

The next question discussed by Tertullian relates to the persons who may receive the rite of baptism.<sup>1</sup> He says that it must not be hastily conferred ; and recommends delay in the case not only of infants, but also of unmarried persons and widows, whom he considers peculiarly exposed to temptation. What he says with respect to the baptism of infants has been already noticed in our remarks on the ninth Article of the Church :<sup>2</sup> we then observed that the recommendation of delay in their case was inconsistent with the conviction, which he manifests on other occasions, of the absolute necessity of baptism to relieve mankind from the injurious consequences of Adam's fall. In the treatise *de Animâ*,<sup>3</sup> alluding to what St. Paul says respecting the holiness of children either of whose parents is a Christian, he supposes the apostle to affirm that the children of believing parents are, by the very circumstances of their birth, marked out to holiness, and, therefore, to salvation. "But," he continues, "the apostle had a particular object in view when he made the assertion ; he wished to prevent the dissolution of marriage in cases in which one of the parties was a heathen. Otherwise, he would have borne in mind our Lord's declaration, that *unless a man is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven*, that is, cannot be holy. So that every soul is numbered in Adam, until it is numbered anew in Christ ; being, until it is thus numbered anew, unclean, and consequently sinful." It is scarcely possible to conceive words more strongly declaratory of the universality of original sin, or of the necessity of bringing the children of believing parents to the baptismal font, in order that they may become partakers of the holiness for which they are designed at their birth. Some have supposed that Tertullian was led to contend for the expediency of delaying baptism, in consequence of the opinion which he entertained concerning the irremissible character of heinous sins committed after baptism ; and the passage in the tract *de Baptismo*, on which we have been remarking, favours the supposition.<sup>4</sup> But, not to detain the reader longer with the consideration of an inconsistency for which we do not undertake to account, we will only add that the anti-pædobaptists lay great stress upon this passage ; although, as Wall, who has gone into a detailed examination of it, justly observes, the fair inference from it is, that, whatever might be Tertullian's individual

<sup>1</sup> C. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Chap. v. pp. 160-163.

<sup>3</sup> C. 39. 1 Cor. vii. 14. Compare Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, book v. c. 60.

<sup>4</sup> Hey's *Lectures*, book iv. article 27, sect. 14.



opinion, the general practice of the Church was to baptize infants.

With respect to the season when baptism might be administered, Tertullian remarks that every day and every hour are alike suited to the performance of so holy a rite.<sup>1</sup> He specifies, however, the interval between Good Friday and Whitsunday as peculiarly appropriate; because in that interval the passion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, as well as the descent of the Holy Ghost, took place and were commemorated.

We now proceed to the other sacrament of our Church, which is called by Tertullian Eucharistia,<sup>2</sup> Eucharistiæ Sacramentum,<sup>3</sup> Convivium Dominicum,<sup>4</sup> Convivium Dei,<sup>5</sup> Panis et Calicis Sacramentum.<sup>6</sup> The term Sacrificium<sup>7</sup> is also applied to the Eucharist; but in the same general manner in which it is applied to other parts of divine worship, and to other modes of conciliating the divine favour; as to prayer, or fasting, or bodily mortifications.<sup>8</sup> Tertullian says<sup>9</sup> that the Eucharist, which was instituted by our blessed Lord during a meal—the institution being accompanied by a command which applied generally to all present—was in his own day celebrated in the assemblies which were held before daybreak; and received only at the hands of the presidents. He notices also the extreme solicitude of the Christians to prevent any part of the bread and wine from falling to the ground; and speaks of the communicants as standing at the altar of God, when they received the sacrament.<sup>10</sup> It may, however, be doubted whether

<sup>1</sup> C. 19.

<sup>2</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 36. "Eucharistia pascit."

<sup>3</sup> *De Coronâ*, c. 3, referred to in chap. v. p. 177, note 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 9. "In convivio Dei;" but Semler reads "In connubio Dei."

<sup>6</sup> "Proinde panis et calicis sacramento, jam in Evangelio probavimus corporis et sanguinis Domini veritatem, adversus phantasma Marcionis." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 8. This title ought to have been added to those mentioned in our remarks on the twenty-fifth Article of the Church. Chap. v. p. 176.

<sup>7</sup> See the tract *de Oratione*, c. 14; *de Cultu Fæminarum*, l. ii. c. 11.

<sup>8</sup> *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 1; *de Res. Carnis*, c. 8.

<sup>9</sup> *De Coronâ*, c. 3. "Eucharistiæ sacramentum, et in tempore victûs et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam ante lucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manibus quam præsidentium sumimus.—Calicis aut panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur."

<sup>10</sup> "Nonne solennior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris?" *De Oratione*, c. 14. Bingham (l. viii. c. 6, sect. 12) refers to a passage in the first tract *ad Uxorem*, c. 7. "Aram enim Dei nundam proponi oportet:" but it is evidently nothing to the purpose. He refers also to the tract *de Exhortatione*



the expression is to be understood literally; or whether we are warranted in inferring from it that altars had at that early period been generally introduced into the places of religious assembly. The kiss of peace appears to have been constantly given at the celebration of the Eucharist. Our author calls it *signaculum orationis*,<sup>1</sup>—an expression from which Bingham infers that, in that age of the Church, it was given after the prayers of consecration;<sup>2</sup> but there appears to be no sufficient reason for understanding the word *orationis* in that restricted sense. We are rather disposed to infer that, at the conclusion of all their meetings for the purposes of devotion, the early Christians were accustomed to give the kiss of peace, in token of the brotherly love subsisting amongst them.<sup>3</sup>

The Roman Catholic commentators on Tertullian are naturally desirous to allege his authority in support of the doctrine of transubstantiation. When, however, the different passages in which he speaks of the body and blood of Christ are compared together, it will be evident that he never thought of any corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He speaks, indeed, “of feeding on the fatness of the Lord’s body, that is, on the Eucharist;”<sup>4</sup> and “of our flesh feeding on the body and blood of Christ, in order that our soul may be fattened of God.”<sup>5</sup> These, it must be allowed, are strong expressions; but when compared with other passages in his writings, they will manifestly appear to have been used in a figurative sense. Thus, in commenting upon the clause in the Lord’s Prayer, “*Give us this day our daily bread,*” he says that we should understand it spiritually.<sup>6</sup> “Christ is our bread; for Christ is life, and bread is life. Christ said, *I am the bread of life*; and a little before, *The word of the living God which descended from heaven, that is bread*. Moreover, *Castitatis*, c. 10. “*Quomodo audebit orationem ducere ad altare?*” but the reading *ad altare* is only a conjecture of Rigault.

<sup>1</sup> *De Oratione*, c. 14.

<sup>2</sup> L. xv. c. 3, sect. 3.

<sup>3</sup> See *ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 4, quoted on p. 202, note 6.

<sup>4</sup> “*Atque ita exinde opimitate Dominici corporis vescitur, Eucharistiâ scilicet.*” *De Pudicitia*, c. 9, where the words *Eucharistiâ scilicet* bear the appearance of a gloss. See also *adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 7; *adv. Judæos*, c. 14. “*Dominicæ gratiæ quasi visceratione quâdam fruerentur.*”

<sup>5</sup> “*Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur.*” *De Res. Carnis*, c. 8.

<sup>6</sup> “*Quanquam panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie spiritaliter potius intelligamus. Christus enim panis noster est, quia vita Christus, et vita panis. Ego sum, inquit, panis vitæ. Et paulo supra: Panis est sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de cælis.*” (The words are not accurately quoted.) “*Tum quod et corpus ejus in pane censetur, Hoc est corpus meum.*” *De Oratione*, c. 6. Compare *de Res. Carnis*, c. 37.



His body is reckoned (or supposed) to be in the bread, in the words *This is my body.*" It is evident, from the whole tenor of the passage, that Tertullian affixed a figurative interpretation to the words, *This is my body.* In other places he expressly calls the bread the *representation* of the body of Christ;<sup>1</sup> and the wine, of His blood.

There is one passage from which Pamelius has so strangely contrived to extract an argument in favour of transubstantiation, that we cannot forbear referring the reader to it. It is in the treatise *against Praxeas*,<sup>2</sup> where Tertullian is inquiring, "How the Word was made flesh? was He transfigured into flesh, or did He put on flesh?" "Surely, He put it on," is Tertullian's answer, "for as God is eternal, we must also believe that He is immutable, and incapable of being formed (into another substance). But transfiguration is a destruction of that which before existed: whatever is transfigured into another thing ceases to be what it was, and begins to be what it was not." This passage, says Pamelius, makes for transubstantiation. By what process of reasoning he arrived at this conclusion, we are utterly at a loss to conceive. Tertullian evidently means to say that if the Word had been transfigured into flesh, either the divine nature would have been entirely destroyed, and the human alone would have remained, or a third nature have arisen from the mixture of the former two, as the substance called *electrum* from the mixture of gold and silver.<sup>3</sup> In either case the substance which is transfigured disappears; and that into which it is transfigured is alone

<sup>1</sup> "Nec panem, quo ipsum corpus suum *representat.*" *Adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 14. "Panem corpus suum appellans, ut et hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui *figuram* pani dedisse," l. iii. c. 19. *Adv. Judæos*, c. 10. "Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, *hoc est corpus meum* dicendo, id est *figura* corporis mei—ut autem et sanguinis veterem figuram in vino recognoscas, aderit Esaias." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 40. See also *ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 5; *de Animâ*, c. 17. "Alium postea vini saporem, quod in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit."

<sup>2</sup> "Igitur sermo in carne, dum et de hoc quærendum, quomodo sermo caro sit factus, utrumne quasi transfiguratus in carne, an indutus carnem? imo indutus. Cæterum Deum immutabilem et informabilem credi necesse est, ut æternum. Transfiguratio autem interemptio est pristini. Omne enim quodcunque transfiguratur in aliud, desinit esse quod fuerat, et incipit esse quod non erat. Deus autem neque desinit esse, neque aliud potest esse," etc., c. 27. The remark of Pamelius is, "Eacit hic locus pro transubstantione, quam Catholici in Sacramento Eucharistiæ adserunt."

<sup>3</sup> "Si enim sermo ex transfiguratione et demutatione substantiæ caro factus est; una jam erat substantia Iesûs ex duabus, ex carne et Spiritu, mixtura quædam, ut *electrum* ex auro et argento; et incipit nec aurum esse, id est, Spiritus, neque argentum, id est caro; dum alterum altero mutatur, et tertium quid efficitur," c. 27.



cognizable by the senses. Whereas, according to the doctrine of transubstantiation, the bread, the substance which is changed, remains in appearance, while that into which it is changed, the body of Christ, is not seen. Pamelius takes another opportunity of enforcing the doctrine of transubstantiation in commenting on a passage in the first book *against Marcion*, from which an inference directly opposed to it may be fairly drawn.<sup>1</sup> From what has been already said, it is evident that the Roman Catholic custom of withholding the cup from the laity was unknown to Tertullian, and that both the bread and the wine were in his day alike offered to the communicants.<sup>2</sup>

One other rite of the Church still remains to be considered—that of Marriage. Bingham infers,<sup>3</sup> apparently with justice, from a passage in the tract *de Monogamiâ*,<sup>4</sup> that the parties were bound in the first instance to make known their intentions to the Church and obtain the permission of the Ecclesiastical Orders. They were also bound to obtain the consent of their parents.<sup>5</sup> Parties marrying clandestinely ran the hazard of being regarded in the light of adulterers or fornicators.<sup>6</sup> That marriage was esteemed by the Christians a strictly religious contract is evident from a

<sup>1</sup> “Non putem impudentiorem, quam qui in alienâ aquâ alii Deo tingitur, ad alienum cœlum alii Deo expanditur, in alienâ terrâ alii Deo sternitur, super alienum panem alii Deo gratiarum actionibus fungitur, de alienis bonis ob alium Deum nomine eleemosynæ et dilectionis operatur,” c. 23, *sub fine*. Tertullian is here contending that, if the doctrine of the Marcionites was true—that the supreme God who sent Christ was not the God who created the world—then it would follow that He had most unjustly appropriated to His own uses the works and productions of another.

<sup>2</sup> A reference should here have been made to the practice of reserving a portion of the consecrated bread, and eating it at home before every other nourishment. “Accepto corpore Domini et *reservato*, utrumque salvum est.” *De Oratione*, c. 14. “Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustas: et si sciverit panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur.” *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 5. See Bingham, l. xv. c. 4, sect. 13. This practice, having given occasion to abuses, was forbidden. See the sixth Rubric after the Communion Service.

<sup>3</sup> L. xxii. c. 2, sect. 2.

<sup>4</sup> C. 11. “Qualis es id matrimonium postulans, quod iis a quibus postulas non licet habere—ab Episcopo monogamo, a presbyteris et diaconis ejusdem sacramenti, a viduis quarum sectam in te recusasti? Et illi plane sic dabunt viros et uxores, quomodo buccellas (Hoc enim est apud illos, *Omni petenti te dabis*), et conjungent vos in Ecclesiâ Virgine, unius Christi unicâ sponsâ.”

<sup>5</sup> “Nam nec in terris filii sine consensu patrum rite et jure nubunt.” *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 9.

<sup>6</sup> “Ideo penes nos occultæ quoque conjunctiones, id est non prius apud ecclesiam professæ, juxta mœchiam et fornicationem judicari periclitantur.” *De Pudicitia*, c. 4. He applies a similar title to marriages contracted by Christians with heathens. “Hæc quum ita sint, fideles gentilium matrimonia subeuntes stupri reos esse constat, et arcendos ab omni communicatione fraternitatis.” *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 3, quoted in chap. v. note 2, p. 194.



passage in the second tract *ad Uxorem*,<sup>1</sup> in which Tertullian expresses his inability to describe the happiness of that marriage, which is cemented by the Church, is confirmed by prayers and oblations, is sealed by a blessing, is announced by angels, and ratified by the Father in heaven. He mentions also the custom of putting a ring on the finger of the female, as a part of the rites, not of marriage, but of espousal, intended as an earnest of the future marriage.<sup>2</sup> He speaks of it as observed by the heathens, but in terms which imply that he deemed it perfectly innocent. In the tract *de Virginibus velandis* the kiss and the joining of hands are noticed as parts of the ceremony.<sup>3</sup>

Tertullian, as we have seen, states that a Christian named Proculus cured the Emperor Severus of a disorder by anointing him with oil.<sup>4</sup> It may be doubted whether we ought to infer from this statement that a practice then subsisted in the Church of anointing sick persons with oil, founded on the injunction in the Epistle of St. James. This, however, is certain, that the practice, if it subsisted, was directly opposed to the Romish sacrament of extreme Unction, which is administered, not with a view to the recovery of the patient, but when his case is hopeless.

We have had frequent occasion to allude to a passage in the tract *de Coronâ*, in which Tertullian mentions a variety of customs resting solely on the authority of tradition.<sup>5</sup> Among them is the practice of making the sign of the cross upon the forehead, which was most scrupulously observed by the primitive Christians: they ventured not to perform the most trivial act, not even to put on their shoes, until they had thus testified their entire reliance upon the cross of Christ. The pagans appear to have regarded this practice with suspicion, as a species of magical superstition.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See chap. v. p. 194. "Unde sufficiamus ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignat benedictio, angeli renuntiant, Pater rato habet?" c. 9. The words *ecclesia conciliat* may either mean "when both the parties are Christians," or "when the sanction of the Church has been regularly obtained," or may embrace both meanings.

<sup>2</sup> "Quum aurum nulla norat præter unico digito, quem sponsus oppignerasset pronubo annulo." *Apology*, c. 6. See also *de Idololatriâ*, c. 16.

<sup>3</sup> "Si autem ad desponsationem velantur, quia et corpore et spiritu masculino mixtæ sunt, per osculum et dexteram," etc., c. 11.

<sup>4</sup> *Ad Scapulam*, c. 4, referred to in chap. i. note 2, p. 27.

<sup>5</sup> C. 3. See the *Scorpiace*, c. 1, quoted in chap. ii. note 1, p. 48, where the practice is described as a protection or remedy against the bite of poisonous animals.

<sup>6</sup> *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 5.



In our remarks upon the testimony afforded by our author's writings to the existence of miraculous powers in the Church, we said that the only power, of the exercise of which specific instances are alleged, was that of exorcising evil spirits.<sup>1</sup> This power, according to him, was not confined to the clergy or to any particular order of men, but was possessed by all Christians in common.<sup>2</sup> Tertullian mentions also the practice of exsufflation, or of blowing away any smoke or savour which might arise from the victims on the altar, etc., in order to escape the pollution of idolatry.<sup>3</sup>

We will conclude our observations on this branch of the internal history of the Church, by referring the reader to a passage in which there is an allusion to the custom of publicly announcing the third, sixth, and ninth hours.<sup>4</sup>



## CHAPTER VII.

### CONCERNING THE HERESIES AND DIVISIONS WHICH TROUBLED THE CHURCH.

WE now come to the last, and unhappily not the least extensive, of the five branches into which Mosheim divides the internal history of the Church—the heresies by which its repose was troubled during the second century. But before I proceed to consider his enumeration of Christian sects, I must briefly call the reader's attention to Tertullian's tract *against the Jews*. Mosheim, in his chapter on the Doctrine of the Church,<sup>5</sup> has observed "that Justin Martyr and Tertullian embarked in a controversy with the Jews, which it was not possible for them to manage with the highest success and dexterity, as they were very little acquainted with the language, the history, and the learning of the Hebrews, and wrote with more levity and inaccuracy than

<sup>1</sup> Chap. ii. p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> *Apology*, cc. 23, 37, 43; *de Animâ*, c. 57; *de Spectaculis*, c. 26; *de Idololatriâ*, c. 11; *de Coronâ*, c. 11; *de Exhortatione Castitatis*, c. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *De Idololatriâ*, c. 11. "Quo ore Christianus thurarius, si per templa transibit, spumantes aras despuet, et exsufflabit, quibus ipse prospexit?" *Ad Uxorem*, l. ii. c. 5. "Quum aliquid immundum flantis explodis."

<sup>4</sup> *De Jejuniis*, c. 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Century* ii. part ii. c. 3, sect. 7.



such a subject would justify." That Tertullian was unacquainted with the language of the Hebrews may be allowed;<sup>1</sup> but thoroughly conversant as he was with the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, his knowledge of their history could be little inferior to that of the Hebrews themselves. Whether, however, he was well or ill qualified to manage the controversy with them, it must be at once interesting and instructive to inquire in what manner the controversy was actually conducted by the early Christians.

Our author begins his tract *adversus Judæos* with disputing the claim set up by the Jews to be considered exclusively as the people of God.<sup>2</sup> In support of this claim, they alleged, in the first place, that they were the descendants of the younger brother Jacob, of whom it was predicted that he should rule over the elder Esau; in the second, that the law was given to them by Moses. Tertullian contends, on the contrary, that the Christians, inasmuch as they were posterior in time to the Jews, were in fact the descendants of the younger brother; and with respect to the law, he observes that mankind never were without a law. God gave Adam a law, in which were contained all the precepts of the decalogue.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the written law of Moses was nothing more than a repetition of the natural unwritten law, by obeying which the patriarchs gained the favour of God, although they neither kept the Jewish Sabbath nor practised the Jewish rite of circumcision.

Hence, proceeds Tertullian, it is evident that circumcision does not confer, as the Jews pretend, an exclusive title to the favour of God.<sup>4</sup> Abraham himself pleased God before he was circumcised. Carnal circumcision was designed as a mark, by which the Jews might be distinguished from other nations in all ages—but particularly in these latter days, when the heavy judgments predicted by the prophets are fallen upon them.<sup>5</sup> We may also collect with certainty, from the prophetic writings, that carnal circumcision was not intended to be of perpetual observ-

<sup>1</sup> We have observed that Tertullian sometimes speaks as if he was acquainted with Hebrew. Chap. i. note 6, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Cc. 1, 2. See Gen. xxv. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Tertullian points out the manner in which our first parents violated each of the commandments of the decalogue by eating the forbidden fruit, c. 2. See chap. v. p. 163.

<sup>4</sup> C. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Tertullian supposes the prediction in Isaiah i. 7 to have referred to the edict of Adrian, by which the Jews were prevented from setting foot in Jerusalem.



ance. Jeremiah speaks of a spiritual circumcision, as well as of a new covenant which God was to give to His people.<sup>1</sup>

In like manner the observance of the Sabbath was not designed to be perpetual.<sup>2</sup> The Jews indeed say that God sanctified the seventh day from the creation of the world, because on that day He rested from His work. But the sanctification spoken of applies to an eternal, not a temporal Sabbath. For what evidence can be produced that either Adam, or Abel, or Enoch, or Noah, or Abraham, kept the Sabbath? It is evident, therefore, that the circumcision, the Sabbath, and the sacrifices appointed under the Mosaic dispensation were intended to subsist only until a new lawgiver should arise, who was to introduce a spiritual circumcision, a spiritual Sabbath, and spiritual sacrifices.<sup>3</sup>

Having thus shown that the Mosaic dispensation was not designed to be perpetual, but preparatory to another system, Tertullian says that the great point to be ascertained is, whether the exalted personage, pointed out by the prophets as the giver of a new law—as enjoining a spiritual Sabbath and spiritual sacrifices—as the eternal ruler of an eternal kingdom—had yet appeared on earth.<sup>4</sup> “Now it is certain that Jesus, whom we affirm to be the promised Lawgiver, has promulgated a new law, and that the predictions respecting the Messiah have been accomplished in Him. Compare, for instance, the prophecies of the Old Testament, which describe the wide extent of the Messiah’s kingdom, with the actual diffusion of Christianity at the present moment.<sup>5</sup> Nations, which the Roman arms have never yet subdued, have submitted themselves to the dominion of Jesus and received the gospel.”

“But,” proceeds our author, “there is in the prophet Daniel an express prediction of the time when the Messiah was to appear.”<sup>6</sup> The numerical errors which have crept into Tertullian’s text, joined to his gross ignorance of chronology, render it impossible to unravel the difficulties in which his calculation of the seventy weeks is involved. But the principles of the calculation are, that the commencement of the seventy weeks is to be dated from the first year of Darius, in which Daniel states that

<sup>1</sup> C. iv. ver. 3.

<sup>2</sup> C. 4.

<sup>3</sup> C. 5.

<sup>4</sup> C. 7.

<sup>5</sup> The prophecy particularly selected by Tertullian is from Isaiah xlv. 1. But between his version of the passage and that given in our English Bibles there are important differences. In our translation it seems to apply exclusively to Cyrus.

<sup>6</sup> C. 8.



he saw the vision—that sixty-two weeks and half a week were completed in the forty-first year of the reign of Augustus when Christ was born—and that the remaining seven weeks and half a week were completed in the first year of Vespasian, when the Jews were reduced beneath the Roman yoke. I need scarcely observe that none of the above principles are admitted by the learned men of modern times, who have endeavoured to elucidate the prophecy of the seventy weeks.

Tertullian goes on to show that the prophecies of the Old Testament, which foretold the birth of the Messiah, were accomplished in Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Thus it was predicted by Isaiah that He should be born of a virgin; that His name should be called Emmanuel; and that, before He was able to pronounce the names of His father and mother, He should take of the riches of Damascus and of the spoils of Samaria from the King of Assyria.<sup>2</sup> The Jews, on the contrary, affirmed that no part of this prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus. He was neither called Emmanuel, nor did He take of the spoils of Damascus and Samaria. They affirmed also that the Hebrew word, which we translate “virgin,” ought to be translated “a young female.” To these objections our author replies, that as the divine and human natures were united in Christ, He was not merely called, but actually was Emmanuel, that is, God with us;—and that with respect to the spoils of Damascus and Samaria, the Jews were misled by their preconceived notions that the Messiah was to be a warlike prince and conqueror; whereas the words of the prophet were accomplished when the Magi brought to the infant Jesus their offerings of gold, and frankincense, and myrrh—the peculiar produce of Arabia and the East. Tertullian admits that, in the Psalms and other parts of the Old Testament, the Messiah is spoken of as a triumphant warrior; but the expressions, he observes, are to be understood of spiritual triumphs achieved over the corrupt hearts and perverse dispositions of man. With respect to the word *virgin*, Tertullian observes that the prophet begins with telling Ahaz that the Lord would give him *a sign*, meaning evidently that some event would take place out of the ordinary course of nature; whereas the pregnancy of a young female is an event of daily occurrence. In order, there-

<sup>1</sup> C. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Tertullian here connects, as Justin Martyr had done before him, Isaiah vii. 14 with viii. 4, and gives a similar explanation of the passage. See the *Dialogue with Trypho*, part ii. p. 303 A, p. 310 C.



fore, to give any consistent meaning to the prophet's words, we must suppose him to have alluded to the pregnancy of a virgin.

One of the objections urged by the Jews was, that in no part of the Old Testament was it predicted that the future deliverer should bear the name of Jesus. To this Tertullian replies, that Joshua was the type of Christ; and that when Moses changed his name from Oshea to Joshua or Jesus, because he was destined to conduct the Israelites into the earthly Canaan, it was manifestly implied that the Messiah, who was to introduce mankind into the heavenly Canaan, would also be called Jesus. Our author then shows from Isaiah xi. 2 that the Messiah was to spring from the seed of David—from Isaiah liii. that He was to undergo severe humiliations and sufferings with the greatest patience—from Isaiah lviii. that He was to be a preacher of righteousness—and from Isaiah xxxv. that He was to work miracles. All these marks, by which the Messiah was to be distinguished, were actually found in Jesus.

But the death of Jesus on the cross constituted, in the opinion of the Jews, the strongest argument against the belief that He was the promised Messiah.<sup>1</sup> It had been expressly declared, in the Mosaic law, that "he who was hanged on a tree was accursed of God."<sup>2</sup> Was it then credible that God would expose the Messiah to a death so ignominious? Nor could any passage of Scripture be produced in which it was predicted that the Messiah was to die on the cross. To the former part of this objection Tertullian replies, that the persons, of whom Moses declared that they were accursed, were malefactors—men who had committed sins worthy of death. How then could the declaration be applicable to Jesus, in whose mouth was no guile, and whose life was one uninterrupted course of justice and benevolence? With respect to the latter part of the objection, Tertullian admits that the particular mode of the Messiah's death is nowhere expressly predicted in the Old Testament, but contends that it is in many places obscurely prefigured—for instance, in the twenty-second Psalm. He then goes on to produce various passages of Scripture, in which he finds allusions to the form of the cross—allusions which were certainly never contemplated by the sacred penman, and are so grossly extravagant that it is difficult to conceive how they could ever enter into the head of any rational being. I know not whether it will be deemed any apology for

<sup>1</sup> C. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. xxi. 22.



Tertullian to observe that he was not the inventor of these fancies ; for it argues perhaps a more lamentable weakness of judgment to have copied, than to have invented them : most, however, if not all, are to be found in Justin Martyr. In speaking of the circumstances connected with our Saviour's Passion, Tertullian asserts that the preternatural darkness at the crucifixion was predicted by the prophet Amos.<sup>1</sup> "But not only," continues our author, "did the prophets predict the death of the Messiah : they foretold also the dispersion of the Jewish people, and the destruction of Jerusalem."<sup>2</sup> The passages which he alleges in proof of this statement are Ezekiel viii. 12 and Deuteronomy xxviii. 64. "Here, then," he says, addressing the Jews, "we find an additional proof that Jesus was the Christ :—your rejection of Him has been followed by a series of the most grievous calamities that ever befel a nation—your holy temple has been consumed with fire, and you are forbidden to set foot upon the territory of your ancestors. Was it not also foretold of the Messiah that *the Gentiles should be His inheritance, and the ends of the earth His possession?* was He not described as *the light of the Gentiles?* and are not these predictions accomplished in the diffusion of the gospel of Jesus through every part of the known world?"<sup>3</sup>

"We, therefore, do not err when we affirm that the Messiah is already come.<sup>4</sup> The error is yours, who still look for His coming. The Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem of Judah, according to the prophet.<sup>5</sup> But at the present moment no one of the stock of Israel remains at Bethlehem : either, therefore, the prophecy is already fulfilled, or its fulfilment is impossible." Tertullian concludes with pointing out the source of the error of the Jews, who did not perceive that two advents of Christ were announced in Scripture—the first in humiliation, the second in glory.<sup>6</sup> Fixing their thoughts exclusively on the latter, they refused to acknowledge a meek and suffering Saviour.

Such were the arguments by which Tertullian endeavoured to show, in opposition to the objections of the Jews, that Jesus of Nazareth was the promised Messiah. It appears from them that the controversy then stood precisely on the same footing on which it stands in the present day ; and that the Jews of his time resorted to the same subterfuges and cavils as the modern

<sup>1</sup> C. viii. 9.

<sup>2</sup> C. II.

<sup>3</sup> C. 12 ; Ps. ii. 7 ; Isa. xlii. 6.

<sup>4</sup> C. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Micah v. 1.

<sup>6</sup> C. 14.



Jews, in order to evade the force of the prophecies which, as the Christians maintained, had been fulfilled in Jesus. If we return to Bishop Pearson, we shall find that the course which he pursues in establishing the truth of the second Article of the Creed, differs not very materially from that of our author.<sup>1</sup> We notice this resemblance for the purpose of removing, at least in part, the unfavourable impression which Mosheim's strictures are calculated to create against this portion of Tertullian's labours. In judging also of the treatise *adversus Judæos*, we should bear in mind that it has come down to us in a corrupt state, some passages bearing evident marks of interpolation.<sup>2</sup> We will conclude our remarks upon it with observing that Tertullian, when he charges the Jews with confounding the two advents of Christ, makes no allusion to the notion of two Messiahs—one suffering, the other triumphant; whence we are warranted in concluding either that he was ignorant of this device, or that it had not been resorted to in his day.

To return to Mosheim. In his enumeration of the heresies which divided the Church in the second century, he first mentions that which originated in a superstitious attachment to the Mosaic law.<sup>3</sup> This heresy is scarcely noticed by Tertullian. There can indeed be little doubt that, after the promulgation of Adrian's edict, those Christians who had united the observance of the Mosaic ritual with the profession of the gospel, fearful lest they should be confounded with the Jews, gradually abandoned the Jewish ceremonies—so that in the time of Tertullian the number of Judaizing Christians had become extremely small.<sup>4</sup> We are now speaking of those whom Mosheim calls Nazarenes—who, though they retained the Mosaic rites, believed all the fundamental articles of the Christian faith.<sup>5</sup> The Ebionites, on the contrary, who also maintained the necessity of observing the ceremonial law, rejected many essential doctrines of Christianity.<sup>6</sup> They are more than once mentioned by Tertullian, who always speaks of them as having received their appellation from their

<sup>1</sup> See p. 76, where he shows that Joshua was a type of Christ. See also article iii. "born of the Virgin Mary," and article iv. "was crucified."

<sup>2</sup> See c. 5 and c. 14, *sub fine*.

<sup>3</sup> *Century* ii. part ii. chap. v.

<sup>4</sup> See Wilson's *Illustration of the Method of Explaining the New Testament*, etc., c. 11, where he enumerates the different causes which contributed to the gradual extinction of the Judaizing Christians, or, as he terms them, Christian Jews.

<sup>5</sup> The Jews, in Tertullian's time, appear to have called Christians in general by the name of Nazarenes. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 8, *sub initio*. *Apud Hebræos Christianos*, l. iii. c. 12.

<sup>6</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 33.



founder Ebion. He did not write any express treatise against them; but we learn from incidental notices in his works that they denied the miraculous conception,<sup>1</sup> and affirmed that Jesus was not the Son of God, but a mere man born according to the ordinary course of nature.<sup>2</sup>

The next heresies of which Mosheim speaks are those which he imagines to have arisen from the attempt *to explain the doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of the Oriental philosophy concerning the origin of evil*. In every age, both before and since the promulgation of the gospel, this question has been found to baffle the powers of the human understanding, and to involve in an endless maze of error all who have engaged in the unavailing research. Of this Tertullian was fully aware; and he traces the rise of many of the heretical opinions which he combats to the curiosity of vain and presumptuous men venturing to explore the hidden things of God.<sup>3</sup> But though he so far connects philosophy with heresy as to style the philosophers the ancestors of the heretics,<sup>4</sup> yet neither he nor any other of the early Fathers appears to have thought that the heretics derived their notions from the Oriental philosophy.<sup>5</sup> On the contrary, Tertullian repeatedly charges them with borrowing from Pythagoras and Plato and other Greek philosophers.<sup>6</sup> In like manner Irenæus affirms that Valentinus was indebted for his succession of Æons to the Theogonies of the Greek poets.<sup>7</sup> It will be said, perhaps, that the authority of the early Fathers can be of little weight in the determination of this question, on account of their ignorance of the Eastern languages; and that it matters little whether the heretics derived their opinions directly from the East, or indirectly through the medium of Pythagoras and Plato, the germ of whose philosophy is known to have been formed during

<sup>1</sup> "Quam utique virginem constat fuisse, licet Ebion resistat." *De Virginibus velandis*, c. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 33; *de Carne Christi*, cc. 14, 18, 24.

<sup>3</sup> "Unde malum, et quare? et unde homo, et quomodo? et quod proxime Valentinus proposuit, unde Deus?" *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 7.

<sup>4</sup> "Hæreticorum Patriarchæ Philosophi." *Adv. Hermogenem*, c. 8; *de Animâ*, cc. 3, 23. "Ipsi illi sapientiæ professores, de quorum ingeniis omnis hæresis animatur." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 13. See also l. v. c. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Mosheim refers to Clemens Alexandrinus, l. vii. c. 17, p. 898, and to Cyprian, ep. 75. But those passages only confirm his statement that Basilides, Cerdo, and the other heretics began to publish their opinions about the time of Adrian: respecting the Oriental origin of the opinions they are silent.

<sup>6</sup> "Ubi tunc Marcion, Ponticus, Nauclerus, Stoicæ studiosus? ubi Valentinus, Platonicæ Sectator?" *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 30.

<sup>7</sup> L. ii. c. 19.



their residence in Egypt. The present is not a fit opportunity for inquiring into the reality of this alleged connexion between the Oriental and Platonic philosophies. Our object in the above observations is merely to show that if any weight is to be attached to the opinions of the early Fathers, the heresies which Mosheim calls Oriental ought rather to be denominated Grecian.

Mosheim speaks of two branches into which the Oriental heretics were divided—the Asiatic and the Egyptian branch. Elxai, whom he mentions as the head of the former, appears to have been entirely unknown to Tertullian; nor does Mosheim himself seem to have arrived at any certain conclusion respecting this heretic; for he doubts whether the followers of Elxai were to be numbered among the Christian or Jewish sects. Of Saturninus, whom he also mentions as a leader of the Asiatic branch, the name occurs but once in our author's writings.<sup>1</sup> He is there described as a disciple of Menander, who was himself a disciple of Simon Magus; and he is said to have maintained the following extraordinary doctrine respecting the origin of the human race—that man was formed by the angels, an imperfect image of the Supreme Being—that he crept upon the ground like a worm in a state of utter helplessness and inability to stand upright, until the Supreme Being mercifully animated him with the spark of life, and raised him from the earth—and that at his death this spark will bring him back to the original source of his existence. Of Cerdo, whom Mosheim also numbers among the leaders of the Asiatic sect, Tertullian only states that Marcion borrowed many notions from him.<sup>2</sup> But against Marcion himself our author expressly composed five books, in which he has entered into an elaborate examination and confutation of that heretic's errors.

From various notices scattered over Tertullian's writings we may collect that Marcion was a native of Pontus<sup>3</sup>—that he flourished during the reign of Antoninus Pius and the pontificate of Eleutherius, being originally in communion with the Church at Rome—that he was a man of a restless temper, fond of novelties, by the publication of which he unsettled the faith of

<sup>1</sup> *De Animâ*, c. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Marcionem*, l. i. cc. 2, 22, *sub fine*; l. iii. c. 21; l. iv. c. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 30; *adv. Marcionem*, l. i. cc. 1. 19. Tertullian frequently calls Marcion *Ponticus Nauclerus*, because his countrymen, the natives of Pontus, were chiefly occupied in nautical pursuits, l. i. c. 18, *sub fine*; iii. c. 6.



the weaker brethren, and was in consequence more than once ejected from the congregation—that he afterwards became sensible of his errors, and expressed a wish to be reconciled to the Church—and that his wish was granted, on condition that he should bring back with him those whom he had perverted by his doctrines.<sup>1</sup> He died, however, before he was formally restored to its communion. Tertullian refers in confirmation of some parts of this statement to a certain letter of Marcion, the genuineness of which appears to have been questioned by his followers.<sup>2</sup> Marcion, like many other heretics, was betrayed into his errors and extravagances by the desire of framing a system which would reconcile the existence of evil in the universe with the *perfect* power and wisdom and goodness of the Supreme Being.<sup>3</sup> But the precise nature of his opinions will be best understood from a brief analysis of the five books written by our author against them, and still extant amongst his works.

Tertullian had previously written two works in refutation of Marcion's doctrines. The first was a hurried composition, the defects of which he intended to supply by a second or more perfect treatise.<sup>4</sup> Of the latter a copy was obtained by a person who, having afterwards embraced the opinions of Marcion, published it in a very inaccurate form. Our author was in consequence obliged in self-defence to compose the five books, of which we shall now proceed to give an account.

After an exordium<sup>5</sup>—in which he abuses not only Marcion but also the Pontus Euxinus, because that heretic happened to be born upon its shores—Tertullian proceeds to say that Marcion

<sup>1</sup> *Adv. Marcionem*, l. v. c. 19; l. iv. c. 4, where it is said that Marcion in the first fervour of his faith made a donation of a sum of money to the Church, which was returned to him when he was expelled from its communion. Some learned men doubt the story respecting Marcion's repeated ejections from the Church, and suppose that Tertullian confounded Marcion with Cerdo. Lardner's *History of Heretics*, c. 9, sect. 3.

<sup>2</sup> "Sicut et ipse confiteris in quâdam epistolâ: et tui non negant, et nostri probant." *De Carne Chriſti*, c. 2. But in the fourth book *against Marcion*, c. 4, we find the following sentence:—"Quid nunc si negaverint Marcionitæ primam apud nos fidem ejus, adversus epistolam quoque ipsius? quid si nec epistolam agnoverint?"

<sup>3</sup> "Languens enim (quod et nunc multi, et maximè hæretici) circa mali quæſtionem, Unde malum?" *Adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 2.

<sup>4</sup> "Primum opusculum, quasi properatum, pleniore postea compositione rescideram. Hanc quoque nondum exemplariis suffectam fraude tunc fratris, dehinc apostatæ, amisi, qui forte descripserat quædam mendosissime, et exhibuit frequentia. Emendationis necessitas facta est," etc., l. i. c. 1.

<sup>5</sup> C. 1.



held the doctrine of two gods—the one the author of evil, who created the world; the other a deity of pure benevolence, who was unknown to mankind until revealed by Christ.<sup>1</sup> In confutation of this doctrine, Tertullian first observes that in the definition of God are comprised the ideas of supreme power, eternal duration, and self-existence.<sup>2</sup> “The unity of the Deity is a necessary consequence from this definition, since the supposition of two supreme beings involves a contradiction in terms. Nor can this conclusion be evaded by a reference to worldly monarchs, who are as numerous as the kingdoms into which the earth is divided, each being supreme in his own dominions.<sup>3</sup> We cannot thus argue from man to God. Two deities, in every respect equal, are in fact only one deity:—nor, if you introduce two, can any satisfactory reason be assigned why you may not, with Valentinus, introduce thirty.<sup>4</sup> Should Marcion reply that he does not assert the perfect equality of his two deities, he would by that very reply give up the point in dispute.<sup>5</sup> He would admit that the inferior of the two is not strictly entitled to the name of God, since he does not possess the attributes of the Godhead, and that the name is applied to him only in a subordinate sense, in which we find it occasionally used in Scripture.”

“How absurd,” proceeds Tertullian, addressing the Marcionites, “is the notion that, during the whole interval between the creation and the coming of Christ, the Supreme Being should have remained utterly unknown; while the inferior deity, the Demiurge, received the undivided homage of mankind!<sup>5</sup> It would surely be more reasonable to assign the superiority to that Being who had manifested His power in the works of creation, than to him who had not even afforded any evidence of his existence.<sup>6</sup> But, in order to evade the force of this argument, you affect to despise the world in which you live;<sup>7</sup> and notwithstanding the innumerable instances of skill and contrivance which it exhibits

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian supposes Marcion to have adopted this notion of a God of pure benevolence from the Stoics. “Inde Marcionis Deus melior, de tranquillitate, a Stoicis venerat.” *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 7.

<sup>2</sup> C. 3. “Quantum humana conditio de Deo definire potest, id definitio quod et omnium conscientia agnoscet, Deum summum esse magnum, in æternitate constitutum, innatum, infectum, sine initio, sine fine.”

<sup>3</sup> C. 4. Tertullian ought rather to have contended that the illustration strengthened his argument. In each kingdom there is only one supreme power; but the universe is God’s kingdom; there is therefore only one Supreme Power in the universe.

<sup>4</sup> C. 5.

<sup>5</sup> Cc. 6, 7.

<sup>6</sup> Cc. 9, 10, 11, 12.

<sup>7</sup> Cc. 13, 14.



on every side, you represent it as altogether unworthy to be regarded as the work of the Supreme Being. Yet Christ, whom you suppose to have been sent to deliver man from the dominion of the Demiurge, has been content to allow the use of the elements and productions of this vile world, even in the sacraments which He has instituted—of water, and oil, and milk, and honey in baptism, and of bread in the Eucharist. Nay, you yourselves also, with unaccountable inconsistency, have recourse to them for sustenance and enjoyment. How, moreover, do you account for the fact that, notwithstanding two hundred years have elapsed since the birth of Christ, the old world—the work of the Demiurge—still continues to subsist, and has not been superseded by a new creation proceeding from the Supreme Being, whom you suppose to have been revealed in Christ?"<sup>1</sup> Tertullian here states incidentally that, according to Marcion, the world was created by the Demiurge out of pre-existent matter.<sup>2</sup>

In answer to our author's last question, the Marcionites appear to have affirmed that, as the Supreme Being was invisible, so also were His works; and that the deliverance of man from the dominion of the Demiurge was an incontestable manifestation of His power.<sup>3</sup> "Why, then," rejoins Tertullian, "was the deliverance so long delayed?"<sup>4</sup> Why was man left, during the whole interval between the creation and Christ's advent, under the power of a malignant deity? And in what manner was the Supreme Deity at last revealed?<sup>5</sup> We admit two modes of arriving at the knowledge of God—by His works, and by express revelation. But the Supreme Deity could not be known by His works, inasmuch as the visible world in which we live was not made by Him, but by the Demiurge. You will therefore answer that He was made known by express revelation: 'in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, Christ Jesus, a Spirit of health (*Spiritus salutaris*), condescended to come down from heaven.'<sup>6</sup> How then happened it that the purpose of His coming was still kept secret from mankind? that the full disclosure of the truth was reserved till the reign of Antoninus Pius,<sup>7</sup> when Marcion first began to teach that the God revealed

<sup>1</sup> C. 15.

<sup>2</sup> "Sed ex materiâ et ille fuisse debebit, eâdem ratione occurrente illi quoque Deo, quæ opponeretur Creatori, ut æque Deo." Compare l. v. c. 19.

<sup>3</sup> C. 16.

<sup>4</sup> C. 17.

<sup>5</sup> C. 18.

<sup>6</sup> C. 19.

<sup>7</sup> Tertullian places an interval of 115 years and 6½ months between Tiberius and Antoninus Pius.



by Christ was a different God from the Creator; and that the Law and the Gospel were at variance with each other?"

Marcion appears to have appealed, in confirmation of his opinions, to the dispute between St. Paul and St. Peter, respecting the observance of the ceremonial law; and to have argued that the part then taken by the former, in denying the necessity of any such observance, implied a conviction in his mind that there was an opposition between the Law and the Gospel.<sup>1</sup> To this argument Tertullian answers that the inference is incorrect, since in the Old Testament, which, according to Marcion, was a revelation from the Demiurge, the cessation of the ceremonial law, and the introduction of a more spiritual system, are clearly predicted. "But," he adds, "if St. Paul had known that Christ came for the purpose of revealing a God distinct from the Creator, that fact alone would have been decisive as to the abolition of the ceremonial law; and he would have spared himself the unnecessary trouble of *proving* that it was no longer obligatory. The real difficulty with which the apostle had to contend arose from the fact that the law and the gospel proceeded from the *same* God; since it thence became necessary to explain why observances, which God had Himself enjoined under the former, were no longer to be deemed obligatory under the latter."<sup>2</sup> Our author then urges the agreement of all the Churches, which traced their descent from the apostles, in the belief that Christ was sent by the Creator of this world, as a proof of the truth of that belief.<sup>3</sup>

Tertullian lastly contends that Marcion's system does not even accomplish the main object which its author had in view—it does not establish the pure benevolence of his supposed Supreme Being.<sup>4</sup> "For how," he asks, "can the goodness of that Being be reconciled with the supposition that a malignant deity was so long permitted to hold the universe in subjection? Goodness, moreover, loses its character if it is not guided by reason and justice; but it was neither reasonable nor just in Marcion's Supreme God to invade as it were the territory of the Creator, and to deprive Him of the allegiance of man—His creature and subject. At best, the goodness of Marcion's God is imperfect:—it neither saves the whole human race, nor even a single individual, fully and completely; since, according to Marcion, the

<sup>1</sup> C. 20.

<sup>3</sup> See chap. v. p. 145.

<sup>2</sup> C. 21. See chap. v. p. 146.

<sup>4</sup> C. 22, *ad finem*.



soul only is saved, while the body is destroyed. Yet Marcion would persuade us that his Supreme Deity is a Deity of pure benevolence and goodness, who neither judges, nor condemns, nor punishes, but is in every respect similar to the listless and indolent gods of Epicurus. Does not, then, the very term *goodness* imply an abhorrence of evil? And what are we to think of a goodness which either does not forbid the commission of evil, or overlooks it when committed? Such doctrines proclaim impunity to every species of profligacy and crime; yet with strange inconsistency the Marcionites profess to believe that evil-doers will finally be punished.”<sup>1</sup> While, however, Tertullian asserts that the doctrines of Marcion lead by necessary consequence to the encouragement of vice, he does not appear to charge the Marcionites with actual immorality.

The foregoing sketch of the first book *against Marcion* will give the reader an insight into the nature of the controversy, and the mode in which Tertullian conducted it. With respect to the remaining four books, we shall content ourselves with merely stating the subjects discussed in each. We have seen that the object of the first book was to expose the absurdity of maintaining that there is a Supreme Deity distinct from the Creator of the world. That of the second is to expose the futility of the reasonings by which Marcion endeavoured to prove that the Creator of the world was not the Supreme Deity. It has been already observed that Marcion's errors originated in a desire to reconcile the existence of evil, both in the natural and moral world, with the goodness of God. Whatever exists, exists, if not by the appointment, at least by the permission of God; and a God of infinite power and goodness would not permit the existence of evil. Marcion could devise no better mode of solving this difficulty than by supposing the existence of two deities—one the Creator of the world, the other the Supreme God—a God of pure and absolute benevolence. Tertullian, on the contrary, endeavours to show, in the second book, that the appearances of evil in the world are not inconsistent with the

<sup>1</sup> Their notion seems to have been that bad men would not be punished by the Supreme God—for perfect goodness cannot punish—but would be rejected by Him; and being thus rejected, would become the prey of the fire of the Creator. “Multo adhuc vanius, quum interrogati, ‘quid fiat peccatori cuique die illo,’ respondent, ‘abjici illum quasi ab oculis.’ Nonne et hoc judicio agitur? judicatur enim abjiciendus, et utique judicio damnationis: nisi in salutem abjiciatur peccator, ut et hoc Deo optimo competat,” c. 27. Again, in c. 28, “Exitus autem illi abjecto quis? ab igne, inquit, Creatoris deprehendetur.”



perfect goodness of its Author. He expatiates upon the folly and presumption of which a blind, imperfect being, like man, is guilty, in venturing to canvass the divine dispensations.<sup>1</sup> He appeals to the proofs of the divine goodness exhibited in the material world, in the creation of man, and in the law which was given to Adam; the superiority of man to all other animals being evinced by the very circumstance that a law was given him, which he possessed the power either of obeying or disobeying.<sup>2</sup> To the common argument, that the fall of Adam implied a defect either in the goodness, power, or prescience of God, Tertullian replies that, possessing as we do, clear and decisive evidences of the exercise of those attributes, we must not allow our faith to be shaken by any speculative reasoning.<sup>3</sup> God made man in His own image; man was consequently to be endowed with freedom of will: he abused that excellent gift, and fell. His fall, therefore, detracts not from the goodness of God. "But why," rejoined Marcion, "endow him with a gift which God must have foreseen that he would abuse?"<sup>4</sup> "Because," Tertullian answered, "his likeness to his Maker consisted partly in the freedom of his will." Without entering into any further detail of the arguments either of Marcion or Tertullian, we may remark that our author is, as might be expected, far more successful in exposing the errors and inconsistencies of his opponent, than in solving the difficulties in which the question itself is involved.<sup>5</sup> Not that his failure in the latter respect is to be attributed to any want of acuteness or ingenuity on his part, but to the nature of the inquiry, which must ever baffle the powers of human reason.

Having once established that the fall of Adam was the consequence of the abuse of that free-will with which he was endowed at his creation, Tertullian finds no difficulty in proving that the evil, which was introduced into the world by the fall, and still continues to exist, is in no way derogatory from the goodness of God. Marcion appears to have contended that the denunciation and infliction of punishment were inconsistent with perfect goodness. Tertullian, on the contrary, argues that justice is

<sup>1</sup> C. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cc. 3, 4.

<sup>3</sup> C. 5. See the observations on the tenth Article of our Church, in chap. v. p. 164. Compare also l. iv. c. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Cc. 6, 7, 8.

<sup>5</sup> One of Marcion's arguments is that, since it is the soul which sins in man, and the soul derives its origin from the breath of God, that is, of the Creator, sin must in some degree be ascribed to the nature of the Creator, c. 9, quoted in chap. iii. note 4, p. 95.



inseparable from goodness, and that the punishment of vice is nothing but an exercise of justice.<sup>1</sup> To reckon justice among the attributes of the Deity, and at the same time to affirm that the judgments which He brings upon men on account of their wickedness are at variance with His goodness, is as absurd as to admit on the one hand that the skill of the surgeon is beneficial to society, and, on the other, to accuse him of cruelty because he occasionally causes his patients to suffer pain.<sup>2</sup> Nor must we, when we read in Scripture of the anger, or indignation, or jealousy of God, suppose that those passions exist in Him as they do in man; unless we are also prepared to assert that He has human hands, and eyes, and feet, because those members are ascribed to Him in the sacred writings. "Even the precepts and institutions," Tertullian continues, "which Marcion produces from Scripture as proofs of the harshness and severity of the God who gave the law, will, on examination, be found to tend directly to the benefit of man."<sup>3</sup> Thus the Lex Talionis was a law adapted to the character of the Jewish people, and instituted for the purpose of repressing violence and injustice.<sup>4</sup> The prohibition of certain kinds of food was designed to inculcate self-restraint, and thereby to preserve men from the evil consequences of excess. The sacrifices and other burthensome observances of the ceremonial law, independently of their typical and prophetic meaning, answered the immediate purpose of preventing the Jews from being seduced into idolatry by the splendid rites of their heathen neighbours."

One of the passages of Scripture urged by the Marcionites was that in which God commands the Israelites, previously to their departure from Egypt, to borrow gold and silver of the Egyptians.<sup>5</sup> This Marcion termed a fraudulent command, and denounced it as inconsistent with every idea of goodness. The mode in which Tertullian accounts for it is, that the Egyptians were greatly indebted to the Israelites, and that the gold and silver which the latter obtained, constituted a very inadequate compensation for the toil and labour of the many years during

<sup>1</sup> Something like a fallacy appears to pervade the whole of Tertullian's reasoning on this point, arising out of the double meaning of the word *bonitas*, which he here employs as if it meant goodness, that is, the combination of all those excellences which constitute a perfect moral character; whereas Marcion rather used the word to express kindness or benevolence, as opposed to severity, malice, etc. See c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> C. 19. Compare *de Pudicitia*, c. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Cc. 17, 18, 19.

<sup>4</sup> Compare l. iv. c. 16.

<sup>5</sup> C. 20. Compare l. iv. c. 24. *Philo Judæus de Mose*, tom. ii. p. 103, ed. Mangey.



which they had been detained in servitude. The Marcionites also objected to certain contradictions which they pretended to discover in Scripture: <sup>1</sup> for example, between the general command not to perform any manner of work on the Sabbath, and the particular command to bear the ark round the walls of Jericho for seven successive days, one of which must necessarily have been a Sabbath—between the general command not to make any graven image, and the particular command to make the brazen serpent, etc. <sup>2</sup> In like manner, they objected to those passages in which God is said to repent—for instance, of having made Saul king—on the ground that repentance necessarily implies previous error, either of judgment or conduct. <sup>3</sup> Tertullian does not appear to have been aware of the true answer to this objection—that when we speak of the anger, repentance, jealousy of God, we merely mean to say that such effects have been produced in the course of the divine dispensations as would, if they were the results of human conduct, be ascribed to the operation of those passions; and that we use the terms, because the narrowness of human conceptions, and the imperfection of human language, furnish us with no better modes of expressing ourselves. Our author notices various other inconsistencies which the Marcionites professed to find in the Scripture; and concludes this part of his subject with observing, that all the reasons assigned by those heretics, for denying that the God who created the world was the Supreme God, applied with equal force to their own imaginary deity. <sup>4</sup>

Having thus proved, as he thinks satisfactorily, that the notion of two distinct deities, one the Creator of the world, the other Supreme, was a mere fiction, and that the former was indeed the one Supreme God, Tertullian proceeds to refute the notion that Jesus was not sent by the Creator. The mode which he adopts is to compare the predictions in the Old Testament with the actions of Jesus as recorded in the New, and to show that the former were exactly accomplished in the latter. The necessary conclusion is, that Jesus must have been sent by the same Deity who spoke by the prophets under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, that is, by the Creator of the world. It can scarcely be necessary to remark that, in this part of the

<sup>1</sup> C. 21. Tertullian's words are, "Jubentis arcam circumferri per dies octo." Compare 1. iv. c. 12, where Rigault, however, reads *septem diebus*; and we find the same reading in the tract *adv. Judæos*, c. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cc. 22, 23.

<sup>3</sup> C. 24.

<sup>4</sup> C. 25, *ad finem*.



controversy with Marcion, our author is obliged to take precisely the same ground which I have already described him to have taken in his treatise *against the Jews*. But before he enters upon the investigation of particular prophecies, he makes some general observations which are not unworthy of notice. He contends, for instance, that unless the coming of Christ had been predicted, the evidence of His divine mission would have been incomplete.<sup>1</sup> The miracles which He performed were not, as Marcion asserted, alone sufficient to establish the point; it was further necessary that previous intimations of His appearance and character should have been given, in order to furnish a test whereby to ascertain whether He was really the person He professed to be. The conclusion which Tertullian builds upon these premises is, that Jesus must have been sent by the Creator of the world, who foretold His coming, and not by Marcion's supposed Supreme Being, who had given no intimation whatever on the subject. Our author then mentions two circumstances which ought, he says, always to be borne in mind by the reader of the prophetic writings — that in them, future events are frequently spoken of as if they had already happened; and that, as the language of prophecy is frequently figurative, men may be led into great errors by affixing to it too literal a meaning.<sup>2</sup>

His next remark is, that the Marcionites, although in one respect they made common cause with the Jews—namely, by denying that the prophecies of the Old Testament were accomplished in Jesus of Nazareth—were on all other points directly opposed to them.<sup>3</sup> For the Jews alleged the supposed disagreement between the prophecies respecting the Messiah and the history of Jesus as a reason for rejecting the pretensions of the latter; whereas the Marcionites alleged it as a reason for asserting that Jesus was sent by the Supreme God—not by the God of the Old Testament. Tertullian then proceeds, almost in the same words which he has used in his treatise *against the Jews*, to show that they, as well as the Marcionites, had been betrayed into their error by not distinguishing between the two advents of Christ—the one in humiliation, the other in glory.<sup>4</sup> He dwells<sup>5</sup> at some length on the absurd consequences which

<sup>1</sup> L. iii. cc. 2, 3. Lardner (tom. iv. ed. 4to, p. 604), in speaking of this part of Tertullian's work, accuses him of rashness in weakening a very strong, if not the strongest, argument for the truth of the Christian religion; but Lardner's representation scarcely does justice to our author's reasoning on the subject. See chap. ii. note 1, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> C. 5.

<sup>3</sup> C. 6.

<sup>4</sup> C. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Cc. 8, 9, 10.



necessarily flow from the notion of the Marcionites, that the body of Christ was a mere phantasm, and says that the title of Antichrist might with greater propriety be applied to them than to the heretics mentioned by St. John, who denied that Christ had come in the flesh. To the latter it appeared incredible that God should be made flesh; the former further denied that God was the Creator of man or of the flesh. We learn incidentally that the Marcionites denied the reality of Christ's flesh, because they felt that if they admitted it, they should also be compelled to admit the reality of His birth, and consequently His connexion with the Demiurge, the author of the human body or flesh.<sup>1</sup> The remainder of the third book consists principally of references to the same passages in the Old Testament, which were produced in the treatise *against the Jews*, in order to prove that Jesus was the Messiah predicted by the prophets. We have already noticed the inference deduced by Semler from this resemblance between the two treatises, and assigned what seemed to us satisfactory reasons for thinking the inference unsound.<sup>2</sup>

Marcion appears to have composed a work to which he gave the title of *Antitheses*, because in it he had set, as it were in opposition to each other, passages from the Old and New Testaments, intending his readers to infer, from the apparent disagreement between them, that the law and the gospel did not proceed from the same author.<sup>3</sup> The object of Tertullian's fourth book is to expose the weakness of this attempt. He admits that, as all previous dispensations were only preparatory to the Christian, and were designed to apply to mankind when placed under very different circumstances, the law and the gospel could not but differ in some respects from each other. But he contends that this difference had been clearly pointed out by the prophets, and was therefore an argument that the Creator, who inspired the prophets and gave the law, gave the gospel also. As the genuine Gospels did not suit Marcion's purpose, he compiled a gospel for himself, out of that of St. Luke;<sup>4</sup> which he appears to have

<sup>1</sup> C. II. Compare l. iv. c. 19. *De Carne Christi*, cc. 1, 2, 3, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Chap. i. p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> L. iv. c. 1. This work seems to have been placed by Marcion in the hands of his followers, for the purpose of instructing them in the principles of his system. Compare l. i. c. 19; l. ii. cc. 28, 29; l. iv. cc. 4, 6.

<sup>4</sup> Cc. 2, 5. Marcion does not appear to have called it St. Luke's Gospel. He cut out from it such passages as he conceived to militate against his own opinions; such as the History of the Temptation, l. v. c. 6. See *de Carne Christi*, c. 7. In speaking of Marcion's gospel, Tertullian calls it *Evangelium vestrum*, l. iii. cap. ult.; *Evangelium ejus*, l. iv. c. 1. See also l. iv. c. 3; l. v. c. 16, *sub fine*.



selected because that evangelist was supposed to have written from the preaching and under the direction of St. Paul, who had reproved St. Peter for departing from the truth of the gospel. The conclusion which Marcion meant to draw from this circumstance was that, in order to discover the genuine doctrines of Christianity, recourse must be had to St. Paul, in preference to the other apostles. This conclusion our author overthrows by observing that St. Paul appears, from the Epistle to the Galatians, to have gone up to Jerusalem for the very purpose of ascertaining whether the doctrines which he preached coincided with those preached by Peter, and James, and John. "All the apostles," continues Tertullian, "were equally commissioned by Christ to preach the gospel; all, therefore, preached the genuine doctrine. Instead of setting the authority of St. Paul above that of the rest, Marcion ought rather to contend that the Gospels which the orthodox use, have been adulterated, and that his alone contains the truth."<sup>1</sup> With respect to the Gospel of St. Luke, Marcion contended that it had been adulterated by those Judaizing Christians who were anxious to establish a connexion between the law and the gospel, and that he had restored it to its original integrity.<sup>2</sup> Tertullian here enters into that discussion, respecting the mode of ascertaining the genuineness of the sacred Scriptures, to which we referred in our observations on the sixth Article of our Church.<sup>3</sup>

He next proceeds to state the point actually in controversy, between the orthodox and the Marcionites, respecting Christ.<sup>4</sup> According to the latter, the Christ predicted in the Old Testament had not yet appeared, but was to come at some future period, to restore the Jews to their native land and to their ancient temporal prosperity: whereas the Christ, whose actions are recorded in the New Testament, was sent by the Supreme God to accomplish the salvation of the whole human race. "It would follow," proceeds Tertullian, "from this statement that there ought to be no resemblance, either in character or in the transactions of their lives, between the Christ of the Old and the

On the subject of Marcion's gospel, the reader will find some valuable remarks in the introduction to Dr. Schleiermacher's work to which we have already referred.

<sup>1</sup> C. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Cc. 4, 5.

<sup>3</sup> See chap. v. p. 54.

<sup>4</sup> Compare l. iii. c. 21. "Nam etsi putes Creatoris quidem terrenas promissiones fuisse, Christi vero cœlestes," l. iv. c. 14, c. 35, *sub fine*; l. iii. c. 24, *sub initio*, quoted in chap. v. note 4, p. 130; whence it appears that, according to Marcion, the Jews were after death to pass to a state of enjoyment in the bosom of Abraham, l. iv. c. 34, quoted in chap. v. note 7, p. 131.



Christ of the New Testament. How then happens it that the latter has carried on the dispensations of the God of the Old Testament—has fulfilled His prophecies—has realized His promises—has confirmed His law—has enforced and perfected the rule of life set forth by Him?" It would be a tedious and not very edifying task to follow our author through all the quotations from Scripture, by which he endeavours to establish the exact correspondence of the actions and sayings of Christ with those ascribed to the promised Messiah by the ancient prophets. It will be sufficient to produce a few examples of the contradictions which Marcion pretended to discover between the Old and New Testaments, and of the mode in which Tertullian accounted for them.

Marcion contended, for instance, that the Lex Talionis, established by Moses, was directly at variance with our Saviour's precept, that we should offer our left cheek to him who smites us on the right.<sup>1</sup> Tertullian replies that, although the Lex Talionis was suited to the temper and moral condition of the Israelites, and at first instituted for the purpose of repressing violence, yet in the prophetic writings we find frequent exhortations to patience under injuries. Those exhortations were inserted in order to prepare the minds of men for that prohibition of all acts of retaliation, and even of angry and revengeful feelings, which the Messiah, one part of whose office would be to perfect the law, would introduce under the gospel.

Another alleged instance of inconsistency was, that Moses voluntarily interfered to put an end to the quarrel between the two Israelites; whereas Christ refused to interfere between the two brethren, one of whom appealed to Him respecting the division of an inheritance.<sup>2</sup> In this case Tertullian has recourse to a most unsatisfactory solution. He says that Christ's refusal was meant to convey a severe reproof of the applicant, by insinuating that, if he were to interfere, He should probably meet with the same ungrateful treatment which Moses experienced from his countryman.

A third instance of contradiction urged by Marcion was that, whereas Moses permitted divorce, Christ prohibited it in every case, excepting that of adultery.<sup>3</sup> Tertullian answers that Christ had Himself furnished a solution of this apparent contradiction

<sup>1</sup> C. 16. See p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> C. 28.

<sup>3</sup> C. 34.



when He said that from the beginning it was not so, and that Moses had granted the permission to the Jews on account of the hardness of their hearts. He, therefore, who came to take away their stony heart, and to give them a heart of flesh, naturally curtailed the former licence, and restricted divorce to the single case of adultery. Tertullian concludes the fourth book with asserting that he has fully redeemed the pledge which he gave at the commencement, having shown that the doctrines and precepts of Christ coincided so exactly with those delivered by the prophets, and that His miracles, sufferings, and resurrection were so clearly foretold by them as to establish beyond controversy the fact that *their* inspiration and *His* mission originated with the same God—the Creator of the world.

We have observed that Marcion compiled his gospel principally from that of St. Luke, because that evangelist had been the companion of St. Paul.<sup>1</sup> The reason of the preference thus given to the Apostle of the Gentiles was his constant and strenuous opposition to the Judaizing Christians, who wished to re-impose the yoke of the Jewish ceremonies on the necks of their brethren. This opposition the Marcionites wished to construe into a direct denial of the authority of the Mosaic law. They contended also from St. Paul's assertion—that he received his appointment to the apostolic office, not from man, but from Christ—that he alone delivered the genuine doctrines of the gospel. The object, therefore, of Tertullian in the fifth book is to prove, with respect to St. Paul's Epistles, what he had proved in the fourth with respect to St. Luke's Gospel, that, far from being at variance, they were in perfect unison with the writings of the Old Testament. He begins with the Epistle to the Galatians, which was written for the express purpose of confuting the error of those who thought the observance of the Mosaic ritual necessary to salvation.<sup>2</sup> Here he urges an argument to which we have more than once alluded, that the labour bestowed by the apostle was wholly superfluous, in case, as the Marcionites supposed, he had been commissioned to teach that Christ was not sent by the God who gave the Mosaic law.<sup>3</sup> For what need was there, on that supposition, to enter into a long discussion, for the purpose of proving that the gospel had superseded the use of the ceremonial law, when the very fact that they proceeded from different, or, to speak more accurately, from hostile deities, accounted at once for the abolition of the latter? Tertullian examines in like

<sup>1</sup> P. 247.

<sup>2</sup> C. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Chap. v. pp. 146, 240.



manner the two Epistles to the Corinthians,<sup>1</sup> that to the Romans,<sup>2</sup> which he states to have been grievously mutilated by the Marcionites, the two to the Thessalonians,<sup>3</sup> and those to the Ephesians,<sup>4</sup> Colossians,<sup>5</sup> and Philippians.<sup>6</sup> The same reasons which prevented us from entering into any minute investigation of the quotations from the Gospels, induce us to be equally concise in our notice of the quotations from St. Paul's Epistles. The detail would be extremely tedious, and the information derived from it in no respect proportioned to the time which it would necessarily occupy.

When we examine the opinions of Marcion, whether upon points of faith or practice, we find that they all flowed by natural consequence from the leading article of his creed—that the world was created by a deity distinct from the Supreme Deity, out of pre-existent matter. As the flesh or body of man was the work of the Demiurge, it was held by the Marcionites in abhorrence. Hence their assertion that Christ was neither born of the Virgin Mary,<sup>7</sup> nor passed through the customary stages of infancy and boyhood, but descended at once from heaven a full-grown man,<sup>8</sup> in appearance only, not in reality<sup>9</sup>—hence the opprobrious terms in which they spoke of the body,<sup>10</sup> and their denial of its resurrection<sup>11</sup>—hence their aversion to marriage,<sup>12</sup> which they carried to such a length that they refused to administer the rite of baptism to a married man, or to admit him to the sacrament of the Eucharist, until he had repudiated his wife.<sup>13</sup> We find in Tertullian no mention of that notion respecting an intermediate kind of deity, of a mixed nature, neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, which Mosheim ascribes to Marcion.<sup>14</sup> Lardner thinks that the distinction which Marcion made between his two deities was, that the one was good, the other just;<sup>15</sup> but in the second chapter of the first book Tertullian expressly says that Marcion conceived the Creator of the world to be the author of evil, and that he was led into that error by misinterpreting certain passages

<sup>1</sup> Cc. 5-13.<sup>2</sup> Cc. 13, 14.<sup>3</sup> Cc. 15, 16.<sup>4</sup> C. 17.<sup>5</sup> C. 19.<sup>6</sup> C. 20.<sup>7</sup> L. iv. c. 10, *sub fine*.<sup>8</sup> L. iv. c. 7, *sub in.*, c. 21. *De Carne Christi*, cc. 1, 7.<sup>9</sup> L. i. cc. 11, 22, *sub in.*, 24; l. ii. c. 28; l. iii. cc. 8, 9, 10; l. iv. cc. 8, 42. *De Res. Carnis*, c. 2; *de Carne Christi*, cc. 4, 6; *de Animâ*, c. 17; *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 33.<sup>10</sup> L. iii. c. 11. *De Carne Christi*, c. 4.<sup>11</sup> L. i. c. 24; l. iv. c. 37; l. v. c. 10.<sup>12</sup> L. i. cc. 1, 24, 29; l. iv. c. 11; l. v. c. 7. *Ad Uxorem*, l. 1, c. 3.<sup>13</sup> L. iv. c. 34.<sup>14</sup> Cent. ii. par. ii. chap. v. sect. 7.<sup>15</sup> *History of Heretics*, chap. x. sect. 12.



of Scripture. The other charges brought against him by our author are, that he denied the freedom of the will;<sup>1</sup> and that he rejected some, and mutilated and corrupted other portions of Scripture.<sup>2</sup> His followers were charged with being addicted to astrology.<sup>3</sup> Like other heretical leaders, he appears to have been attended by females, who pretended to great sanctity—a practice probably adopted in imitation of the apostles.<sup>4</sup>

Mosheim speaks of Lucan, Severus, Blastus, and Apelles, as followers of Marcion, who deviated in some respects from the tenets of their master. Lucan is once mentioned by Tertullian as holding the opinion that neither the soul nor the body would rise again, but a sort of third substance—an opinion which our author supposes him to have borrowed from Aristotle.<sup>5</sup> The name of Apelles occurs frequently in Tertullian's writings.<sup>6</sup> He is described as a disciple of Marcion, who endeavoured to improve upon his master's doctrine; and the account given of him is that, being unable to comply with Marcion's strict notions on the subject of continence, he left that heretic and went to Alexandria, where he met with a female named Philumena, who performed various magical illusions by the assistance of an evil spirit.<sup>7</sup> To this woman he attached himself, and under her instruction composed a work called *φανέρωσεις*, or Revelations. Like his master, he denied the resurrection of the body,<sup>8</sup> and at first prohibited marriage.<sup>9</sup> He affirmed that the souls of men were tempted to come down from the super-celestial regions—the regions above the heavens which invest this earth—by the allurements offered to them by the fiery angel,<sup>10</sup> the God

<sup>1</sup> *De Animâ*, c. 21.

<sup>2</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 38; *adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 1. Marcion necessarily rejected the whole of the Old Testament, as proceeding from the Demiurge. *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 30. Tertullian mentions also his rejection of St. Matthew's Gospel, l. iv. c. 34; of St. John's Gospel, *de Carne Christi*, c. 3; of the Acts of the Apostles, l. v. c. 2; *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 22; of the Apocalypse, l. v. c. 5; of the two Epistles to Timothy and of that to Titus, l. v. cap. ult.; but he appears to have recognised the Epistle to Philemon. The reader will find in Lardner a detailed account of the alterations which Marcion made in St. Luke's Gospel, and in the ten Epistles of St. Paul which he received. *History of Heretics*, chap. x. sect. 35, etc.

<sup>3</sup> L. i. c. 18.

<sup>4</sup> L. v. c. 8, *sub fine*.

<sup>5</sup> *De Res. Carnis*, c. 2, *sub fine*.

<sup>6</sup> "Hoc meminisse debuerat Apelles, Marcionis de discipulo emendator." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iv. c. 17; *de Carne Christi*, c. 6, *sub in*.

<sup>7</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 30. See also cc. 6, 10, 37; *de Carne Christi*, c. 24. Lardner questions the story of the incontinence of Apelles. *History of Heretics*, chap. xii. sect. 3.

<sup>8</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 33.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *De Animâ*, c. 23; *de Carne Christi*, c. 8; *de Res. Carnis*, c. 5.



both of the Israelites and of the Gentiles,<sup>1</sup> who no sooner got them into his power than he surrounded them with sinful flesh. The distinction of sexes existed in these souls previously to their descent upon earth, and was from them communicated to the bodies in which they were clothed.<sup>2</sup> Apelles differed also from his master in admitting the reality of Christ's flesh, though he denied that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary.<sup>3</sup> His notion appears to have been that the flesh of Christ was not given by the fiery angel or god of evil, who clothed the souls which he seduced into these lower regions with sinful flesh,<sup>4</sup> but was a substance brought down originally from the stars by a certain eminent angel, who formed the world, though he afterwards mixed up repentance with his work.<sup>5</sup> Christ's flesh, therefore, was real, but different from human flesh. In the third book *against Marcion*, our author alludes to certain heretics who maintained that the flesh which the angels assumed who are stated in Scripture to have appeared in human shapes, was not human flesh.<sup>6</sup> Pamelius supposes that the heretics here alluded to were the disciples of Apelles. Of Severus and Blastus there is no mention in Tertullian's writings.

The next heretics in Mosheim's catalogue are Bardesanes and Tatian. The former is not even named by Tertullian: of the latter we have already spoken.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian's expression is, "Ab igneo Angelo, Deo Israelis et nostro." By the word *nostro*, I suppose Tertullian to mean that the fiery angel was not merely the God of the Jews, as some of the heretics supposed with respect to their inferior deity, but also of the Gentiles. But in the tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 34, Tertullian speaks as if the fiery angel was the God of Israel only: "Apelles Creatorem, Angelum nescio quem gloriosum superioris Dei, faceret Deum Legis et Israël, illum igneum affirmans." In c. 7, he traces this notion of a fiery angel to the philosophical tenets of Heraclitus. I conceive it rather to have been derived from the circumstances attending the appearance of God to Moses in the burning bush.

<sup>2</sup> *De Animâ*, c. 36.

<sup>3</sup> "Aut admissâ carne nativatem negare, ut Apelles discipulus et postea desertor ipsius." *De Carne Christi*, c. 1.

<sup>4</sup> "Nam et Philumena illa magis persuasit Apelli cæterisque desertoribus Marcionis, ex fide quidem Christum circumtulisse carnem, nullius tamen nativatis, utpote de elementis eam mutuatum." *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 11. See *de Res. Carnis*, c. 2; *de Carne Christi*, c. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Tertullian's words are, "Angelum quendam inclytum nominant, qui mundum hunc instituerit, et instituto eo pœnitentiam admiscuerit." *De Carne Christi*, c. 8. Semler for *admiscuerit* reads *admiserit*. If *admiscuerit* is the true reading, I should conjecture the meaning to be that this angel either did not or could not create a perfect world, but introduced into it many things which he afterwards wished to alter.

<sup>6</sup> C. 9. Pamelius refers to the tract *de Carne Christi*, c. 6.

<sup>7</sup> Chap. iv. p. 129.



From the Oriental, Mosheim proceeds to what he terms the Egyptian branch of the Gnostics. In this branch he assigns the first place to Basilides, who is mentioned once, and only once, by our author, in the tract *de Resurrectione Carnis*. He is there stated to have agreed with Marcion in denying the reality of Christ's flesh. Mosheim, however, contends that this opinion is unjustly ascribed to him,<sup>1</sup> though probably held by some of his followers.

We come next to Carpocrates, who is twice mentioned by Tertullian, in the treatise *de Animâ*. In one place he is said to have maintained that *his own* soul and the souls of his followers were derived from a heavenly power, who looked down, as it were from an eminence, upon all the powers of this lower world.<sup>2</sup> He conceived, therefore, both himself and them to be entirely on a level with Christ and the apostles. In the other place, he is accused of holding the doctrine of the metempsychosis;<sup>3</sup> on the ground that the soul must perform all the acts to which it was originally destined, before it can attain to a state of rest. In support of this notion he quoted the words of our Saviour, *Verily thou shalt not depart thence, until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing*. Tertullian remarks incidentally that Carpocrates believed nothing to be evil in itself; good and evil depending entirely on opinion.

Tertullian wrote a treatise expressly against the Valentinians. He speaks of them as a very numerous sect,<sup>4</sup> and ascribes their popularity to the fables with which their theology abounded, and to the air of mystery which they threw around their doctrines. He says that their founder, Valentinus, was a man of ability and eloquence, and flourished in the reign of Antoninus Pius.<sup>5</sup> Being offended because the claim of another to a vacant see was preferred to his own, he quitted the Church in disgust, and formed a system, not indeed entirely new, but founded in some measure upon opinions previously current. Of this system, Tertullian's treatise is a concise account;<sup>6</sup> taken, as he admits, from the writings of Justin, Miltiades, Irenæus,

<sup>1</sup> C. 2. Lardner also thinks that there is reason for doubting whether Basilides denied the reality of Christ's flesh. *History of Heretics*, chap. ii. sect. 6.

<sup>2</sup> C. 23.

<sup>3</sup> C. 35. See Lardner, *History of Heretics*, chap. iii. sect. 11, where he assigns reasons for doubting the truth of many of the charges against the Carpocratians.

<sup>4</sup> *Adv. Valentinianos*, c. 1.

<sup>5</sup> C. 4. Compare *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, cc. 29, 30.

<sup>6</sup> Cc. 5, 6.



and Proculus, whom he calls contemporaries of the heresiarchs. It is in fact little more than a translation of the first book of the work of Irenæus against the Gnostics. The whole system is so replete with absurdity, that we should be disposed to pass it over without notice, were not the examination of it necessary to the completion of our plan, which is to place before the reader all the information supplied by our author's writings respecting the history of the Church in his day.

Valentinus, then, supposed a God, self-existent, infinite, invisible, eternal, who dwelt in the very highest regions, living in a state of imperturbable tranquillity, like the gods of Epicurus.<sup>1</sup> To this God he gave the names of *αἰὼν τέλειος*, *προαρχή*, *ἀρχή*, and with somewhat of inconsistency, *βυθός*. This Deity, however, was not alone, but had with him, or rather within him, another Being to whom the names of *ἐννοια*, *χάρις*, *σιγή* were assigned. From the latter, who appears to have been considered as a female, and to have been impregnated by the Sovereign Deity, sprang *νοῦς*,<sup>2</sup> who was in every respect like and equal to his Father, and alone capable of comprehending his Father's greatness. He was regarded as the beginning or origin of all things, and even distinguished by the appellation of Father. He was also called *μονογενής*, or only-begotten; notwithstanding that at the same time with him was born a female Æon, called *ἀλήθεια*, or truth.<sup>3</sup> The above four *βυθός*, *σιγή*, *νοῦς*, and *ἀλήθεια*, constituted the first Tetras or Quaternion, from which the remaining Æons were derived. For from *νοῦς* sprang *λόγος* and *ζωή*, the word and life; and from them again *ἄνθρωπος* and *ἐκκλησία*, man and the Church. The last four, added to the first-mentioned four, constituted the *ὀγδοάς*. Again, from *λόγος* and *ζωή* were derived ten:—*βυθός* (a second of the name, unless we ought rather to read *βύθιος*) and *μίξις*, *ἀγήρατος* and *ἔνωσις*, *αὐτοφυής* and *ἡδονή*, *ἀκίνητος* and *σύγκρασις*, *μονογενής* (a second of the name) and *μακαρία*.<sup>4</sup> From *ἄνθρωπος* and *ἐκκλησία* were derived twelve:—*παράκλητος* and *πίστις*, *πατρικὸς* and *ἐλπὶς*, *μητρικὸς* and *ἀγάπη*, *αἶνος*<sup>5</sup> and *σύνεσις*, *ἐκκλησιαστικὸς* and *μακαριότης*,

<sup>1</sup> C. 7. See *adv. Marcionem*, l. i. c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> In the tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 33, Tertullian translates the word *νοῦς* by the Latin *sensus*.

<sup>3</sup> Tertullian says that he should rather have been called *πρωτογενής*, or first-begotten. Compare *de Animâ*, c. 12.

<sup>4</sup> C. 8. Compare Irenæus, l. i. c. 1. In the *Scorpiace*, c. 10, we find the name *ἑβασκαντός* among the Æons of Valentinus.

<sup>5</sup> Irenæus has *αἰίνους*.



θελητὸς<sup>1</sup> and σοφία. In forming these pairs of Æons, it was evidently the intention of Valentinus to couple together a male and a female Æon; a masculine being regularly joined to a feminine noun. Tertullian, therefore, retains the Greek nouns, lest, in translating them into Latin, the distinction should disappear.<sup>2</sup> We have now reached the number of thirty Æons, which constituted what Valentinus called the πλήρωμα, the fullness of the celestial body.

To νοῦς alone, among the derived Æons, was imparted the full knowledge of the Supreme God.<sup>3</sup> He would have communicated it to the rest, but his mother, σιγῆ, interposed to prevent the communication. They, in consequence, pined with the secret desire of being admitted to the knowledge of the Father. This desire at length became so violent in σοφία, the youngest of the family of the Æons, that she would have been destroyed by its very intensity, and thus one of the members of the Pleroma would have been lost, had she not been preserved by ὄρος, who was sent forth from the Father for this very purpose, at the request of νοῦς. The various emotions, however, by which σοφία was agitated during the continuance of her desire, gave rise to new existences; for to them is to be traced the origin of matter, of ignorance, of fear, of grief. The desire itself—called ἐνθύμησις, which the translator of Irenæus interprets *concupiscentia cum passione*—was separated by ὄρος from its parent σοφία, and driven out of the Pleroma. To ὄρος, on account of the part which he had acted in restoring σοφία to the Pleroma, were given the names of μεταγωγεὺς, ὀροθέτης, σταῦρος (or rather, perhaps, σταυρωτῆς, because he had crucified the desire which preyed upon σοφία), λυτρωτῆς or redeemer, and καρπιστῆς or restorer to liberty.

Having thus described the error of σοφία, the last-born Æon, and her recovery from it, Valentinus proceeded to say that νοῦς sent forth another couple of Æons, Christ and the Holy Spirit.<sup>4</sup> The office of Christ was to instruct the Æons in the nature of the union which subsisted between the different pairs in the Pleroma, and in the mode of arriving at the comprehension of the Supreme Father. The office of the Holy Spirit was to render them, after their instruction by Christ, grateful to the Father,

<sup>1</sup> In several instances we find φιλητὸς instead of θελητὸς, probably by the mistake of the transcriber.

<sup>2</sup> C. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Cc. 9, 10.

<sup>4</sup> C. 11.



and contented with the degree of knowledge which they possessed. Calm and tranquillity being thus restored to the Pleroma by the exertions of Christ and the Holy Spirit, all the Æons, in honour of the Father, contributed, as it were into a common stock, each his most excellent gift.<sup>1</sup> Out of these contributions was formed the brightest star and most perfect fruit of the Pleroma, Jesus; who was also called σωτήρ, χριστός, λόγος, and πάντα, because All had contributed to His formation. Angels also were created to be His attendants; but Tertullian says that he could not ascertain whether they were supposed to be of the same substance or essence with their Lord.

So much for the interior of the Pleroma. With respect to what was *without* it,<sup>2</sup> we have seen that the intense desire which agitated σοφία—and which Valentinus called sometimes ἐνθύμησις, sometimes Achamoth<sup>3</sup>—was driven from the Pleroma, into the outer regions of darkness, where she remained like an abortion, shapeless and imperfect. In this state Christ, at the suggestion of ὁρῶς, regarded her with an eye of pity, and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit gave her a form. She retained in her new condition some savour of her former incorruption; and, sensible of her fall, sought to be readmitted to the regions of light, but was prevented by ὁρῶς. In consequence of her disappointment, she was assailed by those evils which before afflicted her parent, σοφία—fear, grief, and ignorance. To these was now added the desire of conversion to Christ, who gave her life. From her various emotions and affections arose all the substances in this material world.<sup>4</sup> From her desire of conversion arose every living soul, even that of the Demiurge, the God of mankind. From her grief and tears, the element of water; from her fear, the corporeal elements; from her smile, which was caused by the recollection of having seen Christ, light. In the extremity of her distress she at length had recourse to prayer to Christ, who sent to her the Saviour Jesus, with His train of attendant angels.<sup>5</sup> The ecstasy into which she was thrown by their appear-

<sup>1</sup> C. 12.

<sup>2</sup> C. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Tertullianus, c. 14, "hoc nomen *ininterpretabile* vocat, et mox addit, *Achamoth unde, adhuc quæritur.* Feuarentius vero recte deducit a חכמה *Sapientia.*"

Irenæus, ed. Grabe, p. 19, note 3.

<sup>4</sup> C. 15. The reader will observe that whatever took place *without* the Pleroma was, as it were, a copy of what took place *within* it. Thus the formation of matter here described corresponds to the formation of matter within the Pleroma, mentioned in cc. 9, 10. See c. 23.

<sup>5</sup> C. 16.



ance caused her to produce three different kinds of existences—material, animal, and spiritual.<sup>1</sup> Out of the animal she formed the Demiurge, called also by the Valentinians *μητροπατὼρ*, and king.<sup>2</sup> The name of Father, which is included in *μητροπατὼρ*, was applied to him in the case of animal substances, which they placed on the right; that of Demiurge in the case of material substances, which they placed on the left; and that of King indifferently in both cases. The Demiurge created this visible world.<sup>3</sup>

To the devil Valentinus gave the name of *κοσμοκρατὼρ* or Munditenens, and appeared in some respects to place him above the Demiurge, because the latter was only animal, the former spiritual.<sup>4</sup>

The Demiurge created man, not out of the dust of the earth, but out of some peculiar matter which he animated with his breath; so that man was both material and animal.<sup>5</sup> The Demiurge afterwards drew over him a covering of flesh.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, at the time when the breath of life was breathed into him a portion of the spiritual seed which Achamoth retained was also communicated. To this spiritual seed was given the appellation of *ἐκκλησία*, in allusion to the *Æon* so named within the Pleroma.

Corresponding to the three kinds of substances now described, there are three kinds of men—the carnal or material, who are represented by Cain; the animal, who are represented by Abel; and the spiritual, who are represented by Seth: the first are destined to certain perdition, the last to salvation.<sup>7</sup> The final state of the second is uncertain, being determined by their greater *inclination*, either on the one hand to the carnal, or on the other to the spiritual. They in whom is the spiritual seed, being assured of salvation, are exempt from all discipline, and at liberty to live and act as they please; but the animal man is obliged to work out his salvation with care and diligence.<sup>8</sup> One of the consequences which the Valentinians derived from this triple division was, that no credit can be due to the testimony of

<sup>1</sup> C. 17. *De Animâ*, c. 21.

<sup>2</sup> C. 18. See *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, cc. 7, 34. The name *μητροπατὼρ* was applied to him because he was merely the agent of his mother in creating the visible world.

<sup>3</sup> C. 20.

<sup>4</sup> C. 22.

<sup>5</sup> C. 24.

<sup>6</sup> C. 25. Compare *de Animâ*, cc. 11, 23.

<sup>7</sup> C. 26.

<sup>8</sup> Cc. 29, 30.



the senses, as they are to be referred to the animal part of man's nature.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to Christ, the Valentinian doctrine was, that the Demiurge sent forth, *protulit*, from himself an animal Christ, who was foretold by the prophets, and passed through the body of the Virgin as through a canal—that at his baptism, the Saviour, who was before described as formed out of the most excellent qualities of all the Æons in the Pleroma, descended upon him in the shape of a dove, but quitted him when he was examined before Pilate—and thus that only the carnal and animal Christ was crucified.<sup>2</sup> It does not exactly appear whence the Christ of the Demiurge obtained His flesh, which Valentinus supposed to be different from human flesh.<sup>3</sup> We may here observe that, in agreement with this supposition, the Valentinians denied the resurrection of the body.

At the final consummation of all things, Achamoth—who occupied the middle space in the universe, immediately below the Pleroma and above this world—will be received into the Pleroma, and become the bride of the Saviour.<sup>4</sup> The Demiurge will be transferred into the vacant habitation of his mother. Those men in whom was only the material seed will be annihilated. Those in whom was the animal seed, and who lived virtuous lives, will be carried up to the Demiurge, in the middle regions. Those in whom was the spiritual seed, laying aside the souls which they had received from the Demiurge, will be taken up into the Pleroma, and become the brides of the angels who attend upon the Saviour.

Such were the extravagant notions of Valentinus, as they are represented by Tertullian. We have aimed at expressing his meaning accurately, but are not certain that we have always succeeded in the attempt. We doubt, indeed, whether he himself thoroughly comprehended the system which he undertook to describe. Mosheim says that some of the moderns have endeavoured to reconcile the Valentinian doctrines with reason—a more arduous or unpromising undertaking cannot well be

<sup>1</sup> *De Animâ*, c. 18. Tertullian remarks that the Valentinians borrowed their notion from Plato. They supposed the five foolish virgins in the parable to mean the five senses.

<sup>2</sup> C. 27.

<sup>3</sup> *De Carne Christi*, cc. 1, 15; *de Res. Carnis*, c. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cc. 31, 32, 33.



conceived.<sup>1</sup> The design of the heresiarch doubtless was to account for the origin of evil; but in executing this design he appears to have surrendered himself entirely to the guidance of his fancy. His followers, using the same liberty, changed and added to their master's notions at their own discretion; so that, in Tertullian's day, Axionicus of Antioch alone adhered strictly to the doctrines of Valentinus.<sup>2</sup> Ptolemy,<sup>3</sup> one of his most distinguished disciples, differed from him with respect to the names, the number, and the nature of the Æons. Tertullian mentions among his followers, Colarbasus,<sup>4</sup> if the reading is correct; Heracleon;<sup>5</sup> Secundus;<sup>6</sup> Marcus,<sup>7</sup> to whom our author gives the appellation of Magus; Theotimus,<sup>8</sup> who appears to have employed himself in proposing allegorical or figurative expositions of the law; and Alexander,<sup>9</sup> who urged as a reason for denying the reality of Christ's flesh that, if He actually assumed human flesh, He must have assumed sinful flesh; whereas St. Paul says that Christ abolished sin in the flesh. Tertullian mentions certain psalms or hymns of Valentinus.<sup>10</sup> He says also that Valentinus did not, like Marcion, mutilate the Scriptures, but was content to pervert their meaning.<sup>11</sup> In our account of the *Scorpiace*, we stated the grounds on which the Valentinians denied that Christians were under any obligation to encounter martyrdom.<sup>12</sup> One of them, named Prodicus, appears to have taken the lead in asserting this doctrine.<sup>13</sup>

Of the more obscure Gnostic sects enumerated by Mosheim—the Adamites, Cainites, Abelites, Sethites, Florinians, Ophites—Tertullian mentions only the Cainites, who, according to him, were Nicolaitans under another name.<sup>14</sup> It has been already remarked that the female, against whom the tract *de Baptismo* was composed, was said to belong to this sect.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Century* ii. part ii. chap. v. sect. 16, note.

<sup>2</sup> *Adv. Valentinianos*, c. 4. In c. 11 Tertullian says that the divisions among the followers of Valentinus arose chiefly out of their different notions respecting Christ. See *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 42.

<sup>3</sup> Cc. 4, 33.

<sup>4</sup> C. 4.

<sup>5</sup> C. 4.

<sup>6</sup> C. 4 and c. 38, where the system of Secundus is stated.

<sup>7</sup> C. 4. In the tract *de Resurrectione Carnis*, c. 5, Marcus is said to have maintained that the human body was the workmanship of angels.

<sup>8</sup> C. 4. "Multum circa imagines Legis Theotimus operatus est."

<sup>9</sup> *De Carne Christi*, c. 16. See chap. v. note 9, p. 133.

<sup>10</sup> *De Carne Christi*, cc. 17, 20.

<sup>11</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 38.

<sup>12</sup> Chap. i. p. 29; chap. ii. p. 75.

<sup>13</sup> *Scorpiace*, cap. ult. Prodicus is mentioned again in the tract *against Praxeas*, c. 3, *sub fine*.

<sup>14</sup> *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 33.

<sup>15</sup> Chap. i. note 2, p. 9.



From the Oriental heresies, Mosheim proceeds to those which he allows to be of Grecian origin, and which, according to him, principally owed their rise to the attempt to explain the Christian doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, upon the principles of the Grecian philosophy. To this class of heresies he refers the tenets of Praxeas, Artemon, and Theodotus. Of Artemon and Theodotus we find no notice in Tertullian's writings. Against Praxeas he wrote a treatise, from which we collect not only the opinions of that heretic, but also his own, upon the two fundamental articles of Christian faith just mentioned. The reader will remember that the consideration of them was deferred till we arrived at this division of our work; and their paramount importance must be our excuse for entering into a more detailed account of the treatise *against Praxeas* than has been given of the other tracts against the heretics.

Praxeas, according to our author, was a man of a restless temper, who had very recently come from Asia, and by false representations prevailed upon the Bishop of Rome to recall a letter, in which he had recognised the prophecies of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, and had recommended the Asiatic Churches to continue in communion with them.<sup>1</sup> This circumstance doubtless contributed, as much as the heretical tenets of Praxeas, to excite our author's indignation against him. When, however, those tenets found their way to Carthage, they were successfully combated and to all appearance extirpated by Tertullian himself; the person who originally taught them having delivered to the Church a written recantation. But after a time the heresy again displayed itself, and called forth, from the pen of Tertullian, the treatise which we are now to consider.

The error of Praxeas appears to have originated in anxiety to maintain the unity of God,<sup>2</sup> which, he thought, could only be done by saying that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one and the same.<sup>3</sup> He contended, therefore, according to Tertullian, that the Father Himself descended into the Virgin, was

<sup>1</sup> C. I. "Ipsa novellitas Praxeæ hesterni," c. 2.

<sup>2</sup> "Unicum dominum vindicat, omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, ut de unico Hæresim faciat," c. I.

<sup>3</sup> "Dum unicum Deum non alias putat credendum, quam si ipsum eundemque et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum dicat," c. 2. "Quum eundem Patrem et Filium et Spiritum contendunt, adversus οἰκονομίαν Monarchiæ adulantes," c. 9.



born of her, suffered, and was in a word Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup> Praxeas, however, does not appear to have admitted the correctness of this account of his doctrine, but to have declared his opinion to be—that the Father did not suffer in the Son, but sympathized (*compassus est*) with the Son.<sup>2</sup>

Tertullian enters upon the refutation of the doctrines of Praxeas by setting forth his own creed.<sup>3</sup> “We believe,” he says, “in one God, but under the following dispensation or economy—that there is also a Son of God, His Word, who proceeded from Him;<sup>4</sup> by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made; who was sent by Him into the Virgin, and was born of her; being both man and God, the Son of man and the Son of God, and called Jesus Christ; who suffered, died, and was buried, according to the Scriptures; and was raised again by the Father;<sup>5</sup> and was taken up into heaven, there to sit at the right hand of the Father, and thence to come to judge the quick and the dead; who sent from heaven, from His Father, according to His promise, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the Sanctifier of the faith of all who believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”<sup>6</sup> Such, according to Tertullian, was the faith handed down in the Church, from the first preaching of the gospel—a faith which, far from destroying the unity, as Praxeas supposed, is perfectly consistent with it. “For though the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three, they are

<sup>1</sup> “Ipsum dicit Patrem descendisse in virginem, ipsum ex eâ natum, ipsum passum; denique ipsum esse Jesum Christum,” c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> “Ergo nec compassus est Pater Filio; sic enim, directam blasphemiam in Patrem veriti, diminui eam hoc modo sperant, concedentes jam Patrem et Filium duos esse, si filius quidem patitur; Pater vero compatitur,” c. 29. From this passage Lardner contends that Praxeas was not a Patripassian, and that Tertullian was mistaken in his view of that heretic’s doctrines. According to Lardner, who follows Beausobre, Praxeas distinguished between the Word and the Son of God; deeming the former only an attribute or faculty of the divine nature, the communication of which to the man Jesus Christ, through His conception by the Holy Spirit, rendered Him the Son of God. *Credibility of Gospel History*, c. 41. *History of Heretics*, c. 20, sect. 7. But Wilson, in his *Illustration*, etc., pp. 312, 415, has satisfactorily shown that the earliest error on the subject of Christ’s nature was that of those who denied, not His divinity, but His humanity; and that the error of Praxeas consisted in denying His distinct personality. Wilson compares Praxeas and his followers with the Swedenborgians.

<sup>3</sup> C. 2. This passage is quoted in chap. v. note 4, p. 159.

<sup>4</sup> “Qui ex ipso processerit.” In c. 6 Tertullian, speaking of the generation of the Son, uses the word *protulit*. See also c. 7: “Hæc est nativitas perfecta Sermonis, dum ex Deo procedit.” And c. 19: “In quo principio prolatus a Patre est.”

<sup>5</sup> Here, as in the Epistle to the Galatians i. 1, the raising of Christ is attributed to the Father. See Pearson, article v. p. 256.

<sup>6</sup> In c. 4 the Holy Ghost is said to be from the Father, through the Son.



three, not in condition, but in degree;<sup>1</sup> not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in species; being of one substance, one condition, and one power, because there is one God, from whom those degrees, forms, and species, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are derived."

"The simple, indeed," Tertullian proceeds, "not to call them unwise and unlearned, who always constitute the majority of believers, are startled at the doctrine of the Trinity, thinking that it divides the Unity.<sup>2</sup> We, they say, maintain the monarchy, or sole government of God. But what is the meaning of the word monarchy? Sole empire;—and is it not perfectly consistent with singleness of rule that the ruler should have a son, or that he should administer the government through the agency

<sup>1</sup> "Tres autem, non statu, sed gradu; nec substantiâ, sed formâ; nec potestate, sed specie; unius autem substantiæ, et unius statûs, et unius potestatis; quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti, deputantur." C. 2. Compare c. 19. "Rationem reddidimus quâ Dii non duo dicantur, nec Domini, sed quâ Pater et Filius, duo: et hoc non ex separatione substantiæ, sed ex dispositione, quum individuum et inseparatum Filium a Patre pronuntiamus; nec statu, sed gradu alium; qui etsi Deus dicatur quando nominatur singularis, non ideo duos Deos faciat, sed unum; hoc ipso quod et Deus ex unitate Patris vocari habeat." See also cc. 9, 21.

<sup>2</sup> Tertullian's words are: "Simplices enim quique, ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotæ, quæ major semper credentium pars est," etc. In his controversy with Dr. Priestley, Bishop Horsley translated the word *idiotæ* by the English word *idiots*, for which translation he was severely reprehended by Dr. Priestley. The Bishop afterwards explained that by the word *idiot* he did not mean a person labouring under a constitutional defect of the faculty of reason; but a dull, stupid, ignorant person—a dunce or booby. Probably between the publication of his Letters and of his Supplemental Disquisitions, Bentley's animadversions upon Collins for translating "ab idiotis Evangelistis," by *idiot Evangelists*, had occurred to his recollection. *Remarks on Free-thinking*, c. 33.—Wilson, p. 444, thus translates the passage: "For all the men of simplicity" (alluding probably to their affectation of simplicity of doctrine, as well as to their ignorance), "not to call them unwise and unlearned, who always form the majority of Christians." We doubt whether the word *Simplices* was meant to convey the allusion which Wilson supposes. In the tract *against the Valentinians*, c. 2, Tertullian says that they called the orthodox *Simplices*, and themselves *Sapientes*. See also c. 3; *adv. Judæos*, c. 9, "Vel convertere simplices quosque gestitis." *Scorpiace*, c. 1, "Nam quod sciunt multos simplices ac rudes," where the word manifestly means, simple-minded, uninstructed. But that Wilson has rightly translated the word *idiotæ* will appear from the comparison of the following passages: "Male accepit idiotæ quisque," c. 9. "Nec tantus ego sum ut vos alloquar; veruntamen et gladiatores perfectissimos non tantum magistri et præpositi sui, sed etiam idiotæ et supervacue quique abhortantur de longinquo, ut sæpe de ipso populo dictata suggesta profuerint." *Ad Martyres*, c. 1. "Sed est hoc solenne perversis et idiotis (et Rigault) hæreticis, jam et Psychicis universis." *De Pudicitia*, c. 16, *sub fine*. "Te simplicem et rudem et impolitam et idioticam compello." *De Testimonio Animæ*, c. 1. The word *imperitus* is used in nearly the same sense: "Secundum majorem vim imperitorum—apud gloriosissimam scilicet multitudinem Psychiorum." *De Jejuniis*, c. 11.



of whom he will?<sup>1</sup> When a father associates his son with himself in the empire, is the unity of the imperial power thereby destroyed? The Valentinians, it is true, destroy the monarchy of God, because they introduce other deities, who are wholly at variance with Him. The Son is of the substance of the Father;<sup>2</sup> He does nothing but by the will of the Father; He derives all His power from the Father, and will finally, as we learn from St. Paul, restore it to the Father.<sup>3</sup> How then can the doctrine of the Trinity, when thus explained, be deemed inconsistent with the sole government of God? The same reasoning is applicable in the case of the Holy Spirit." The very circumstance, that the Scriptures speak of one who delivers power, and of another to whom it is delivered, affords in Tertullian's estimation convincing evidence of a distinction of persons in the unity of the divine nature; yet expressions sometimes fall from him which seem at first sight to imply that the distinction only subsists for the purpose of carrying on the divine administration under the gospel.<sup>4</sup>

Having removed this popular objection to the doctrine of the Trinity, Tertullian turns to the immediate question between himself and Praxeas, and says that his object will be to inquire whether there *is* a Son, who He is, and how He exists.<sup>5</sup> In following Tertullian through his investigation of the first of these points, we must bear in mind the double sense of the word λόγος—which comprehends ratio and sermo, reason and speech. "Before all things God was alone, being His own world, and place, and universe; alone, because nothing existed without or beyond Him. Yet even then He was not alone, for He had with Him, within Himself, His Reason, called by the Greeks λόγος, by the Latins Sermo, though the word Ratio would be the more accurate translation, and it would be more proper to say, *In the beginning Reason (Ratio) was with God*, than *In the beginning the Word (Sermo) was with God*; since Reason is manifestly prior to the Word which it dictates.<sup>6</sup> Not that this distinction is of great

<sup>1</sup> "Facilius de Filio quam de Patre hæsitabatur." *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 34. Semler insinuates that this part of Tertullian's reasoning verges towards Arianism.

<sup>2</sup> C. 4.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 28.

<sup>4</sup> "Videmus, igitur, non obesse monarchiæ Filium, etsi hodie apud Filium est; quia et in suo statu est apud Filium, et cum suo statu restituetur Patri a Filio; ita eam nemo hoc nomine destruet, si Filium admittat, cui et traditam eam a Patre, et a quo quandoque restituendam Patri constat," c. 4. Compare cc. 13, 16.

<sup>5</sup> C. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Tertullian's words are: "Cæterum ne tunc quidem solus; habebat enim



moment. For as God reasoned with Himself, and arranged the plan of creation, He may be accurately said, by so doing, to have made His Reason His Word. Thought, as we know from our own experience, is a species of internal conversation. This power and disposition of the divine intelligence (*Divini sensus*) is called also in Scripture σοφία, or Wisdom; for what can be better entitled to the name of Wisdom than the Reason and Word of God? <sup>1</sup> When, therefore, God had determined to exhibit in their different substances and forms those things which He had planned within Himself in conjunction with the Reason and Word of His wisdom, He sent forth His Word <sup>2</sup>—who had also in Himself reason and wisdom inseparably united to Him—to the end that all things might be made by Him by whom they had been originally devised and planned—nay, had been actually made, as far as the divine intelligence was concerned (*quantum in Dei sensu*)—nothing more being wanting to them than that they should be known, and as it were fixed in their respective substances and forms. Such is the perfect nativity of the Word, as He proceeds from God: *formed* by Him first, to *devise*, under the name of wisdom; then *begotten*, for the purpose of carrying into effect what had been devised.” <sup>3</sup> The reader will in this passage recognise a distinction, with which the early Fathers were familiar, between the λόγος ἐνδιαθέτος and the λόγος προφορικός. Tertullian’s language would at first sight appear to imply that the generation of the Word took place when He was sent forth to create the world, and that His distinct personality commenced

secum, quam habebat in semetipso, Rationem suam scilicet. Rationalis enim Deus, et Ratio in ipso prius; et ita ab ipso omnia; quæ Ratio sensus ipsius est.” Compare the conclusion of c. 15. *Sensus* in this passage, according to Bull, *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, sect. 3, c. 10, p. 238, corresponds to the Greek word ἐννοια. In the tract *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum*, c. 33, as was observed in note 2, p. 254, Tertullian uses it as synonymous with νοῦς. The difficulty is to reconcile this mode of explaining the generation of Word with the notion of distinct personality. The reader, however, may consult Horsley’s fourth Supplemental Disquisition. There is towards the conclusion of c. 5 an expression on which Bull animadverts severely: “Possum itaque non temerè præstruxisse, et tunc Deum, ante universitatis constitutionem, solum non fuisse, habentem in semetipso proinde Rationem, et in ratione Sermonem, quem secundum a se faceret *agitando intra se*,” p. 236.

<sup>1</sup> C. 6. Tertullian refers to Prov. viii. 22, introducing the quotation by the words, “Itaque Sophiam quoque exaudi, ut secundam personam *conditam* ;” words which would at first sight seem to imply that the second Person in the Trinity was created; but he adds, “In *sensu suo* scilicet condens et generans (Deus).” Part of c. 7 is employed in proving the identity of the Word and Wisdom of God. Compare *adv. Hermogenem*, c. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Semler infers that, previously to this prolation, the Word had no distinct personality.

<sup>3</sup> C. 7. “Hæc est nativitas perfecta Sermonis, dum ex Deo procedit: *conditus* ab eo primum ad cogitatum in nomine Sophiæ—dehinc *generatus* ad effectum.”



from that period. It is, however, certain that our author intended to assert the distinct personality of the λόγος ἐνδιαθέτος.

One of the objections urged by Praxeas was, that the Word of God meant nothing more than the Word of His mouth—not a distinct agent, but the emission of His voice, to which, in metaphorical language, agency was ascribed. “What,” he asked, “do you make the Word a substance, when it is in truth a voice, a sound proceeding from the mouth; and, as the grammarians say, an impulse given to the air, and intelligible through the hearing?”<sup>1</sup> To this objection Tertullian answers, that the expressions in Scripture respecting the Word are of such a nature that they imply a Person, whom we call the Son, distinct from the Father; and that they cannot be accounted for on the supposition that they are metaphorical. Can the Word, of whom it is said that *without Him nothing was made that was made*, be supposed to be a mere empty sound? Can that which is without substance, create substances? “Whatever, then,” concludes Tertullian, “may be the substance of the Word, I call that substance a Person, and give it the name of Son; and while I acknowledge a Son, I maintain that He is second to the Father.”<sup>2</sup> Thus our author determines the first question which he proposed to discuss—whether there is a Son?

We have seen that Tertullian, in speaking of the generation of the Son, uses the words *protulit* and *procedit*.<sup>3</sup> He thinks it therefore necessary to refute by anticipation the charge of introducing the Valentinian προβολή, prolation of Æons.<sup>4</sup> “Their prolation,” he says, “implies an entire separation of the substance emitted—mine does not prevent its most intimate union with that from which it proceeds.” In order to explain his meaning, he borrows illustrations from natural objects. The three persons in the Trinity stand to each other in the relation of the root, the shrub, and the fruit; of the fountain, the river, and the cut from the river; of the sun, the ray, and the terminating

<sup>1</sup> C. 7. “Ergo, inquis, das aliquam substantiam esse Sermonem, Spiritu et Sophiæ traditione constructam? Plane.” And again: “Quid est enim, dices, sermo nisi vox et sonus oris, et sicut Grammatici tradunt, aer offensus, intelligibilis auditu? cæterum vacuum nescio quid et inane et incorporale?”

<sup>2</sup> “Quæcunque ergo substantia Sermonis fuit, illam dico personam, et illi nomen Filii vindico; et dum Filium agnosco, secundum a Patre defendo.” The expression, “Secundum a Patre,” according to Semler, implies a complete separation of the Son from the Father—a separation of substance; but whoever reads the following chapter (viii.) will be convinced that such was not Tertullian’s notion.

<sup>3</sup> Note 4, p. 261.

<sup>4</sup> C. 8.



point of the ray.<sup>1</sup> For these illustrations he professes himself indebted to the revelations of the Paraclete. In later times, divines have occasionally resorted to similar illustrations, for the purpose of familiarising the doctrine of the Trinity to the mind; nor can any danger arise from the proceeding, so long as we recollect that they are illustrations, not arguments—that we must not draw conclusions from them, or think that whatever may be truly predicated of the illustration may be predicated with equal truth of that which it was designed to illustrate.

“Notwithstanding, however, the intimate union which subsists between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we must be careful,” Tertullian continues, “to distinguish between their Persons.”<sup>2</sup> In his representations of this distinction, he sometimes uses expressions which in after times, when controversy had introduced greater precision of language, were studiously avoided by the orthodox. Thus he calls the Father the whole substance; the Son a derivation from or portion of the whole.<sup>3</sup> In proving the distinction of Persons he lays particular stress on John xiv. 16.<sup>4</sup> He contends also that Father and Son are correlative terms, one of which implies the existence of the other: there cannot be a Father without a Son, or a Son without a Father.<sup>5</sup> Consequently the doctrine of Praxeas, which confounds the Father and Son, must be erroneous. To this argument Praxeas replied, that nothing is impossible with God—that He, who could make a barren woman and even a virgin bear, could make Himself at once both Father and Son.<sup>6</sup> In support of this assertion he quoted the first verse of Genesis, in which he appears to have read, *In principio Deus fecit sibi filium.*<sup>7</sup> Tertullian rejoins, that

<sup>1</sup> “Protulit enim Deus Sermonem, quemadmodum etiam Paracletus docet, sicut radix fruticem, et fons fluvium, et Sol radium;” quoted in note 1, p. 10 of chap. i. Again, “Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio, sicut tertius a radice, fructus ex frutice; et tertius a fonte, rivus ex flumine; et tertius a Sole, apex ex radio.” I know not whether I have rightly translated the words *rivus* and *apex*. Let me take this opportunity of observing that I undertake only to state, not always to explain or comprehend, Tertullian’s notions.

<sup>2</sup> C. 9.

<sup>3</sup> “Pater enim tota substantia est, filius vero derivatio totius et portio, sicut ipse profitetur, *quia Pater major me est.*” Semler supposes *derivatio* to be a translation of ἀπόρροια, a word which he states to have been rightly rejected by Irenæus and others. See c. 14, “Pro modulo derivationis,” and c. 26. Bull, sect. 2, c. 7, p. 95.

<sup>4</sup> “I will pray the Father, and He shall give you *another* Comforter—even the Spirit of Truth.”

<sup>5</sup> C. 10.

<sup>6</sup> It appears from this passage that Praxeas admitted the miraculous conception.

<sup>7</sup> C. 5. “Aiunt quidem et Genesin in Hebraico ita incipere, *In principio Deus fecit sibi filium.*” Semler doubts the truth of Tertullian’s assertion. His note is, “*Mirum est sic quosdam finxisse.*”



our business is to inquire what God has done, not to conjecture what He can do ; or to infer that, because He can produce a certain event, He has produced it. He could have given men wings, but He has not given them. In God, will and power are the same ; what, therefore, He wills not to do, that in one sense He cannot do. Tertullian proceeds to say that Praxeas, in order to establish his point, ought to produce passages of Scripture in which the absolute identity of the Father and Son is as clearly expressed as is the distinction of Persons in the passages produced by the orthodox.<sup>1</sup> Our author then alleges various passages, many of them from the Old Testament,<sup>2</sup> and dwells particularly on Genesis i. 26—where God, when about to create man, speaks in the plural number, “Let *us* make man in our image, after our likeness.”<sup>3</sup>

“But how,” asked Praxeas, “do you clear yourself of the charge of polytheism — of teaching a plurality of gods?”<sup>4</sup> Having first shown by copious quotations from Scripture that the names Deus and Dominus are applied to Christ, and consequently that the sacred writers may with equal justice be accused of inculcating polytheism,<sup>5</sup> Tertullian answers, that “the orthodox never speak of two Gods or two Lords, though they affirm that each Person in the Trinity is God and Lord.<sup>6</sup> The design of those passages in the Old Testament, in which two Gods or two Lords are mentioned, was to prepare the minds of men to acknowledge Christ, when He should appear, as God and Lord. But now that Christ has appeared, the necessity for using this language has ceased, and we speak only of one God and one Lord. When, therefore, we have occasion to mention both the Father and Son, we imitate St. Paul, and call the Father, God ; the Son, Lord.<sup>7</sup> When to mention the Son alone, we again imitate St. Paul, and call Him God.”<sup>8</sup> “If,” adds Tertullian, “you require additional proof

<sup>1</sup> C. 11. Tertullian here uses an expression which Semler conceives to savour of Arianism. “Probare autem tam aperte debebis ex Scripturis, quam nos probamus *illum sibi Filium fecisse Sermonem suum.*” But Tertullian had before said, in speaking of the Reason and Word of God, “Cum ratione enim sua cogitans atque disponens Sermonem eam efficiebat, quam Sermone tractabat,” c. 5. See also *adv. Marcionem*, l. ii. c. 27. “Sermonem ejus, quem ex semetipso proferendo filium fecit.”

<sup>2</sup> Isa. xlii. 1, lxi. 1 ; Ps. cx. 1.

<sup>3</sup> C. 12. “Cum quibus enim faciebat hominem, et quibus faciebat similem? Cum Filio quidem, qui erat induturus hominem ; Spiritu vero, qui erat sanctificaturus hominem ; quasi cum ministris et arbitras, ex unitate Trinitatis, loquebatur.” The Jews supposed the Almighty in this verse to speak to the angels.

<sup>4</sup> C. 15.

<sup>5</sup> For instance, Tertullian refers to Ps. xlv. 7, 8, cx. 1 ; Isa. xlv. 14, liii. 1 ; Gen. xix. 14 ; John i. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Compare c. 19.

<sup>7</sup> Rom. i. 4.

<sup>8</sup> Rom. ix. 5.



of our abhorrence of polytheism, you may find it in our refusal to acknowledge two Gods and two Lords, although by making the acknowledgment we might escape the pains of martyrdom."

Tertullian proceeds to argue that a distinction of Persons in the Godhead affords the only means of reconciling some apparent inconsistencies in the sacred writings.<sup>1</sup> At one time God says to Moses that no man can see His face and live;<sup>2</sup> at another we read that God appeared to Abraham, Jacob, and the prophets. These apparent contradictions can only be reconciled by supposing that it was the Son who appeared.<sup>3</sup> "But what," asked Praxeas, "do you gain by this supposition? Is not the Son, who is the Word and Spirit, equally invisible with the Father? And if it was the Son who conversed with Moses, it was the face of the Son which no man could see and live; you in fact establish the identity of the Father and Son. Father and Son are only names applied to the same God; the former, when He is invisible; the latter, when visible." "We grant," answers Tertullian, "that the Son, inasmuch as He is God, and Word, and Spirit, is invisible; but He was seen by the prophets in visions, and conversed with Moses face to face at the time of the transfiguration; for in that event was accomplished the promise made by God to speak with Moses face to face.<sup>4</sup> The New Testament confirms this distinction between the Father, who was never seen, and the Son, who appeared in early times in visions, but afterwards in the flesh.<sup>5</sup> The Son not only made all things, but has from the beginning conducted the government of this world.<sup>6</sup> To Him all power was given. He it was who executed judgment upon mankind, by causing the deluge, and by destroying Sodom and Gomorrah. He it was who descended to converse with man, appearing to Abraham, the patriarchs, and the prophets in visions, and thus as it were preparing Himself for His future residence on earth, when He was to assume the form and substance of man, and to become subject to human infirmities.<sup>7</sup> Praxeas, on the contrary, ignorantly imputes all these acts to the Father, and supposes the Omnipotent, Invisible God, who dwells

<sup>1</sup> C. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Ex. xxxiii. 13, 18, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Compare *adv. Judæos*, c. 9; *adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. cc. 6, 9; l. iv. cc. 10, 13; l. v. c. 19; *de Carne Christi*, c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Num. xii. 2.

<sup>5</sup> C. 15. We have seen, chap. i. note 2, p. 12, that Tertullian applies to the Holy Spirit the names *Christi Vicarius*, *Domini Vicarius*. *De Virginibus velandis*, c. 1. In like manner he calls Christ, *Vicarius Patris*. *Adv. Marcionem*, l. iii. c. 6; *adv. Praxeam*, c. 24.

<sup>6</sup> C. 16.

<sup>7</sup> Compare c. 12.



in light inaccessible, to have been seen by man and to have suffered thirst and hunger. He makes this supposition, because the attributes and titles of God are ascribed in Scripture to Him who appeared to man, forgetting that those attributes and titles equally belong to the Son, though not precisely in the same manner as to the Father."<sup>1</sup>

Our author next enters upon the consideration of those passages of Scripture which were urged by Praxeas in proof of the identity of the Father and Son.<sup>2</sup> When it is said, for instance, that *there is one God the Father, and besides Him there is no other*, Tertullian affirms that the existence of the Son is not denied, who is indeed one God with the Father.<sup>3</sup> "These," he observes, "and similar expressions were directed against the idolatry and polytheism of the heathen; or designed to confute by anticipation the notions of those heretics who feigned another God by whom Christ was sent, distinct from the Creator. The error of Praxeas arises from confining his attention to those passages which favour his own opinion, and overlooking those which clearly bespeak a distinction of Persons, without however violating the unity of the Godhead." Praxeas appears to have insisted particularly on the following texts in St. John's Gospel:—*I and my Father are one. He who has seen me has seen the Father also. I in my Father, and my Father in me.*<sup>4</sup> "To these few texts," observes Tertullian, "he wishes to make the whole of the Old and New Testaments bend; whereas, had he been really desirous of discovering the truth, he would have sought for such an interpretation of them as would have reconciled them to the rest of Scripture." Our author then proceeds to show, by a minute analysis of St. John's Gospel, that the Father and Son are constantly spoken of as distinct Persons.<sup>5</sup> With respect to the first of the texts alleged by Praxeas—*I and my Father are one*, or as it stood in his Latin version, *Ego et Pater unum sumus*—he animadverts severely upon the folly of that heretic in urging it, who ought to have seen in the first place that two Persons are mentioned, *Ego et Pater*; in the next that the word *sumus* implies a plurality of persons.<sup>6</sup> "If," he continues, "the masculine noun *unus* had been used instead of the neuter *unum*, the passage might have afforded some countenance to the doctrine of Praxeas,—since *unus* might

<sup>1</sup> C. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Cc. 18, 19.

<sup>3</sup> C. 20. Isa. lxxv. 5.

<sup>4</sup> C. 10, ver. 30, 38, and c. 14, ver. 10.

<sup>5</sup> Cc. 21, 23, 24.

<sup>6</sup> C. 22. Tertullian's interpretation of the second text will be found in c. 24.