in the flesh. At the day of judg-

¹ Rom. viii. 8.

² Rom. viii. 13.

³ C. 48. 1 Cor. xv. 50. Some in Tertullian's day appear to have interpreted the expression *flesh and blood* in this passage, as well as in Gal. i. 16, of Judaism, c. 50.

⁴ C. 49. Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 10.

⁵ Cc. 50, 51, 42.

⁶ Compare the *Apology*, c. 48. "Superinduti substantiâ propriâ æternitatis." The substance of the glorified body will be, according to Tertullian, the same as that of the angels. *De Cultu Fæminarum*, l. i. c. 2, *sub fine*; *ad Uxorem*, l. i. c. 1; *ad Martyres*, c. 3. *de Animâ*, c. 56. "Ad Angelicæ plenitudinis mensuram temperatum." Our Saviour's declaration, that in the resurrection, men will be as the angels of God, appears to have given rise to this notion respecting the angelic substance. The change which will take place in the body of man is urged by Tertullian in answer to another heretical argument, founded upon the difference between this world and the next: "whatever belongs to the latter is immortal, and cannot therefore be possessed by 'flesh and blood,' which are mortal," c. 59.

ment it will be reunited to the body, and man will then receive his final sentence: if of condemnation, he will suffer eternal punishment in hell; if of justification, his body will be transformed and glorified, and he will thus be fitted to partake of the happiness of heaven. They who shall be alive on earth at the day of judgment will not die, but will at once undergo the change above described."

"But does not St. Paul say, 'That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain'? and does not this comparison necessarily imply that man will be raised in a different body from that in which he died?"¹ Tertullian answers, by no means; for though there may be a difference of appearance, the body remains in kind, in nature, in quality the same. If you sow a grain of wheat, barley does not come up; or the converse. The apostle's comparison leads to the inference that a change will take place in the body, but not such a change as will destroy its identity.

The heretics grounded an argument upon another passage in the same chapter;² but in order to understand it we must turn to the original Greek. The words are, *σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν*, *seminatur corpus animale*, which in our version are rendered, *it is sown a natural body*.³ The heretics affirmed *σῶμα ψυχικόν* to be merely a periphrasis for *ψυχὴ*, and *σῶμα πνευματικόν* for *πνεῦμα*. St. Paul, therefore, by omitting all mention of the flesh, evidently intended to exclude it from all share of the resurrection. In our account of the treatise *de Animâ*, we stated that our author conceived God to have given a soul to Adam, when the breath of life was breathed into his nostrils. He argues, therefore, that as *σῶμα ψυχικόν* means a body animated by a soul, *σῶμα πνευματικόν* means the same body, now become the habitation of the Spirit, and thus imbued with the principle of immortality. The pas-

¹C. 52. I Cor. xv. 37. In interpreting St. Paul's words, "*There is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, another of birds*," our author understands *men* to mean servants of God, *beasts* the heathen, *birds* martyrs who essay to fly up to heaven, *fishes* the mass of Christians, those who have been baptized. So in a subsequent passage, "*There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars*," the *sun* means Christ, the *moon* the Church, the *stars* the seed of Abraham, whether Jews or Christians.

²C. 53. I Cor. xv. 44. Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 10.

³Our translators, though they have not rendered the word *ψυχικόν* literally, appear correctly to have represented St. Paul's meaning. *Ὁ ἄνθρωπος ψυχικός* is, as Tertullian expresses himself, *homo solius carnis et animæ*, the natural man—as opposed to *ὁ ἄνθρωπος πνευματικός*, the man who has received the Holy Spirit.

sage, far from subverting, establishes the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

We will conclude this analysis of Tertullian's tract with observing that he alludes to the passage respecting the baptism for the dead in the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and speaks of it as if St. Paul had referred to a superstitious practice prevalent in his days, of baptizing a living person as a proxy for the dead.¹ But in the fifth book *against Marcion*, he ridicules this as an idle fancy,² on which it was unlikely that St. Paul should found an argument; and interprets the words *for the dead* to mean *for the body*, which is declared to be dead in baptism.

Passing over for the present the fifth Article of our Church, for the same reasons which induced us to omit the first and second, we proceed to the sixth.³ The first question which presents itself for our consideration is, whether Tertullian uniformly speaks of the Scriptures as containing the whole rule to which the faith and practice of Christians must be conformed in points necessary to salvation. To this inquiry his pointed condemnation, already quoted,⁴ of the Valentinian notion that the apostles had not communicated to mankind, publicly and indifferently, all the truths imparted to them by their heavenly Master, appears to furnish a satisfactory answer. So great indeed is the weight which he is on some occasions disposed to ascribe to the authority of Scripture, that he goes the length of denying the lawfulness of any act which is not permitted therein;⁵ and even of asserting that whatever is not there related, must be supposed not to have happened.⁶ We mean not to defend this extravagant

¹ "Si autem et baptizantur quidam pro mortuis (videbimus an ratione?) certe illâ præsumptione hoc eos instituisse contendit, quâ alii etiam carni, ut vicarium baptismum, profuturum existimarent ad spem resurrectionis, quæ nisi corporalis, non alias hic baptismate corporali obligantur," c. 48.

² "Quid, ait, facient qui pro mortuis baptizantur, si mortui non resurgunt? Viderit institutio ista; Calendæ si forte Februariæ respondebunt illi, pro mortuis petere. Noli ergo Apostolum novum statim auctorem aut confirmatorem ejus denotare, ut tanto magis sisteret carnis resurrectionem, quanto illi, qui vanè pro mortuis baptizarentur, fide resurrectionis hoc facerent. Habemus illum alicubi unius baptismi definitorem. Igitur et pro mortuis tingui pro corporibus est tingui: mortuum enim corpus ostendimus," c. 10.

³ P. 262.

⁴ Chap. iv. p. 250.

⁵ "Immo prohibetur, quod non ultro permissum est." *De Coronâ*, c. 2, *sub fine*. Tertullian, however, appears himself to have been conscious of the weakness of the reasoning. See also *ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 2, *sub fine*.

⁶ "Negat Scriptura quod non notat." *De Monogamiâ*, c. 4. Scripture

language, but produce it in order to show what were his opinions on the subject.

But does Tertullian always speak the same language? Does he not on other occasions appeal to tradition? Does he not even say, in his tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, that in arguing with the heretics no appeal ought to be made to the Scriptures; and that they can only be confuted by ascertaining the tradition which has been preserved and handed down in the Apostolic Churches? Undoubtedly he does. But in order to understand the precise meaning of Tertullian's appeal to tradition, we must consider the object which he had immediately in view. "In disputing with the heretics," he says, "it is necessary, in the very outset, to except against all arguments urged by them out of Scripture.¹ For as they do not acknowledge all the books received by the Church, and have mutilated or corrupted those which they do acknowledge, and have put their own interpretations upon the passages respecting the genuineness of which both parties are agreed, the first point to be determined is, which of the two is in possession of the genuine Scriptures, and of their true interpretation.² How, then, is this point to be determined? By inquiring what doctrines are held, and what Scriptures received, by the Apostolic Churches; for in them is preserved the truth, as it was originally communicated by Christ to the apostles, and by the apostles, either orally or by letter, to the Churches which they founded; so that whatever doctrines and Scriptures are so held and received must be deemed orthodox and genuine." Tertullian's opponents do not appear to have objected to the correctness of this mode of reasoning, but to have denied the premises. They contended either that the apostles were not themselves fully instructed in the truth, or that they did not communicate to the Churches all the truths which had been revealed to them.³

In support of the former assertion they alleged the reproof given by St. Paul to St. Peter, which they conceived to imply a defect of knowledge on the part of the latter.⁴ Tertullian justly observes in reply, that the controversy between those two apostles related not to any fundamental article of faith, but to a

mentions the polygamy of Lamech, but of no other individual; he was therefore, according to Tertullian, at that period the only polygamist.

¹ C. 15. See also c. 37.

² C. 17.

³ Cc. 19, 20, 21. See also cc. 37, 38. Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 21.

⁴ C. 22.

question of practice—whether St. Peter had not been guilty of inconsistency in his conduct towards the Gentile brethren.

In support of the second assertion, they quoted St. Paul's exhortations to Timothy:¹ "Keep that which is committed to thy trust"—"That good thing which was committed to thee, keep:" interpreting these expressions of certain doctrines which St. Paul had secretly communicated to Timothy; though, as Tertullian well remarks, St. Paul's design was merely to caution Timothy against allowing any new doctrine to creep in, different from that in which he had been instructed.²

"But may not," the heretics asked, "may not the Churches in process of time have perverted the doctrine originally delivered to them by the apostles?"³ May they not all have wandered from the truth?" "Such an inference," our author answers, "is contrary to all experience. Truth is uniform and consistent; but it is of the very essence of error to be continually assuming new shapes. If the Churches had erred, they would have erred after many different fashions; whence then arises this surprising agreement in error? The single fact, that the same doctrine is maintained by so many different Churches situated in distant quarters of the globe, affords a strong presumption of its truth." I need scarcely observe that the force of this argument was much greater in Tertullian's time, when all the Churches were independent, than in after ages when the bishops of Rome assumed the right of prescribing the rule of faith to the whole Christian community. In this part of his argument our author clearly shows his opinion to be, that the promise of the Holy Spirit, made by Christ to the Church, precludes the possibility of an universal defection from the true faith.⁴

The superior antiquity of the doctrine maintained in the Church furnishes Tertullian with another argument in favour of its truth.⁵ As truth necessarily precedes error, which is, as it were, its image or counterfeit, that must be the true doctrine which was prior in time; that which was subsequent, false: and it may be easily shown that the origin of the heretical sects was posterior to the foundation of the Apostolic Churches.

¹ C. 23. Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 3.

² Cc. 25, 26; 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 14.

³ Cc. 27, 28.

⁴ See the commencement of c. 28.

⁵ Cc. 29, 30, 31, 32. Compare the *Apology*, c. 47.

The circumstance, however, most to our present purpose is, that Tertullian, when he comes at last to examine and confute the heretical doctrines, appeals to the apostolic writings, and shows that St. Paul had, as it were by anticipation, condemned many of those doctrines.¹ If he had not condemned all, it was simply because all were not then in existence; his very silence, therefore, proves the novelty, and consequently the falsehood of the heretical opinions which he did not notice. Tertullian alleges as an instance the heretical notion that the Demiurge who gave the law was not only a distinct being from the Supreme God who gave the gospel, but at variance with Him. "If this opinion existed in the days of St. Paul, how comes it that he never alludes to it in his Epistles? The questions which he discusses relate to meats offered to idols, to marriage, to the introduction of fables and endless genealogies, and to the resurrection. Much of his labour is employed in proving that the observance of the Mosaic ritual is no longer obligatory on the conscience.² Surely he would not have taken this unnecessary trouble if the heretical doctrine now alluded to had been then received, since he might at once have put an end to the controversy by saying that the law and the gospel did not proceed from the same author."

If, then, we closely attend to the object which Tertullian had in view, we shall be led to the conclusion that the tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, far from lending any sanction, is directly opposed to the Roman Catholic notion respecting tradition—to the notion that there are certain doctrines, of which the belief is necessary to salvation, and which rest on the authority, not of Scripture, but of unwritten tradition. Tertullian, it is true, refuses to dispute with the heretics out of the Scriptures; not, however, because he was not persuaded that the Scriptures contained the whole rule of faith, but because the heretics rejected a large portion of the sacred writings, and either mutilated or put forced and erroneous interpretations upon those parts which they received. Before, therefore, an appeal could be made to the Scriptures, it was necessary to determine which were the genuine Scriptures, and what the true interpretation of them. The first of these questions was purely historical; to be determined by ascertaining what books had from the earliest

¹ Cc. 33, 34. See also c. 38, in which Tertullian asserts in the strongest terms the genuineness and integrity of the Scriptures used in the Church.

² See *adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 2.

times been generally received by the Apostolic Churches; and, with respect to the second, though interpretations which had received the sanction of the Church were not to be lightly rejected, yet the practice of Tertullian himself proves that he believed every Christian to be at liberty to exercise his own judgment upon them.¹ The language of Tertullian corresponds exactly with that of the Church of England in the twentieth Article. According to him, the Church is the witness and keeper of Holy Writ; but so far is he from thinking that the Church can either decide anything against Scripture, or prescribe anything not contained in it, as necessary to salvation, that he uniformly and strenuously insists *upon the exact agreement* between the tradition preserved in the Church and the doctrine delivered in Scripture.²

¹ Respecting the degree of authority ascribed by our Church to tradition, in the interpretation of Scripture, see some excellent remarks of Bishop Jebb in the Appendix to his Sermons.

² See *de Præscript. Hæretic.* c. 38. While the first edition of the present work was passing through the press, I received a copy of the translation of Dr. Schleiermacher's *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*. In a learned and ingenious Introduction, the translator has made some remarks on the superiority ascribed by Tertullian to tradition over Scripture, with a particular reference to the tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*.¹ He admits that "Tertullian's argument is perfectly consistent with Protestant principles;" and that "the tradition which is the subject of controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants is very different from the *Traditio Apostolorum* spoken of by Tertullian" (*de Præscr. Hæret.* c. 21). But he afterwards states "what he conceives to be an incontestable fact, that the maxims of the Protestant Church with respect to the use of the Scriptures are as different from those which prevailed in all ages, from the time of Tertullian down to the Reformation, as from those which now prevail in the Roman Catholic Church." As I had myself expressed a different opinion, viz. that Tertullian's language respecting tradition corresponds exactly with that of the Church of England—one, and certainly not the least important branch of the Protestant Church—I was induced by the learned translator's remark to reconsider the subject; and I must confess that, after having again perused the tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, I discover no reason for coming to a different conclusion from that which I had before formed.

From the commencement of the treatise it appears that the minds of many members of the Church were disquieted by the rapid progress of heresy. They were surprised and scandalized at the divisions which prevailed among those who called themselves Christians; and their surprise was increased by observing that men of high reputation for wisdom and piety from time to time quitted the Church, and attached themselves to one or other of the heretical sects. Tertullian, therefore, in the first four chapters of the tract, contends that the existence and prevalence of heresy ought not to be a matter of surprise, since Christ had predicted that heresies would arise, and St. Paul had affirmed that the very purpose of their existence was to prove the faith of Christians.

In the fifth and sixth chapters he appeals to the authority of the same apostle, in proof of the mischievous nature of heresy; and in the seventh, traces the tenets of the different sects to the Grecian philosophy. In the eighth he states that the heretics gained many converts to their opinions by persuading men that it was the duty of every Christian to search the Scriptures. "*Seek,*" they said, "*and you*

¹ P. cxxxv. *et seq.*

If we mistake not the signs of the times, the period is not far distant when the whole controversy between the English and

shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you, are the injunctions of Christ Himself." Tertullian, in reply, first contends that those injunctions were delivered in the very outset of Christ's ministry, and addressed especially to the Jews, who, by searching their Scriptures—those of the Old Testament—might have learned that He was the Messiah predicted by the prophets. "But grant," Tertullian continues, "that the injunction was addressed indiscriminately to all mankind, still it is evident that Christ intended to propose some definite object of search; and when that was attained, to release His followers from the labour of further inquiry. He could not mean that they were to go on searching for ever. They were to inquire what was the doctrine which He had actually delivered; and when they had found it, they were to believe. If, after having been once satisfied that they have found the truth, Christians are to recommence their inquiries as often as a new opinion is started, their faith can never be settled or stedfast. At least it must be allowed to be absurd and useless to seek the truth among the heretics, who differ as widely from each other as they do from the Church; or among those who, having believed as we do, have deserted their original faith, and having been once our friends, are now our enemies."¹

In the thirteenth chapter Tertullian lays down what he calls the rule of faith, *Regula Fidei*; and promises to prove that it was delivered by Christ.² In the fourteenth he says that all our inquiries into Scripture should be conducted with reference and in subordination to that rule. But as the heretics rested their whole cause upon an appeal to Scripture, asserting that their doctrine was derived from it, and that the rule of faith could only be found *ex litteris fidei*, in those books which are of the faith, Tertullian proceeds, in the fifteenth and following chapters, to assign the reasons of which we have just given a sketch, why, in arguing with the heretics, he declined all appeal to the Scriptures.

Now, whatever may be the case with other Protestant Churches, I see nothing in Tertullian's reasoning at variance with the maxims of the Church of England respecting the use of the Scriptures. Tertullian, according to the learned translator, appeals to apostolic tradition—to a rule of faith, not *originally* deduced from Scripture, but delivered by the apostles orally to the Churches which they founded, and regularly transmitted from them to his own time. How, I would ask, is this appeal inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England, which declares *only* that Holy Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation? Respecting the source from which the rule of faith was *originally* deduced, our Church is silent. The framers of our Articles meant not to deny that the rule of faith might, independently of the Scriptures, have been faithfully transmitted in the Apostolic Churches *down to Tertullian's time*. What they meant to assert was, that the rule, so transmitted, contained no article which was not either expressed in Scripture, or might not be proved by it; and that the peculiar doctrines, in support of which the Roman Catholics appealed to tradition, formed no part of the apostolic rule.

With respect also to the motives of Tertullian's appeal to apostolic tradition, I cannot think that the learned translator is warranted in saying that Tertullian considered it as the only sure foundation of Christian faith, and appealed to it as an authority paramount to Scripture. To me he appears to have appealed to it from necessity, because he could not, from the nature of the dispute in which he was engaged, directly appeal to Scripture. The heretics with whom he was contending not only proposed a different rule of faith, but in defence of it produced a different set of Scriptures. How, then, was Tertullian to confute them? By showing that the faith which he professed, and the Scriptures to which he appealed, were, and had always been, the faith and Scriptures of those Churches of which the origin could be traced to the apostles—the first depositaries of the faith. In

¹ Cc. 9, 10, 11, 12.

² He fulfils this promise in cc. 20, 21.

Romish Churches will be revived, and all the points in dispute again brought under review. Of those points none is more important than the question respecting tradition; and it is therefore most essential that they who stand forth as the defenders of the Church of England should take a correct and rational view of the subject—the view, in short, which was taken by our divines at the Reformation. Nothing was more remote from their intention than indiscriminately to condemn all tradition. They knew that, in strictness of speech, Scripture is tradition—written tradition.¹ They knew that, as far as external evidence is concerned, the tradition preserved in the Church is the only ground on which the genuineness of the books of Scripture can be established. For though we are not, upon the authority of the Church, bound to receive as Scripture any book which contains internal evidence of its own spuriousness—such as discrepancies,

this case Tertullian had no alternative: he was *compelled* to appeal to apostolic tradition. But when he is contending against Praxeas, a heretic who acknowledged the Scriptures received by the Church, though he begins with laying down the rule of faith nearly in the same words as in the tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, yet he conducts the controversy by a constant appeal to Scripture. Why, indeed, did Marcion think it necessary to compile a gospel, if it was not usual for the contending parties even in his time to allege the authority of the written word in support of their respective tenets? Let it be observed also that in Tertullian's view of the subject the genuine Scriptures evidently formed a part of the apostolic tradition.¹

When, again, the learned translator says that Tertullian dissuades his believing brother from entering into any scriptural researches, he appears to me not to make due allowance for the vehemence of Tertullian's temper, and his disposition always to use the strongest expressions which occurred to him at the moment. In the place referred to, he is manifestly addressing himself to ordinary Christians—to those who are unfitted by their talents and acquirements to engage in theological controversy.² To them he says, "Adhere closely to the creed in which you have been instructed. If you read the Scriptures, and meet with difficulties, consult some doctor of the Church who has made the sacred volume his peculiar study; or if you cannot readily have recourse to such a person, be content to be ignorant. It is faith that saves you, not familiarity with the Scriptures. At any rate, do not go for a solution of your doubts to the heretics, who confess by their continual inquiries that they are themselves in doubt." Tertullian's object in this passage manifestly is to deter the unlearned Christian from curious researches which may lead him into error; and, as his custom is, he employs very strong language. But a writer, whose works teem with scriptural quotations, could not deliberately intend to disparage scriptural knowledge.

¹ Tertullian uses the expression *Scripta Traditio*. *De Coronâ*, c. 3. In the tract *de Carne Christi*, c. 2, speaking of the history of our Saviour's life and actions as delivered in Scripture, he says, "Si tantum Christianus es, crede quod traditum est;" and again, "Porro quod traditum erat, id erat verum, ut ab iis traditum quorum fuit tradere."

¹ See *adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 5, the whole object of which is to prove by an appeal to the tradition preserved in the Apostolic Churches, that the Gospel of St. Luke used by the orthodox was genuine, that of Marcion spurious.

² *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 14.

contradictions of other portions of Scripture, idle fables, or precepts at variance with the great principles of morality—yet no internal evidence is sufficient to prove a book to be Scripture, of which the reception, by a portion at least of the Church, cannot be traced from the earliest period of its history to the present time. What our reformers opposed was the notion that men must, upon the mere authority of tradition, receive, as necessary to salvation, doctrines not contained in Scripture. Against this notion in general they urged the incredibility of the supposition that the apostles, when unfolding *in their writings* the principles of the gospel, should have entirely omitted any doctrines essential to man's salvation. The whole tenor, indeed, of those writings, as well as of our blessed Lord's discourses, runs counter to the supposition that any truths of fundamental importance would be suffered long to rest upon so precarious a foundation as that of oral tradition. With respect to the particular doctrines, in defence of which the Roman Catholics appeal to tradition, our reformers contended that some were directly at variance with Scripture; and that others, far from being supported by an unbroken chain of tradition from the apostolic age, were of very recent origin, and utterly unknown to the early Fathers. Such was the view of this important question taken by our reformers. In this, as in other instances, they wisely adopted a middle course; they neither bowed submissively to the authority of tradition, nor yet rejected it altogether. We in the present day must tread in their footsteps and imitate their moderation, if we intend to combat our Roman Catholic adversaries with success. We must be careful that, in our anxiety to avoid one extreme, we run not into the other by adopting the extravagant language of those who, not content with ascribing a paramount authority to the written word on all points pertaining to eternal salvation, talk as if the Bible—and that too the Bible in our English translation—were, independently of all external aids and evidence, sufficient to prove its own genuineness and inspiration, and to be its own interpreter.

To return to Tertullian. In the passage to which reference has just been made,¹ he speaks both of written and unwritten tradition; but the cases in which he lays any stress upon the authority of the latter are precisely those which our reformers allowed to be within its province—cases of ceremonies and ritual observances.² Of these he enumerates several, for which no

¹ In the preceding note, from the tract *de Coronâ Militis*, c. 3.

² It is important to distinguish between traditional doctrines and traditional

express warrant can be found in Scripture, and which must consequently have been derived solely from tradition; the forms, for instance, observed in baptism, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, and in public prayer.¹ Even in these cases he seems to have deemed it essential to the validity of a traditional observance, that some satisfactory reason should be assigned for its original institution; ² and when different observances have prevailed in different Churches, it is our duty, he says,³ to inquire which of the two is more agreeable to the rule of life laid down by Scripture. In relation to the subject now treated of, there is only one point in which I discover any difference of opinion between Tertullian and the framers of our Articles. He sometimes appears to contend that an uniformity of ceremonies ought to be maintained in all the particular Churches, of which the visible Church is composed; ⁴ and that any Church which breaks this uniformity divides the body of Christ. Our Church,⁵ on the contrary, though it asserts that every individual member of a Church is bound to comply with the observances ordained in it by competent authority, yet, availing itself of that liberty in things indifferent which the apostle of the Gentiles allows, declares that "traditions and ceremonies need not be in all places one and utterly like, but may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners," with this single proviso, "that nothing be ordained against God's Word." Our author, however, is not always consistent with himself, for in another place he speaks as if it were lawful, not merely for every

practices. Our Church receives no traditional doctrines—no doctrines necessary to salvation, preserved through several ages by oral tradition, and afterwards committed to writing; but it has a respect for traditional practices: not, however, such a respect as to preclude it from examining their original reasonableness, and their suitableness to existing manners and circumstances.

¹ *De Coronâ*, cc. 3, 4.

² "Rationem traditioni, et consuetudini, et fidei patrocinaturam aut ipse perspicies, aut ab aliquo qui perspexerit disces: interim nonnullam esse credes, cui debeat obsequium." *De Coronâ*, c. 4. "Sed quia eorum quæ ex traditione observantur tanto magis dignam rationem afferre debemus, quanto carent Scripturæ auctoritate." *De Jejuniiis*, c. 10. "Non exploratis rationibus Traditionum." *De Baptismo*, c. 1.

³ "Tamen hic, sicut in omnibus variè institutis et dubiis et incertis fieri solet, adhibenda fuit examinatio, quæ magis ex duabus tam diversis consuetudinibus disciplinæ Dei conveniret." *De Virginibus velandis*, c. 2.

⁴ "Non possumus respuere consuetudinem, quam damnare non possumus, utpote non extraneam, quia non extraneorum, cum quibus scilicet communicamus jus pacis et nomen fraternitatis. Una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri Sacramenta. Semel dixerim, una Ecclesia sumus. Ita nostrum est quodcunque nostrorum est. Cæterum dividis corpus." *De Virginibus velandis*, c. 2.

⁵ Article 34.

Church, but for every Christian, to appoint observances, if they are but agreeable to the Word of God, tend to promote a Christian temper and life, and are profitable unto salvation.¹ Before we quit the subject of tradition, we must, in justice to Tertullian, remark that when, in opposition to the tradition of the Church, he contended for the reception of the new discipline of Montanus, he was not chargeable with inconsistency; since, conceiving as he did, that Montanus was divinely inspired, he conceived him to possess at least equal authority with the apostles themselves.

We will now proceed to inquire what information the writings of Tertullian supply respecting the canon of Scripture. His quotations include all the books of the Old Testament, excepting Ruth, the two Books of Chronicles, the Book of Nehemiah, and the prophecies of Obadiah and Haggai. Of the apocryphal books he quotes Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch under the name of Jeremiah,² the Song of the Three Children under the name of Daniel,³ the Stories of Susannah⁴ and of Bel and the Dragon,⁵ and the first Book of Maccabees. He quotes all the books of the New Testament,⁶ excepting the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the Third of St. John, and perhaps the Epistle of St. James;⁷ for we concur in Lardner's opinion that there is sufficient ground for believing some words to have dropped out towards the conclusion of the fifth book *against Marcion* which contained a reference to the Epistle to Philemon.⁸ The reader will find in the fourth book *against Marcion* some valuable remarks upon the genuineness and integrity of the Gospels.⁹ Tertullian states

¹ "Annon putas *omni fidei* licere concipere et constituere, duntaxat quod Deo congruat, quod disciplinæ conducat, quod saluti proficiat? dicente Domino, *cur autem non et a vobis ipsis quod justum est judicatis?* et non de judicio tantum, sed de omni sententiâ rerum examinandarum." *De Coronâ*, c. 4. Tertullian in this passage could scarcely mean to assert that observances appointed by one individual were obligatory upon others.

² "*Scorpiace*, c. 8. The quotation is from the sixth chapter, which is called in our Bibles the Epistle of Jeremiah.

³ "Cui etiam in animalia et incorporalia laudes canunt apud Danielelem." *Adv. Hermogenem*, c. 44.

⁴ *De Coronâ*, c. 4.

⁵ *De Idololatriâ*, c. 18; *de Jejuniis*, c. 7, *sub fine*.

⁶ In the *Index locorum ex Scripturis Sacris*, annexed to the Paris edition, the second (or fourth) Book of Esdras and the second Book of Maccabees occur; but the supposed quotations are of a very doubtful character. The former is probably referred to in the first book *de Cultu Fœminarum*, c. 3.

⁷ See Lardner, *Credibility*, c. 27, sect. XI.

⁸ *Credibility of the Gospel History*, c. 27. Rigault thinks that there is an allusion to the Epistle to Philemon in the following passage from the tract *adv. Valentini-anos*, "Et forsitan parias aliquem Onesimum Æonem," c. 32. St. Paul speaks of Onesimus as his son, begotten by him, v. 10.

⁹ Cc. 2, 3, 4, 5. In c. 5, the Apocalypse is ascribed to St. John.

St. Luke to have been the author of the Acts of the Apostles.¹ The account which Tertullian gives of the Septuagint translation is, that Ptolemy Philadelphus, at the suggestion of Demetrius Phalereus, obtained a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures in order to place it in his library, and afterwards caused it to be translated by seventy-two interpreters, who were sent to him by the Jews for that purpose. This Tertullian states on the authority of Aristæus or Aristeas; and adds that the Hebrew copy was preserved in his own time in the temple of Serapis at Alexandria.² He evidently supposed that the translators executed their work under the influence of divine inspiration. It is unnecessary to detail the reasons which have induced the majority of learned men to treat the narrative of Aristæus as a fable. We will content ourselves with observing that Tertullian, in quoting the Old Testament, appears either himself to have translated from the Greek, or to have used a Latin version made from the Greek, not from the Hebrew.³

Tertullian quotes, more than once, the prophecy of Enoch.⁴ In one place he admits that it was not received into the Jewish canon; but supposes that the Jews rejected it merely because they were unable to account for its having survived the deluge.⁵ He argues, therefore, that Noah might have received it from his great-grandfather Enoch, and handed it down to his posterity; or if it was actually lost at the deluge, Noah might have restored it from immediate revelation, as Ezra restored the whole Jewish Scripture.⁶ "Perhaps," he adds, "the Jews reject it because it contains a prediction of Christ's advent; at any rate, the reference to it made by the apostle Jude ought to quiet all our doubts respecting its genuineness." For a more detailed

¹ "Porro quum in eodem commentario Lucæ." *De Jejuniiis*, c. 10. The allusion is to the second chapter of Acts.

² Tertullian must have been mistaken in conceiving that the Hebrew copy was extant in his day, if, as Gibbon tells us, the *old* library of the Ptolemies was *totally* consumed in Cæsar's Alexandrian war. Chap. xxviii. note 41.

³ Thus in citing Isaiah v. 18. Tertullian, *de Pœnitentiâ*, c. 11, reads, "Væ illis qui delicta sua velut procero fune nectunt;" conformably to the Septuagint, οὐαὶ οἱ ἐπισπόμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὡς σχοινίῳ μακρῷ. Jerome in agreement with the Hebrew reads, "Væ qui trahitis iniquitatem in tuniculis vanitatis."

⁴ *De Idololatriâ*, c. 15; *de Cultu Fœminarum*, l. ii. c. 10.

⁵ "Scio Scripturam Enoch, quæ hunc ordinem Angelis dedit, non recipi a quibusdam, quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur." *De Cultu Fœminarum*, l. i. c. 3.

⁶ We are not certain whether Tertullian borrowed this statement respecting the restoration of the Hebrew Scriptures from the apocryphal book of Esdras xiv. 21, or drew an inference from Nehemiah viii.

account of this book we refer the reader to the Dissertation, prefixed by Dr. Laurence¹ to his translation of the book of Enoch the Prophet, from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library.

Such of our readers as are acquainted with the late Professor Porson's letters to Archdeacon Travis will remember the archdeacon's interpretation of an expression used by Tertullian, when speaking of the Apostolic Churches. "Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsent, apud quas ipsæ Authenticæ Literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque."² By the words *authenticæ literæ* the archdeacon understood Tertullian to mean the autographs of the apostles. If, however, we turn to the tract *de Monogamiâ*,³ we find our author, after he has given the Latin version of a passage, stating that it was differently read *in Græco authentico*; that is, in the original Greek, as contradistinguished from a translation. In like manner he uses the expressions *originalia instrumenta Christi*; *originale instrumentum Moysi*;⁴ meaning, of course, not an autograph either of Christ or Moses, but the Gospels and the Pentateuch, as they were originally written. Berriman, therefore, and others, suppose that Tertullian by the words *authenticæ literæ* meant only the genuine unadulterated Epistles.⁵ Lardner conceives that our author intended to appeal, not to the Epistles which St. Paul addressed to the particular Churches mentioned by Tertullian, but to *all* the Scriptures of the New Testament, of which the Apostolic Churches were peculiarly the depositaries.⁶ But Lardner's argument is, in my opinion, founded on a misapprehension of Tertullian's immediate object in the passage in question. He there appeals to the Apostolic Churches as bear-

¹ Now Lord Archbishop Cashel. The work was published at Oxford in 1821.

² *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 36.

³ C. 11. The passage is 1 Cor. vii. 39. The MSS. now extant lend no countenance to Tertullian's assertion. Does not, however, the assertion prove that a Latin version was actually extant in his time, in opposition to Semler's notion stated in chap. ii. note 38? See Lardner, *Credibility*, c. 27, sect. xix. The following passage in the tract *against Praxeas* seems to remove all doubts on the subject: "Ideoque jam in usu est nostrorum, per simplicitatem interpretationis, *Sermonem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse*," c. 5.

⁴ *De Carne Christi*, c. 2. *Adv. Hermogenem*, c. 19.

⁵ Tertullian says of Valentinus, "De Ecclesiâ *authenticæ* regulæ abruptit," he separated himself from the Church which possessed the genuine rule of life. *Adv. Valentinianos*, c. 4. In another place he says of our Saviour, "Ipse *authenticus* Pontifex Dei Patris." He was the true, the original Priest, of whom the priests under the Mosaic law were only copies. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 35.

⁶ *Credibility of the Gospel History*, c. 27.

ing witness, not to the genuineness and integrity of the Scriptures, but to the true and uncorrupted doctrine of the gospel. For this he tells us that we must look to those Churches which were founded by the apostles, and were able to produce the authority of epistles addressed to them by the apostles. The words *literæ authenticæ* may therefore mean epistles possessing authority. It is, however, of little consequence to which of the above meanings we give the preference, since the whole passage is evidently nothing more than a declamatory mode of stating the weight which Tertullian attached to the authority of the Apostolic Churches. To infer from it that the very chairs in which the apostles sat, or that the very Epistles which they wrote, then actually existed at Corinth, Ephesus, Rome, etc., would be only to betray a total ignorance of Tertullian's style.

Tertullian expressly ascribes the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas:¹ he does not say that it was universally received in the Church, but that it was more generally received than the *Shepherd of Hermas*. He mentions also a work falsely ascribed to St. Paul,² but composed by an Asiatic presbyter, who was impelled, as he himself confessed, to commit the pious fraud by admiration of the apostle. The work appears to have been quoted in defence of a custom which had crept in of allowing females to baptize.

In speaking of the mode in which the canon of the New Testament was formed, Lardner says that it was not determined by the authority of councils.³ This may in one sense be true. Yet it appears from a passage in the tract *de Pudicitia*, referred to in a former chapter,⁴ that in Tertullian's time one part of the business of councils was to decide what books were genuine, and what spurious; for he appeals to the decisions of councils

¹ *De Pudicitia*, c. 20. "Extat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos: adeo satis auctoritatis viro, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiæ tenore: aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc operandi potestatem? Et utique receptior apud Ecclesias Epistola Barnabæ illo apocrypho Pastore mœchorum." Tertullian then proceeds to quote a passage from the sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Lardner thinks it doubtful whether Tertullian's works contain any other allusion to the Epistle.

² *De Baptismo*, c. 17, *sub fine*. Jerome, *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum* under St. Luke. He appears to have supposed that the work in question was entitled the *Travels of Paul and Thecla*.

³ *History of the Apostles and Evangelists*, c. 3.

⁴ Chap. iv. p. 121, note 17. "Sed cederem tibi, si Scriptura Pastoris, quæ sola mœchos amat, divino instrumento meruisset incidi: si non ab omni concilio Ecclesiarum etiam vestrarum inter apocrypha et falsa judicaretur," c. 10.

in support of his rejection of the *Shepherd of Hermas*. We have seen that Tertullian appeals to the original Greek text of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.¹ This fact appears to militate strongly against the theory of the author of a recent work entitled *Palæoromaica*, who asserts that the said Epistle, as well as the greater part of the New Testament, was originally written in Latin.

When we contrast the acuteness which the anonymous author of that work occasionally, and the extensive reading which he always displays, with the extraordinary conclusions at which he arrives, we are strongly tempted to suspect that he is only playing with his readers, and trying how far intrepid assertion will go towards inducing men to lend a favourable ear to the most startling paradoxes. To take a single instance from the Epistle just mentioned. His solution of the celebrated difficulty respecting the power which, according to St. Paul,² a woman ought to have on her head, is—that in the original Latin the word was *habitus*, which the ignorant translator rendered etymologically ἐξουσία.³ In support of this fancy he quotes the following words from Tertullian's treatise *de Virginibus velandis*, c. 3: "O sacrilegæ manus, quæ dicatum Deo *habitus* (the veil) detrahare potuerunt!"—meaning his readers to infer that Tertullian found *habitus* in the verse in question, but omitting to inform them that it is twice quoted by Tertullian in this very tract, and that in both instances the reading is *potestas*.⁴ That the omission proceeded, not from inadvertence, but design, is, we think, rendered certain by the still more extraordinary solution subjoined by the author, that *vestitus* was the original reading; which, when pronounced by a Jew, might easily be confounded with *potestas*. It is impossible that the author could be serious in throwing out either of these conjectures.

We will mention one other argument of a more plausible character, alleged by the author in support of his theory. The author contends that the very titles of the existing Greek Gospels, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Λοῦκαν, prove them to be translations.⁵ The version of the Septuagint was called κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα, that of Aquila κατὰ Ἀκυλάν. But why does

¹ See p. 154, note 3.

² 1 Cor. xi. 10.

³ Supplement to *Palæoromaica*, p. 61, note 5. The author does not inform us how the word *habitus* came to be translated etymologically ἐξουσία; does he mean that the translator confounded ἐξίς and ἐξουσία?

⁴ Cc. 7, 17.

⁵ Supplement to *Palæoromaica*, p. 3, note 2.

he stop short in his inference? If the argument proves anything, it proves, not merely that the existing Greek Gospels were translations, but also that Matthew, Luke, etc., were the translators. The true answer, however, is that the force of the preposition *κατὰ* depends entirely upon the word with which it is connected. The title *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου* means "the glad tidings of salvation as delivered by St. Matthew;" or as paraphrased by Hammond, "That story of Christ which Matthew compiled and set down." For though the word *εὐαγγέλιον* was employed at a very early period to signify a written book,¹ yet it continued to be used in its primitive meaning; as by Tertullian, when he calls St. Matthew, *fidelissimus Evangelii commentator*, the most faithful expositor of the life and doctrine of Christ.² We will take this opportunity of remarking that our author, in speaking of the Scriptures, sometimes calls them *Instrumentum*, sometimes *Testamentum*;³ but says on one occasion that the latter term was in more general use.⁴ He calls them also *Digesta*.⁵

Some learned men have contended that the Epistle, which in our Bibles is inscribed to the Ephesians, should be entitled to the Laodiceans.⁶ Tertullian in one place says that the heretics alone gave it that title;⁷ in another,⁸ that Marcion had at one time manifested an intention to alter the title of the Epistle. Semler's inference is that some of the Epistles were without inscriptions, and received in consequence a variety of titles.

There are in Tertullian, as well as in the other Fathers, quotations purporting to be taken from Scripture, but which cannot be found in our present copies. Thus in the tract *de Idololatriâ*,

¹ See *de Res. Carnis*, c. 33: *de Carne Christi*, c. 7: *adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 1; l. iv. cc. 1, 3; l. v. 1: *Scorpiace*, c. 2.

² *De Carne Christi*, c. 22. See also *de Res. Carnis*, c. 33. The word *commentator* is similarly used, *adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 2.

³ "Vetus Instrumentum." *Apology*, c. 47. "Ex instrumento divinarum Scripturarum." *Adv. Judæos*, c. 1. The two words are joined together, *adv. Praxeam*, c. 20. "Instrumentum utriusque testamenti."

⁴ "Alterum alterius instrumenti, vel (quod magis usui est dicere) testamenti." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 1.

⁵ "Et inde sunt nostra digesta." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 2. "Si quid in sanctis offenderunt digestis." *Apology*, c. 47.

⁶ Lardner, *History of the Apostles and Evangelists*, c. 13.

⁷ "Prætereo hic et de aliâ epistolâ, quam nos ad Ephesios perscriptam habemus; Hæretici vero ad Laodiceños." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 11.

⁸ "Ecclesiæ quidem veritate, Epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodiceños: sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 17.

c. 20, "Nam sicut scriptum est *ecce homo et facta ejus, ita, ex ore tuo justificaberis.*"¹ The commentators have not been able to trace the former of the two quotations, and some suppose it to have been taken from the book of Enoch. On three different occasions Tertullian quotes the words *Dominus regnavit a ligno* as a portion of the tenth verse of the 95th (or 96th) Psalm;² from which, according to Justin Martyr, the words corresponding to *a ligno* had been erased by the Jews. In the tract *de Carne Christi*, c. 23, we find the following sentence: "Legimus quidem apud Ezechielem de vaccâ illâ, *quæ peperit et non peperit*;" the words are also quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus,³ but he does not refer to any particular portion of Scripture. In the tract *de Exhortatione Castitatis*,⁴ Tertullian says, "Cautum in Levitico, *Sacerdotes mei non plus nubent*;" but the prohibition,⁵ as it stands in our Bibles, is that a priest shall not marry a widow or divorced female. Tertullian's writings afford many exemplifications of the justice of Porson's remarks respecting the want of correctness and precision observable in the quotations of the Fathers from the Scriptures. He sometimes refers his readers to one part of Scripture for passages which belong to another; and he so mixes up the quotations with his own words, that it is difficult to distinguish between them.⁶ The consequence has been that his inferences and explanations have been mistaken for various readings,⁷ and have in some instances found their way into the text of the sacred volume.⁸

We proceed to the seventh Article, on which it will be sufficient to remark that, as the heretical opinions of Marcion were founded on the notion that the God who created the world and gave the law was opposed to the Supreme God, he maintained as a necessary consequence that the Old Testament was contrary to the New. Our author, therefore, who undertakes to confute

¹ Matt. xii. 37.

² *Adv. Judæos*, cc. 10, 13. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 19. See Thirlby's note on *Justin Martyr against Trypho*, p. 298 D.

³ *Strom.* l. vii. p. 890, ed. Potter. See Porson's *Letters to Travis*, p. 275.

⁴ C. 7. Compare *de Monogamiâ*, c. 7.

⁵ Lev. xxi. 7, 13, 14.

⁶ Thus in the *Scorpiace*, c. 13, a passage extant in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Philippians, is quoted as from the Epistles to the Thessalonians.

⁷ See an instance in Porson's *Letters to Travis*, p. 273, or in Semler's *Dissertation*, sect. ix.

⁸ The author might have produced numerous other instances in confirmation of the statements made in this paragraph, but he was unwilling to swell the bulk of the volume.

him, must have held that the two Testaments were not at variance.¹

We have seen that Tertullian,² when arguing against the heretics, uniformly represents the rule of faith maintained in the Apostolic Churches to be the same which the apostles originally delivered. He does not indeed state that they compiled any creed or public declaration of belief, to which all the members of the Church were bound to give their assent. But in the commencement of the tract *de Virginibus velandis*,³ he describes what he calls the one fixed, unchangeable rule of faith, which will be found to contain nearly all the articles of what is now termed the Apostles' Creed. Those which are there wanting may be supplied, either from another summary of faith in the second chapter of the tract *against Praxeas*,⁴ or from detached passages of our author's writings. Thus the conception by the Holy Ghost is stated in the treatise *against Praxeas*, c. 27: "Certè enim de Spiritu Sancto Virgo concepit;" and we have seen in our remarks on the third Article that Tertullian believed the doctrine of Christ's descent into hell. Schlitingius indeed contended, on the authority of the passage just quoted from the tract *de Virginibus velandis*, that a belief in the Holy Ghost formed no part of the faith required from a Christian in the time of Tertullian;⁵ but the whole tenor of the tract *against Praxeas* confutes the assertion, and proves that the divinity of the Holy Ghost was then received as one of the doctrines of the Church. With

¹ See particularly *adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 11, where are some judicious observations respecting the relation in which the Law stands to the Gospel.

² Chap. iv. p. 114, note 2.

³ "Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et Filium ejus Iesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Mariâ, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertio die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in coelis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem." Compare *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 13.

⁴ "Nos vero, et semper, et nunc magis ut instructiores per Paracletum, deductorem scilicet omnis veritatis, unicum quidem Deum credimus; sub hâc tamen dispensatione, quam οἰκονομίαν dicimus, ut unicus Dei sit et filius, Sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt et sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, et ex eâ natum, hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Iesum Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuum et sepultum secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in coelos resumptum, sedere ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos. Qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, Sanctificatorem fidei eorum, qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Hanc regulam ab initio Evangelii decucurrisset," etc. See also cap. ult. "Si non exinde Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, tres crediti, unum Deum sistunt."

⁵ Pearson *On the Creed*, Article viii. p. 307.

respect to the next clause—the Holy Catholic Church—by which I understand, with Pearson, a visible Church on earth,¹ Tertullian repeatedly speaks of a Church which was founded by the apostles,² especially by St. Peter,³ according to the promise made by Christ to him, and is composed of all the Christian communities throughout the world, which are united by the profession of a common faith, by the same hope in Christ Jesus, and by the same sacrament of baptism.⁴ To this Church Tertullian applies also the term *Catholica*.⁵ Of the doctrine contained in the next clause of the Apostles' Creed—the Communion of Saints—as it is explained by Pearson, I find no traces in Tertullian's writings; and with respect to the remission of sins, we have seen that, though after he became a Montanist he denied to the Church the power of forgiving certain sins in this life, he still supposed that the offender might, through the blood of Christ, upon sincere repentance, obtain pardon in the life to come.⁶ The inference, therefore, to be drawn from a comparison of different passages scattered through Tertullian's writings is, that the Apostles' Creed in its present form was not known to him as a summary of faith, but that the various clauses of which it is composed were generally received as articles of faith by orthodox Christians. When we come to speak of the tract *against Praxeas*, we shall have an opportunity of ascertaining how far the opinions of our author coincided with the language employed in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.

We proceed to the ninth Article of our Church—on original sin—a subject on which we must not expect Tertullian to speak with the same precision of language which was used by those who wrote after the Pelagian controversy had arisen. In describing the cause and consequences of Adam's fall, he says that our first parent, having been seduced into disobedience by Satan, was delivered over unto death, and transmitted his

¹ Article ix. p. 339. Tertullian, however, speaks sometimes of a heavenly or invisible Church. "Emissa de cœlis, ubi Ecclesia est arcâ figurata." *De Baptismo*, c. 8. "Una Ecclesia in cœlis," c. 15. "Jam tunc de mundo in Ecclesiam," *Adv. Marcionem*, l. ii. c. 4. Here, however, the expression is ambiguous; it may mean the transition from Paganism to Christianity. "Apud Veram et Catholicam Hierusalem," etc., l. iii. c. 22.

² "In Ecclesiam, quam nondum Apostoli struxerant." *De Baptismo*, c. 11.

³ "In ipso Ecclesia extructa est, id est, per ipsum." *De Pudicitia*, c. 21.

⁴ "Una nobis et illis fides, unus Deus, idem Christus, eadem spes, eadem lavacri Sacramenta." *De Virginibus velandis*, c. 2.

⁵ *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, cc. 26, 30.

⁶ Chap. iv. p. 127.

condemnation to the whole human race, which was infected from his seed.¹ The effect of this condemnation was to involve mankind in sin as well as in punishment. In our account of the treatise *de Animâ*, we stated that our author expressed his approbation of the Platonic division of the soul into rational and irrational.² According to him, the rational was its natural, original character, as it was created by God; the irrational was introduced by Satan, and has since been wrought so completely into the soul as to have become as it were its natural character. In the same tract he says also that every soul is numbered in Adam, until, being born of water and the Spirit, it is numbered anew in Christ.³ He does not, however, appear to have admitted a total corruption of man's nature. "Besides the evil," he says, "which the soul contracts from the intervention of the wicked spirit, there is an antecedent, and in a certain sense natural evil, arising from its corrupt origin. For, as we have already observed, the corruption of our nature is another nature; having its proper god and father, namely the author of that corruption. Still there is a portion of good in the soul; of that original, divine, and genuine good, which is its proper nature. For that which is derived from God is rather obscured than extinguished. It may be obscured, because it is not God; but it cannot be extinguished, because it emanates from God. As, therefore, light, when intercepted by an opaque body, still remains, though it is not seen, so the good in the soul, being weighed down by the evil, is either not seen at all, or is partially and occasionally visible. Men differ widely in their moral characters, yet the souls of all form but one genus: in the worst there is something good; in the best there is something bad.⁴ For God alone is without sin; and the only man without sin is Christ, since Christ is God. Thus the divine nature of the soul bursts forth in prophetic anticipations, the consequences of its original good; and conscious of its origin it bears testimony to God,

¹ "Per quem (Satanam) 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." *De Testimonio Animæ*, c. 3. "Homo damnatur ad mortem ob unius arbusculæ delibationem, et exinde proficiunt delicta cum poenis, et pereunt jam omnes, qui Paradisi nullum cespitem nôrunt." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 22.

² C. 16. Compare c. 11, where Tertullian speaks of Adam's soul.

³ "Ita omnis anima eo usque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur," c. 40. In the tract *de Patientiâ*, c. 5, Tertullian says that the sin of Adam consisted in impatience, *i.e.* under the commandment of God; but in the tract *de Pudicitâ*, c. 6, he ascribes the fall to what the apostle terms the lust of the eye (1 John ii. 16).

⁴ Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. ii. c. 23.

its author, in exclamations like these—*Deus bonus est, Deus videt, Deo commendo*. As no soul is without sin, neither is any without the seeds of good. Moreover, when the soul embraces the true faith, being renewed in its second birth by water and the power from above, then the veil of its former corruption being taken away, it beholds the light in all its brightness. As in its first birth it was received by the unholy, in its second it is received by the Holy Spirit. The flesh follows the soul now wedded to the Spirit, as a part of the bridal portion; no longer the servant of the soul, but of the Spirit. O happy marriage, if no violation of the marriage vow takes place!"¹

The language of the passages now cited appears to differ little from that of our Article. The original state of Adam was a state of righteousness:² in his nature, as he was created, good was the pervading principle, good immediately derived from God and akin to the divine goodness; or, as Tertullian expresses himself on another occasion, the original righteousness of Adam consisted in a participation in the Spirit of God, which he lost by his transgression.³ The effect of his transgression has been to make his offspring the heirs of his condemnation—to entail upon them a corruption of nature, from which no man born into the world is exempt, and for which there is no other remedy than to be born again by water and the Holy Spirit.⁴ Although, therefore, Tertullian denies that the corruption of man's nature is total, and that the seeds of good are altogether extinguished in it, yet he expressly states that man cannot by his own efforts restore himself to the favour of God, but requires that his soul should be renewed by grace from above. Had our author admitted the total corruption of human nature—had he used

¹ *De Animâ*, c. 41.

² *De Pudicitâ*, c. 9. Tertullian speaking of the prodigal son says, "Recordatur Patris Dei, satisfacto redivit, vestem pristinam recipit, statum scilicet eum quem Adam transgressus amiserat." Compare *de Monogamiâ*, c. 5.

³ "Recipit enim illum Dei Spiritum, quem tunc de afflatu ejus acceperat, sed post amiserat per delictum." *De Baptismo*, c. 5. Tertullian's notion here seems to be that God made man *in His image*, that is, in the form which Christ was to bear during His residence on earth; this image man retained after the fall. (Compare *adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 8, *sub in.*) But God also made man after His likeness, that is, immortal; this likeness man lost at the fall, but it is restored to him in baptism through the Holy Spirit. In the second book *against Marcion*, c. 2, Tertullian applies to Adam at the time of his transgression the term *homo animalis*, that is, without the Spirit of God, as opposed to *spiritualis*.

⁴ See *de Jejuniis*, c. 3, where, speaking of the effects of Adam's fall, Tertullian says, "In me quoque cum ipso genere transductam." So in the tract *de Exhortatione Castitatis*, c. 2, "Semini enim tuo respondeas necesse esse." See also *de Pudicitâ*, c. 6.

the language which is sometimes used in our own day, that man is wholly the offspring of the devil—his adversary Marcion might have turned round upon him and said, “This is my doctrine, for I affirm that man was made by a being distinct from the supreme God and at variance with Him.”

It must, however, be admitted that there is, in the tract *de Baptismo*, a passage which seems to imply a denial of the doctrine of original sin.¹ Tertullian recommends delay in administering the rite of baptism, particularly in the case of children; and asks, “Why should the *age of innocence* (infancy) be in haste to obtain the remission of sins?”² Here is an evident inconsistency. The passages which we have already cited, prove that our author was strongly impressed with the conviction that baptism is necessary in order to relieve mankind from the injurious consequences of Adam’s fall.³ We might therefore reasonably have expected to find him a strenuous advocate of infant baptism. As we shall have occasion to recur to this passage when we come to treat of the rites and ceremonies of the Church, we shall say nothing more respecting it at present.

We will take this opportunity of noticing two strange opinions of Tertullian. One is, that the prohibition given to Adam in Paradise contained in it all the precepts of the decalogue;⁴ the other, that Eve was a virgin when tempted by the serpent⁵—an assertion which he does not attempt to reconcile with the divine blessing, “Be fruitful and multiply.” It marks, however, his strong disposition to exaggerate the merit of a life of celibacy.

Tertullian’s notions on free-will—the subject of the tenth Article of our Church—may be collected from a passage in his treatise *de Animâ*.⁶ He is arguing against the Valentinians, who maintained that men were of three kinds—spiritual, animal, and terrestrial—and that, as this distinction took place at their birth, it was consequently immutable: as a thorn cannot produce figs,

¹ C. 18.

² The expression *innocens ætas* occurs again in the fourth book *against Marcion*, c. 23. See also *de Animâ*, c. 56, *sub fine*.

³ See particularly the passage quoted on p. 161, note 3.

⁴ *Adv. Judæos*, c. 2.

⁵ *De Carne Christi*, c. 17. Compare *de Monogamiâ*, c. 5. “Christus innuptus in totum, quod etiam primus Adam ante exilium.”

⁶ C. 21, partly quoted in chap. iii. note 2, p. 101.

or a thistle grapes, an animal man cannot produce the works of the Spirit; or the contrary. "If this were so," answers Tertullian, "God could neither out of stones raise up sons to Abraham, nor could the generation of vipers bring forth the fruits of repentance; and the apostle was in error when he wrote, *Ye were once darkness, and we also were once by nature the children of wrath, and ye were of the same number, but now ye have been washed.* The declarations of Scripture are never at variance with each other: a bad tree will not produce good fruit, unless a graft is made upon it; and a good tree will bring forth bad fruit, unless it is cultivated; and stones will become the sons of Abraham, if they are formed into the faith of Abraham; and the generation of vipers will bring forth the fruits of repentance, if they cast out the poison of a malignant nature. Such is the power of divine grace; being stronger than nature, and having subject to itself the free power of the will within us, which the Greeks call *αὐτεξούσιον*.¹ This power is natural and changeable; consequently in what direction soever it turns, the nature (of man) turns in that direction with it. For we have already shown that man possesses by nature freedom of will." On another occasion, Tertullian is disputing with Marcion, who contended that the fall of Adam was irreconcilable with the attributes of God; who must be deemed deficient either in goodness if He willed, in prescience if He did not foresee, or in power if He did not prevent it.² Our author answers that the cause of Adam's fall must be sought, not in the attributes of God, but in the condition and nature of man. Adam was created free; for God would not have given him a law and annexed the penalty of death to transgression, unless it had been in his power either to obey or disobey. Precepts, threats, and exhortations all proceed upon the assumption that man acts freely and according to his will. "But did not God foresee that Adam would make an ill use of his freedom? how then can we reconcile it to His goodness that He should have bestowed a gift which He foresaw that Adam would abuse?" To this question Tertullian replies in a laboured argument, the object of which is to prove that God, having determined to create man after His own image and likeness, and consequently to make him a free agent, could not consistently

¹ Tertullian appears not to have held the notion of a self-determining power of the will; for he speaks of it as determined by something extraneous. "Nam et voluntas poterit necessitas contendere: habens scilicet unde cogatur." *De Coronâ*, c. II.

² *Adv. Marcionem*, l. ii. cc. 5, 6, 7, 8. Compare cc. 10, 25.

interpose to prevent him from using his freedom as he pleased. We must observe that throughout this passage Tertullian is speaking of the original state of Adam; not of his state after the fall, or of the state in which all men are born into the world. Before man in his present state can repent and do that which is good, his will must be brought under subjection to the grace of God. The great object of Tertullian is to vindicate the dealings of God with man, and to prove that, when men sin, the guilt is strictly and properly their own.¹ Adam sinned voluntarily; the tempter did not impose upon him the inclination to sin, but afforded him the means of gratifying the inclination which already existed. We may think Tertullian's reasoning incorrect, and deny that his solution of the difficulties connected with the questions of the divine agency and the freedom of man is satisfactory: where, indeed, are we to look for a satisfactory solution? But it is evident that nothing could be more remote from his intention than *se* to assert the freedom of man's will as either to deny the necessity or to detract from the efficacy of divine grace; from the sole operation of which he conceived patience and the other moral graces to take their origin.²

What I remarked with respect to the doctrine of original sin is equally applicable to that of justification, the subject of the eleventh Article of our Church. No controversy on the subject existed in Tertullian's time. That which occupied so large a portion of St. Paul's attention, the dispute respecting the necessity of observing the Mosaic ritual as a means of justification, appears to have died away immediately after the expulsion of the Jews by Adrian. We must not therefore expect in Tertullian's language, when he speaks on this subject, the precision of controversy. He describes, however, the death of Christ as the whole weight and benefit of the Christian name, and the foundation of man's salvation.³ He says in one place that we are

¹ Compare *de Monogamiâ*, c. 14. "Nec ideo duritia imputabitur Christo de arbitrii cujuscunque liberi vitio. 'Ecce, inquit, posui ante te bonum et malum.' Elige quod bonum est; si non potes, quia non vis (posse enim te, si velis, ostendit, quia tuo arbitrio utrumque proposuit) discedas oportet ab eo cujus non facis voluntatem."

² "Nisi quod bonorum quorundam, sicuti et malorum, intolerabilis magnitudo est, ut ad capienda et præstanda ea sola gratia divinæ inspirationis operetur. Nam quod maximè bonum, id maximè penes Deum, nec alius id quam qui possidet dispensat, ut cuique dignatur." *De Patientiâ*, c. 1.

³ "Totum Christiani nominis et pondus et fructus, mors Christi, negatur, quam tam impressè Apostolus demandat, utique veram, summum eam fundamentum Evangelii constituens, et salutis nostræ, et prædicationis suæ: *Tradidi enim*

redeemed by the blood of God ;¹ in another, by the blood of the Lord and the Lamb.² He asserts that such is the efficacy of the blood of Christ, that it not only cleanses men from sin and brings them out of darkness into light, but preserves them also in a state of purity if they continue to walk in the light.³ He speaks of a repentance which is justified by faith, *pœnitentiam ex fide justificatam* ;⁴ and of justification by faith without the ordinances of the law.⁵ If, therefore, on other occasions we find him dwelling in strong terms on the efficacy of repentance, we ought in fairness to infer that he did not mean to represent it as of itself possessing this efficacy, but as deriving its reconciling virtue from the sacrifice of Christ.⁶ In the same sense we must understand other passages, in which he ascribes to bodily mortifications a certain degree of merit, and the power of appeasing the divine displeasure.⁷ The case in which Tertullian's language approaches most nearly to the Roman Catholic doctrine of merit, is that of martyrdom. To this undoubtedly he ascribed the power of washing away guilt ; still, we conceive, under the restriction under which he ascribes the same power to baptism.⁸ The efficacy which martyrdom possessed was derived solely from the death of Christ. This at least is certain, that he positively denied all superabundance of merit in the martyr. "Let it suffice," he says, speaking of the custom then prevalent of restoring penitents to the communion of the Church at the intercession of martyrs, "let it suffice to the martyr to have

inquit, *vobis in primis, quod Christus mortuus sit pro peccatis nostris,*" etc. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 8. See also l. ii. c. 26. "Christum—oblatores animæ suæ pro populi salute ;" and the *Scorpiace*, c. 7, "Christus est qui se tradidit pro delictis nostris." *De Idololatriâ*. "Quum Christus non aliâ ex causâ descenderit, quam liberandorum peccatorum."

¹ "Non sumus nostri, sed pretio empti ; et quali pretio ? sanguine Dei." *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 3.

² "Itaque si exinde quo statum vertit (caro) et in Christum tincta induit Christum, et magno redempta est, sanguine scilicet Domini et Agni." *De Pudicitia*, c. 6.

³ "Hæc est enim vis Dominici Sanguinis, ut quos jam delicto mundârit, et exinde in lumine constituerit, mundos exinde præstet, si in lumine incedere perseveraverint." *De Pudicitia*, c. 19.

⁴ *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 18, *sub fine*.

⁵ "Ex fide jam justificandos sine ordine legis." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 35.

⁶ See *de Pœnitentiâ*, cc. 4, 9.

⁷ "In primis adflictatio carnis hostia Domino placatoria per humiliationis sacrificium," etc. *De Patientiâ*, c. 13 ; *de Res. Carnis*, c. 9. "Quo plenius id quod de Evâ trahit (ignominiam, dico, primi delicti et invidiam perditionis humanæ) omni satisfactionis habitu expiaret." *De Cultu Fœminarum*, l. i. c. 1. *De Jejuniis*, cc. 3, 4, 7, *et passim*.

⁸ "Ubi accessit, pati exoptat, ut Dei totam gratiam redimat, ut omnem veniam ab eo compensatione sanguinis sui expediat ? Omnia enim huic operi (martyrio) delicta donantur." *Apology*, *sub fine*.

washed away his own sins. It is a mark of ingratitude or presumption in him to scatter profusely upon others that which he has himself acquired at a great price. For who but the Son of God can by His own death relieve others from death? He indeed delivered the thief at the very moment of His passion; for He had come for this very end, that being Himself free from sin and perfectly holy, He might die for sinners. You then who imitate Christ in pardoning sins, if you are yourself sinless, suffer death for me. But if you are yourself a sinner, how can the oil out of your cruse suffice both for you and me?"¹

We have observed nothing in Tertullian's works which bears upon the twelfth Article of our Church; but with reference to the thirteenth—which involves the question respecting the nature of heathen virtue—he is supposed by his editor Rigault, in a passage in the tract *de Spectaculis*,² to express a doubt whether a heathen can be actuated by a really virtuous principle; literally, whether a heathen has any savour of that which is good. In the tract *ad Martyres*,³ a distinction is made between the principles in which the fortitude of a Christian and of a heathen originates. But in neither case is the language of that clear and express character which will warrant us in building any decided conclusion upon it. The fair inference, however, from the general tenor of Tertullian's writings is, that he deemed all heathen virtue imperfect, and could not therefore ascribe to it any merit of congruity.⁴

From the passage which has been just quoted from the tract *de Pudicitia*, it is manifest that Tertullian entirely rejected, with our fourteenth Article, the notion of works of supererogation;⁵ and in the same passage, the reader would remark that, in agreement with our fifteenth Article, he declared Christ alone to be without sin. The same statement is repeated in various

¹ *De Pudicitia*, c. 22.

² "Quam melius ergo est nescire quum mali puniuntur, ne sciam et quum boni pereunt, si tamen bonum sapiunt," c. 19.

³ C. 4, *sub fine*.

⁴ "Quia nihil verum in his (foeminis) quæ Deum nesciunt Præsidem et Magistratum veritatis." *De Cultu Fœminarum*, l. ii. c. 1. "Igitur ignorantes quique Deum, rem quoque ejus ignorent necesse est." *De Pœnitentiâ*, c. 1. "Philosophi quidem qui alicujus sapientiæ animalis deputantur." *De Patientiâ*, c. 1. "Cui enim veritas comperta sine Deo? Cui Deus cognitus sine Christo? Cui Christus exploratus sine Spiritu Sancto?" etc. *De Animâ*, c. 1.

⁵ C. 22.

parts of his writings;¹ and it is amusing to observe the anxiety of several of the Romish commentators to limit its application, and to assure us that the Virgin is not to be included in this general charge of sinfulness. All the other descendants of Adam contract guilt; and that, too, after they have received marks of the divine favour.² In proof of this assertion, our author appeals to the cases of Saul, and David, and Solomon. "These," he says, "are they who soil their wedding garment, and provide no oil in their lamps, and having strayed from the flock must be sought in the mountains and woods, and be brought back on the shoulders of the Shepherd."³

With respect to the recovery of those who fall into sin after baptism—the subject of the sixteenth Article—we have seen that the opinions of Tertullian underwent a material alteration;⁴ and that, after he had adopted the notions of Montanus in all their rigour, he allowed a place of repentance only to those who fell into venial transgressions; maintaining that the stain of mortal sin after baptism could only be washed away by martyrdom, by the baptism of the sinner in his own blood.⁵ Of the sin against the Holy Ghost he makes no express mention. With respect to perseverance, Tertullian appears to have thought that the true Christian will either persevere to the end, or will only fall into those lighter offences from which no man is free.⁶ He who does not persevere never was a Christian;⁷ so that if, in order to accommodate Tertullian's language to the controversies of later times, we substitute the word elect for Christian, perseverance, according to him, is the evidence of election; though he did not think that Christians can be assured of their final perseverance.⁸ On comparing, therefore, the *later* opinions of Tertullian with the doctrine of the Church of England in its

¹ *De Oratione*, c. 7; *de Animâ*, c. 41; *de Carne Christi*, c. 16; *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 3.

² *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 3.

³ "Prospexerat et has Deus imbecillitates conditionis humanæ, adversarii insidias, rerum fallacias, seculi retia, etiam post Lavacrum periclitaturam fidem, perituros plerosque rursum post salutem: qui vestitum obsoletâssent nuptialem, qui faculis oleum non præparâssent, qui requirendi per montes et saltus, et humeris essent reportandi." *Scorpiace*, c. 6.

⁴ Chap. iv. p. 126.

⁵ "Posuit igitur secunda solatia et extrema præsidia, dimicationem martyrii, et lavacrum sanguinis exinde securum." *Scorpiace*, c. 6.

⁶ *De Pudicitia*, c. 19, *prope finem*.

⁷ "Nemo autem Christianus, nisi qui ad finem usque perseveraverit." *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 3.

⁸ "Optantes perseverare id in nobis, non tamen præsumentes." *De Cultu Fœminarum*, l. ii. c. 2.

sixteenth Article, we find that they are directly opposed to each other. He regards perseverance as the evidence that a man is a Christian; or in the language of the Article, that he has received the Holy Ghost. But when he says that *he* alone is a Christian who perseveres to the end, his words seem to imply that he who does not persevere never was a Christian—had never received grace; whereas the express declaration of the Article is, that a man *may* receive grace and afterwards fall from it; and such indeed is the declaration of our author himself, in the passage which has been just quoted respecting the defection of Saul, David, and Solomon.¹ This apparent contradiction leads me to observe, that in reading the works of the Fathers we should be careful to distinguish between incidental or general remarks, and remarks made with reference to the particular controversies then subsisting. In the former they must not be supposed to speak with the same precision as in the latter. There was no controversy in Tertullian's day on the subject of perseverance; we must therefore not construe his expressions too strictly.

Of Predestination, as the term is defined in our seventeenth Article, we find no trace in the writings of Tertullian. The doctrine, as proposed in the Article, is the result of a number of texts of Scripture, describing the various steps of a true believer's progress towards salvation. What Tertullian says on the subject has a closer connexion with the questions agitated in the schools of philosophy, respecting fate and free-will, than with the Scriptures. His controversies with the heretics of his time, who appear to have lost their way in the vain search after a solution of the difficulties respecting the origin of evil, frequently oblige him to speak of the purpose or will of God in the natural and moral government of the world; and to contend that this purpose or will is not inconsistent with human liberty. "Some," he says, "argue that whatever happens, happens by the will of God; for if God had not willed, it would not have happened. But this is to strike at the root of all virtue, and to offer an apology for every sin. The sophistry, moreover, of the argument is not less glaring than its pernicious tendency. For if nothing happens but what God wills, God wills the commission of crime; in other words, He wills what He forbids. We must not therefore *so* refer all events to the will of God as to leave nothing in the power of man. Man has also a will,

¹ See p. 168, note 3. Compare *de Pœnitentiâ*, c. 7.

which ought always to conspire with the will of God, but is often at variance with it.”¹ In the chapter which immediately follows, our author distinguishes between the will by which God ordains, and the will by which He permits; calling the former *pura voluntas*, the latter *invita voluntas*. Yet at other times he seems to have been aware that this in the case of the Almighty is a verbal, not a real distinction; for in reasoning upon the apostle’s declaration, that “there must be heresies that they which are approved may be made manifest,”² he says that the very purpose of heresies being to try the faith of Christians, they must necessarily pervert those whose faith is not well grounded and stedfast. For that which is ordained to be (for instance, heresies), as it has a cause or purpose on account of which it is (the trial of the faith of Christians), so it must also possess a power by which it is, and cannot but be what it is (cannot but be subversive of the faith of unstable Christians); as in the case of fevers and other mortal diseases, which are ordained as modes of removing men from this world, and must therefore possess the power of effecting the end for which they were ordained—that of killing. Here our author evidently supposes that the existence of heresy is not merely permitted, but ordained for a particular end. Still he is careful to add that, if any individuals are perverted, the fault is their own. Had their faith been of a firmer character, which depended upon themselves, they would not have fallen away. We may further observe that Tertullian appears to have considered foreknowledge as the consequence of predestination; or that events are foretold because they are pre-ordained. For in assigning the reason why

¹ *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, c. 2. Compare *adv. Praxeam*, c. 10, *sub fine*.

² “*Conditio præsentium temporum etiam hanc admonitionem provocat nostram, non oportere nos mirari super Hæreses istas, sive quia sunt: futuræ enim prænuntiabantur: sive quia fidem quorundam subvertunt; ad hoc enim sunt, ut fides, habendo tentationem, habeat etiam probationem. Vanè ergo et inconsideratè plerique hoc ipso scandalizantur, quod tantum Hæreses valeant. Quantum si non fuissent? quum quod sortitum est ut omni modo sit, sicut causam accipit ob quam sit, sic vim consequitur per quam sit, nec esse non possit.*” (We have adopted in part the reading of Semler’s edition.) “*Febrem denique, inter cæteros mortificos et cruciarios exitus, erogando homini deputatam, neque quia est miramur; est enim; neque quia erogat hominem; ad hoc enim est.*” *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, cc. 1, 2.

Tertullian seems also to have been aware that election implied reprobation (“*Prælatio alterius sine alterius contumeliâ non potest procedere, quia nec Electio sine Reprobatione,*” *Apology*, c. 13. Again, *adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 23: “*Nam sicut ad salutem vocat, quem non recusat vel etiam quem ultro vocat; ita in perditionem damnat, quem recusat*”), as well as of the futility of the distinction which is attempted to be drawn, when it is said that God does not positively reprobate, but only does not elect or passes by. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. 29.

in the prophetic writings future events are frequently spoken of as if they had already happened, he says that there is no distinction of time in the divine mind.¹ God regards that which He has decreed to do as if it were already done.

We have seen that Tertullian was inclined to ascribe a certain degree of divine inspiration to the philosophers who had ridiculed the absurdities of the national polytheism.² With respect, however, to the Gentile world in general, his opinion was that it was under the dominion of the powers of darkness, and consequently in a state of alienation from God.³ The question which is involved in the eighteenth Article of our Church—whether a heathen, who framed his life according to the light of nature, could be saved?—appears never to have presented itself to Tertullian's mind. Had it been proposed to him, entertaining the opinions which he did respecting the necessity of baptism to salvation, he must have replied in the negative.

Having already laid before the reader all the information which the writings of our author supply respecting the Church and its authority, and the authority of general councils, the subjects of our nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first Articles,⁴ we proceed to the twenty-second, entitled of Purgatory.

The Roman Catholic commentators, as we might naturally expect, are extremely anxious to discover their doctrine of Purgatory in the writings of Tertullian. In our review of his tract *de Animâ*, we stated his opinion to be, that the souls of ordinary Christians, immediately after death, are transferred to a place to which he gives the name of *Inferi*, and there remain until the general resurrection, when they will be re-united to their respective bodies—that while they remain there, the souls of the good

¹ "Nam et divinitati competit, quæcunque decreverit, ut perfecta reputare, quia non sit apud illam differentia temporis, apud quam uniformem statum temporum dirigit æternitas ipsa: et divinationi propheticæ magis familiare est id quod prospiciat, dum prospicit, jam visum atque ita jam expunctum, id est, omni modo futurum demonstrare." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 5.

² *Ad Nationes*, l. i. c. 10, quoted in chap. iii. note 1, p. 87.

³ See the passages quoted in note 4, p. 167, particularly the commencement of the tract *de Pœnitentiâ*, and that from the second tract *de Cultu Fœminarum*, in which Tertullian says that the Gentiles, though they might not be devoid of *all* feelings of remorse or of *all* sense of modesty, yet could not possibly comprehend the true notion of repentance and chastity. See also *ad Nationes*, l. ii. c. 2. "Quis autem sapiens expers veritatis, qui ipsius sapientiæ ac veritatis patrem et dominum Deum ignoret?"

⁴ Chap. iv. pp. 114-121. Chap. v. pp. 150-155.

enjoy a foretaste of the happiness, and the souls of the wicked of the misery, which will be their eternal portion—and that, until the soul is re-united to the body, the work of retribution cannot be complete.¹ We need scarcely observe that this opinion, which makes the final state of man a continuation only of the intermediate state just described, is directly opposed to the doctrine of Purgatory. It must, however, be admitted that there are in Tertullian's writings passages which seem to imply that, in the interval between death and the general resurrection, the souls of those who are destined to eternal happiness undergo a purification from the stains which even the best men contract during their lives.² Though he was, as we have seen,³ fully aware of the mischief which had arisen from blending the tenets of philosophy with the doctrines of the gospel, he was unable to keep himself entirely free from the prevalent contagion; for there can be no doubt that the notion of a purification, which is necessary to the soul before it can be admitted to the happiness of heaven, is of Platonic origin.⁴

¹ Chap. iii. p. 105. "Omnes ergo animæ penes Inferos, inquis. Velis ac nolis, et *supplicia jam illic et refrigeria*; habes pauperem et divitem—Cur enim non putes animam et puniri et foveri in Inferis interim sub expectatione utriusque judicii in quâdam usurpatione et candidâ ejus?—Delibari putes judicium, an incipi? præcipitari, an præministrari? Jam vero quam iniquissimum etiam apud Inferos, si et nocentibus adhuc illic bene est, et innocentibus nondum." *De Animâ*, cap. ult.

² Thus, in the very chapter of the tract *de Animâ* to which we have just referred, "In summâ, quum carcerem illum, quem Evangelium demonstrat" (see Matt. v. 25 or Luke xii. 58). "Inferos intelligamus, et novissimum quadrantem, modicum quodque delictum morâ resurrectionis illic luendum interpretemur, nemo dubitabit animam aliquid pensare penes Inferos, salvâ resurrectionis plenitudine per carnem quoque." Again, in c. 35: "Et Judex te tradat Angelo executionis, et ille te in carcerem mandet infernum, unde non dimittaris, nisi modico quoque delicto morâ resurrectionis expenso." See also *de Res. Carnis*, c. 42: "Ne inferos experiatur, usque novissimum quadrantem exacturos;" and *de Oratione*, c. 7. See Bingham, l. xv. c. 3, sect. 16. Perhaps the correct statement of Tertullian's opinion, after he became a Montanist, is, that he conceived the souls of the wicked to remain in a state of suffering *apud Inferos* till the general judgment; the souls of the saints to be reunited to their bodies, not at once, but at different times, according to their different merits, *pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium*, in the course of the thousand years during which the reign of the saints on earth was to last. At the end of those thousand years the general judgment would take place. The souls of the wicked being re-united to their bodies, they would be consigned to eternal misery; while the bodies of the saints, who had already risen, would undergo the transformation mentioned in our account of the tract *de Res. Carnis*. See this chapter, p. 141, and note 4, p. 181. According to this opinion, the souls even of the saints require purification, though in different degrees, *apud Inferos*.

³ Chap. iii. p. 87.

⁴ Our author, however, refers the origin of the notion to the revelations of the Paraclete. "Hoc etiam Paracletus frequentissimè commendavit." *De Animâ*, cap. ult.

Of Pardons, in the sense in which the word is used in our twenty-second Article, there is no mention in Tertullian's writings.

The same remark applies to image-worship and to the invocation of saints.¹ It is, however, impossible to read our author's animadversions on the Gentile idolatry, without being convinced that he would have regarded the slightest approach to image-worship with the utmost abhorrence.

On the other hand, we find more than one allusion to the practice of praying and offering for the dead,² and of making oblations in honour of the martyrs on the anniversary of their martyrdom.³

We may take this opportunity of observing that Pearson⁴ maintains the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord, on the ground that it has been believed by the Church of God in all ages. He admits, indeed, that Tertullian had been appealed to as an assertor of the opposite opinion; and that Jerome,⁵ instead of denying the charge, had contented himself with replying that Tertullian was a separatist from the Church;—but he thinks, though he does not state the grounds of his opinion, that Jerome might have denied the charge. There is, however, a passage in the tract *de Monogamiâ*⁶ which, though not entirely free from ambiguity, appears to be inconsistent with the notion of the perpetual virginity.

¹ "Ut quem (Deum) ubique audire et videre fideret, ei soli religionem suam offerret." *De Oratione*, c. i. This remark would scarcely have been made by one who allowed the invocation of saints.

² "Neque enim pristinam (uxorem) poteris odisse, cui etiam religiosiorem reservas affectionem, ut jam receptæ apud Deum, *pro cuius Spiritu postulas*, pro quâ oblationes annuas reddis?" *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, c. ii. "Enimvero et pro animâ ejus orat, et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in primâ resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus." *De Monogamiâ*, c. io.

³ "Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annuâ die facimus." *De Coronâ*, c. 3. In one place Bingham speaks as if this practice applied to the dead generally, b. xv. c. 3, sect. 15; in another, as if it had been confined to martyrs, b. xiii. c. 9, sect. 5.

⁴ Article iii. p. 173.

⁵ *Adversus Helvidium*, Ep. 53. "Et de Tertulliano quidem nihil amplius dico, quam Ecclesiæ hominem non fuisse."

⁶ C. 8. "Et Christum quidem virgo enixa est, semel nuptura *post* partum, ut uterque titulus sanctitatis in Christi censu dispungeretur, per matrem et virginem et univiram." But Semler instead of *post* reads *ob*. See also *de Carne Christi*, c. 23: "Et virgo, quantum a viro; non virgo, quantum a partu."

What has been already stated respecting Tertullian's notion of the Church sufficiently proves that, in agreement with our twenty-third Article, he considered no one at liberty to preach the Word of God without a regular commission.¹ The apostles, he says, were appointed by our Lord to the office of preaching the gospel throughout the world.² They appointed persons to preside in the different Churches which they founded; and thus an uninterrupted succession of bishops had been kept up to the very time at which he wrote. We have seen also that, among other charges which he brought against the heretics, he particularly alleged that they made no sufficient inquiry into the qualifications of the persons whom they ordained, and that they even enjoined laymen to perform the sacerdotal functions.³ Those passages of his writings in which he appears to claim for Christians in general the right of administering the sacraments, on the ground that the priestly character is, if I may use the term, inherent equally in all Christians, refer only to cases of necessity.⁴

The prevalent, perhaps the universal, opinion of the early Christians was, that baptism was absolutely necessary to salvation. This opinion they grounded upon the words of Christ to Nicodemus—"Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." In those days cases must frequently have occurred in which persons suffering under severe illness, and expecting the near approach of death, were anxious to receive baptism, but could not procure the attendance of a regularly ordained minister. What, then, was to be done? The answer of reflecting men at the present day would probably be, that when a sincere desire exists to receive baptism, as well as the devout frame of mind necessary to its worthy reception, the unavoidable omission of the outward act will never constitute, in the sight of a merciful God, a reason for excluding a believer from the benefits of the Christian covenant. But Tertullian and the Christians of his day reasoned otherwise,—they were impressed with the belief that the external rite was absolutely necessary to

¹ Chap. iv. p. 114.

² "Cum Discipulis autem quibusdam apud Galilæam, Judææ regionem, ad quadraginta dies egit, docens eos quæ docerent: dehinc ordinatis iis ad officium prædicandi per orbem, circumfusâ nube in cœlum ereptus est." *Apology*, c. 21. See also *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 32, referred to in chap. iv. note 1, p. 114.

³ *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 41, quoted in chap. iv. note 2, p. 113.

⁴ See *de Baptismo*, c. 17; *de Exhortatione Castitatis*, c. 7, quoted in chap. iv. note 1, p. 112; *de Monogamiâ*, c. 12, quoted in the same chapter, note 1, p. 113.