

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

LECTURE VI.

Interpolation of Cyprian in the editions of Manutius and of Pamelius; continued by the Benedictine editors. Purity of earlier editions. No evidence of the corruption of MSS. Limited extent of the remaining corruptions in the edition of Manutius. Mass of evidence in Cyprian against the Romanists; on the Papal Supremacy; on Transubstantiation; on Tradition; on Absolution; on Extreme Unction; on the number of the Sacraments. Germ of abuses discoverable in him; not introduced by the Romanists. Estimate of patristic testimony formed by English Divines since the Reformation. Causes of the outcry against the Fathers raised by Dailé and others.

I SAID that the first of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and indeed the only one, whom the Romanists are *distinctly* charged either by Dailé or by James' with abusing by interpolations or omissions, is Cyprian; and I have reserved him for a separate and fuller consideration, because in this instance the accusation is made on specific grounds, and the paragraphs adduced, which are supposed to sustain it. For, as I have remarked, Dailé at least usually indulges in more general declamation on the subject of forgery.

It seems that in the Roman edition of Cyprian printed by Manutius in 1564, there were, for the first time, several words introduced into a passage in the "De Unitate Ecclesiæ" of Cyprian, with a view to support the doctrine of the Supremacy of the Pope: and that in the Antwerp edition of Pamelius in 1568, a few more to the same effect were added: corruptions, we may subjoin, which have been continued in the Benedictine edition, though evidently with the feeling on the part of the editor, that corruptions they are, and that the words in question have no right to the place assigned them in the text.² Thus, whereas the genuine Cyprian says, "The

¹ See James's Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers, Part II. p. 75, and Dailé, p. 83.

² See a curious note in italics in p. 545 of the Benedict Ed., giving the reason why they had been restored,

though Baluzius, whom in general that edition follows, had expunged them.

Hæc rationum momenta, de quibus Critici judicabant, Baluzium adduxerant, ut nonnulla ex hoc testimonio expungeret. Sed reposita fuere in textu,

Church was built upon one (super unum),” meaning Peter ; the interpolated Cyprian says, “upon him alone (super illum unum).” Whereas the genuine Cyprian says, Christ, “that he might make manifest the principle of unity, ordered it by his authority, that the origin of that same unity should begin from one ;” the interpolated Cyprian says, “Christ, that he might make manifest the principle of unity, established one chair (unam cathedram constituit), and ordered it by his authority,” &c. Whereas the genuine Cyprian says, “Still what Peter was, the same were the other Apostles also ; endowed with the same share of honour and power : but the beginning proceeds from unity, in order that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one ; which Church the Holy Spirit in the person of the Lord in the Song of Songs designates to be one, and says,” &c. : the interpolated Cyprian says, “but the beginning proceeds from unity. The *Primacy is given to Peter (Primatus Petro datur)*, in order that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one, and the chair one (et cathedra una). And they are all shepherds, but the flock is shown to be one, which was to be fed by all the Apostles with unanimous consent (et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur), which Church the Holy Spirit in the person of the Lord,” &c. And whereas the genuine Cyprian says, “Whoso strives against and resists the Church, can he trust that he is in the Church ?” The interpolated Cyprian says, “Whoso strives against and resists the Church ; *whoso deserts the Chair of Peter on which the Church is founded (qui cathedram Petri, super quam fundata est ecclesia, deserit)*, can he trust that he is in the Church ?”¹

Now, these are, no doubt, wilful interpolations of Cyprian, all of them, mind you, occurring in one and the same passage of the “De Unitate Ecclesiæ,” so that no general adulteration of the author is pretended. But the example, if used to support Daillé in his charge of forgery, cuts both ways, hinders more than helps him, since the same evidence, which

propterea quod servata fuerunt in omnibus editionibus, quæ in Galliâ ab annis centum et quinquaginta prodierunt, etiam in Rigaltianâ. Quinetiam necesse

fuit in Baluzii notis non pauca mutare, ac plura essent mutata, id si commode fieri potuisset.

¹ Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesiæ, § iv.

proves this Roman edition of 1564 by Manutius to be interpolated in that particular place, proves also how free from interpolation even this passage had been kept in the custody of the Romanists up to that time. There had been editions of Cyprian printed, one in 1477, two in 1520, one in 1525, and one in 1530; all without these intrusive paragraphs. Indeed, Pamelius himself testifies that he had the use of eight or nine printed copies of Cyprian that were before 1564, which were without them; and nine or ten MSS., but one of which contained them¹: so that the habit of the middle ages, the ages of Daillé's corruptors, as far as the present case testifies, was to keep the ecclesiastical treasures committed to them safe and unimpaired, indeed often not aware that they had such in possession, however, by accident for the once, it might be violated. Nor indeed was it likely that frauds of this kind would be started to any great extent, so long as the Church had no jealous eyes fixed upon her. It was the stir of the æra of the Reformation, which tempted her to falsify antiquity for her own support, but that age which supplied the temptation to fraud, supplied also light and opportunity for detecting it. Indeed, it must have been no easy matter to corrupt the *manuscripts* of an author (so long as his works only existed in manuscript) for a specific purpose, and to make those manuscripts speak uniformly. They were scattered over Christendom, and copies of these would be multiplied from that manuscript, which was the readiest to be had. Nothing could have been more difficult than to render the errors of all identical. A *translation* might give an universal wrong impression of the original, because all the transcripts of that translation would be alike; and whenever the translation, and that only, was read, it would give the same impression of the author, and that an erroneous one. Rufinus, *e.g.* expressly tells us that he had misrepresented Origen, when he thought it expedient to do so, in his version of the "De Principiis,"² and accordingly Rufinus's Origen in the absence of the Greek text is that which is now in circulation. But the heretics, to whom he imputes by *conjecture* the interpolation of these passages, which he thinks objectionable in Origen, and which he therefore takes on himself to alter, would have hardly done

¹ Corruptions, Pt. II. p. 78.

² Origen, Prologus Rufini in Libros | de Principiis and Præf. Lib. tert. pp. 45.

107, Bened. Ed.

so without a conspiracy to that effect amongst all of their body in Christendom, wherever a manuscript of Origen then was—a thing very improbable in itself. Even mutilation of manuscripts though much more easy than interpolation, is proved to have been very difficult to do effectually; that is to say, in a manner so universal, that all the manuscripts should conspire. Thus the five last chapters of Irenæus, were suppressed in all the editions of Irenæus, which preceded that of Feuardentius, and upon the faith of manuscripts. The extinction of them, however, effected, as is supposed, by those who disapproved of the doctrine of the Millennium, which they advocated, was not so complete, but that Feuardentius found them in his own manuscript, and replaced them, future editors following him; and now they stand as a monument of the impracticability of this kind of fraud.

There is another complaint still made by James against the edition of Manutius—that it omits the 74th and 75th Epistles; the first, one of Cyprian “ad Pompeium contra Epistolam Stephani;” the latter an Epistle of Firmilianus to Cyprian; and both of them taking very great liberties with the Pope. But these are found in all the manuscripts, so that no attempt was made to suppress them in the middle ages; and they were even restored by Pamelius in his edition, which came out four years later than that of Manutius,¹ and are now in the Benedictine edition.

Daillé also notices² a wilful omission of the sentence “Et vestram quoque sententiam”³ in Ep. xi. to the people of Carthage, in Pamelius’ edition and in the two editions which had preceded it—these words showing that the people took part in the affairs and deliberations of the Church, together with the clergy; on which account, says Daillé, they were suppressed. But it *was* a suppression, for the words are confessed to have been in the manuscripts, which had therefore been kept pure⁴; and they were restored in subsequent editions, and now are found in the Benedictine. And the same is true of the alteration of “Petrum” for “Petram” made by Pame-

¹ James, Pt. II. p. 87.

² Daillé, p. 83.

³ Audiant, quæso, patienter consilium nostrum; expectent regressionem nostram ut, cum ad vos per Dei misericordiam venerimus, convocati coepiscopi

plures, secundum Domini disciplinam et confessorum presentiam et vestram quoque sententiam, beatorum martyrum literas et desideria examinare possimus.
—Cyprian, Ep. xi. § 3.

⁴ See Benedict. Ed. p. 398.

lius in the 40th Letter, also noticed by Daillé: it was made against the manuscripts, and has since been corrected by the Romanists themselves.

I do not observe any other charge against the Romanists with respect to their treatment of Cyprian besides these; for as to the last three letters, printed in the Benedictine edition of Cyprian, the editor himself does not pretend that they are genuine—*habes fatentem reum*—and yet what a temptation must they have been under in dealing with him, to mutilate him, if they knew what was in him! For who can read Cyprian without perceiving the strong testimony he bears against the Romanists in many most vital dogmas, he a Latin Father too, and therefore so much more accessible than a Greek; so that if they spared his writings, whose should they spoil? Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, in the 48th Letter, writes to Cyprian and tells him of the schismatical proceedings of Novatianus, Novatus, and others; and in the 49th, Cyprian replies to Cornelius, approving what he had done, confirming his ill opinion of Novatus by a report of his proceedings at Carthage before he went to Rome, where his attempts to disturb the Church were the same as those he had made at Carthage; “only,” adds Cyprian, “as Rome, on account of *its magnitude*, ought to take the lead of Carthage, his achievements there have been worse and more mischievous.” Is this the ground on which the modern Church of Rome would have its superiority established? The 55th Letter of Cyprian is addressed to the same Cornelius in terms quite didactic—Cornelius, it should seem, having invited his counsel in a difficulty. Again, his 67th Letter is written to Stephanus, the successor of Cornelius, entirely in the language of an equal, the Gallic Church having appealed for advice to them both as conspicuous Bishops of the Church Catholic, and Cyprian in this letter suggesting what should be done. The 68th Letter is an answer to a similar application for counsel made by the Church of Spain to Cyprian, and not made, you will observe, to the Bishop of Rome. The 74th Letter, addressed to Pompeius, a Bishop of Tripolis, animadverts on a letter of the same Stephanus on the subject of the Baptism of heretics, in terms of high indignation. He bids Pompeius read this letter of Stephanus, which he incloses to him, “and then,” says he, “you will mark his error yet more and

more ; endeavouring, as he does, to assert the cause of the heretics against the Christians, and against the Church of God. For amongst other things either arrogant, or irrelevant, or inconsistent with himself, which he has incautiously written, he has added this, ' If any one, therefore, of any heresy come to you, let no innovation on tradition be attempted, and let imposition of hands be allowed him on repentance.' Not innovate on tradition," Cyprian then exclaims, " as if he was not the innovator, who forgets the unity of the Church, and usurps the right of imparting his mendacious and pestilent dipping. . . . What obstinacy and presumption is it to prefer human tradition to the Divine will, and not to perceive that God is angry as often as human tradition annuls the Divine precepts ; saying, ' Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect for the sake of your tradition.'¹ . . . How, then, hath the gross perverseness of our brother Stephanus gone to that extreme, that he should maintain, that sons may be born to God even by the baptism of Marcion, of Valentinus, of Apelles, and other blasphemers against God the Father ; and say, that remission of sins is given in the name of Christ, even by those who blaspheme the Father and Christ the Lord God." Whilst in the Epistle of Firmilianus on the same subject, the 75th, we have language held towards Stephanus as strong as Luther's could have been ; " I am greatly indignant at the open and manifest folly of Stephanus." " How diligently hath Stephanus fulfilled these wholesome mandates of the Apostle ! What lowliness and meekness doth he observe ! For what more meek and lowly than to disagree with so many Bishops throughout the world, breaking the bond of peace with each by vain words of discord !" " Thus is not Stephanus ashamed to patronize heretics against the Church, and by such patronage to divide the brethren ; nay, even to call Cyprian a false Christ, a false apostle, a deceitful workman ; who, being conscious that he was all these himself, forestalled the charge !" And much more to the same effect. Is this the kind of language which Rome would wish to preserve and circulate ? Yet there it is in the manuscripts, which have been for ages in her custody ! The manner in which she is disposed to deal with it (for she feels the pungency of it) is by endeavouring to discredit Firmilianus himself ; to how little

¹ Matt. xv. 6.

purpose, however, may be seen in Bishop Pearson's defence of Firmilian, which is attached to Mr. Churton's recent Life of Pearson.¹ But this attempt of the Romanists was all fair ; if they could succeed in damaging the character of the testimony of Firmilian by argument or historical evidence, well and good. But they did not expunge the letter from the manuscripts. Again, in a letter to Quintus, a Bishop of Mauritania,² on the same subject, Cyprian writes, "After all it must not be merely custom, but reason, that must decide the question. For Peter, whom the Lord chose first, and upon whom he built his Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him on the question of circumcision, did not make *any arrogant claims for himself, and say that he had obtained the Primacy*, and ought to be obeyed by those who were younger and later than himself ; neither did he despise Paul, because he had been a persecutor of the Church, but listened to the sound reasons by which Paul maintained his cause." Again, a few schismatics, who had set up a Bishop of their own at Carthage, had sailed to Rome, as we have already seen, and published their proceedings there in the hope of finding support. In the letter which Cyprian writes to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, to counteract these,³ and to which I have before had occasion to refer, he asserts principles quite at variance with the pretensions of the modern Church of Rome. "Since it is determined by us all," says he, "and is a thing no more than just and right, that the cause of every one should be heard in the place where his offence has been committed, and that his own portion of the flock should be assigned to each pastor for himself to guide and govern, having by and by himself to render an account of the same to God, it becomes those whom we preside over not to run about and bring Bishops into collision by their temerity, but to plead their cause in the place where they have both their accusers and witnesses, unless it be, that to a few desperate and abandoned men the authority of the Bishops of Africa may seem less, because they have already passed judgment upon them, and condemned by their grave censure those whom their own consciences had condemned already." There is an independence here claimed for separate Churches, which would not suit the Pope of Rome of later times, as

¹ Bp. Pearson's Minor Theological Works, Vol. I. Appendix A. p. civ.

² Ep. lxxi.

³ Ep. lv.

would neither the assertion contained in an address of Cyprian's to the Bishops assembled at Carthage to record their sentiments on heretical Baptism. "None of us holds himself to be a Bishop of Bishops, nor by any tyrannical threats drives his colleagues to the necessity of obedience, inasmuch as every Bishop must exercise his free judgment according to the right of liberty he possesses."¹ I could produce abundance of passages on the Supremacy of the same character from Cyprian, and am only embarrassed by the affluence of my resources.

Again, we find in the 63rd Epistle many expressions altogether inconsistent with their author's belief in *Transubstantiation*. "Christ's Blood *seems* to be in the cup (*videtur esse in calice*)"—"is represented (*ostenditur*)"—"water alone cannot possibly *express* the Blood of Christ (*quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere.*)" But as I referred to these passages at some length in the second Lecture, I now only remind you of them. There is another passage, however, to which I did not then advert, to the same purport, in the 76th Epistle. "When the Lord *calls* the bread his Body (*vocat*), made up as that bread is of many grains, he indicates, that our people, whom he bare, were to be *united*; and when he *calls* the wine his Blood (*appellat*), made up as that wine is from many berries of the grape, he signifies that our flock is composed of an *united* multitude." The use of such terms is inconsistent with the existence of a belief in *Transubstantiation* in the mind of Cyprian at the time. Yet remember, all these expressions, from which we draw so important a conclusion, are found in manuscripts preserved for us by the Romanists.

Again, observe the manner in which the question of *Tradition* is treated of by Cyprian. It was touched upon in a former quotation, but it requires to be more distinctly produced: my object, you will bear in mind, being all along to show that the character of the writings of Cyprian, even as we have them at present, is in itself a presumption, that the Romanists cannot have meddled with them to any amount;

¹ Neque enim quisquam nostrum | libertatis et potestatis sue arbitrium
episcopum se esse episcoporum consti- | proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non
tuit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi | possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum
necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quan- | judicare.—Concil. Carthag. sub Cypri-
do habeat omnis episcopus pro licentiâ | ano VII.

and that it is unfair, therefore, to insinuate the charge without some definite evidence of it. Thus, "Whence is this tradition?" says Cyprian, in answer to Stephanus on one occasion, when he had pleaded it against him. "Whence is this tradition? Does it descend from the authority of the Lord and the Gospel, or from the mandates and Epistles of the Apostles? For God testifies that those things are to be done, which are *written*; his language to Joshua being, 'This book of the Law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is *written* therein.'¹ And the same Lord sends his Apostles and commands them to baptize all nations, and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever He hath commanded.² If, therefore, it is either taught in the Gospel, or is contained in the Epistles of the Apostles, or in the Acts, that persons coming from whatever heresy are not to be baptized, but are simply to receive imposition of hands as penitents, let this *Divine and holy tradition be observed*. But if they are always named as enemies, and antichrists, as to be avoided and as self-condemned, how can they not be condemned by us?"³ Again, "Let us, I say, as faithful servants of God, defend the camp, committed to us from above, with trustworthy valour: and let not *custom*, which hath beguiled some, prevail with us against truth. For *custom without truth is merely antiquity of error*."⁴ Once more in the same Epistle, "If a pipe, which supplied water, suddenly failed, should we not go to the fountain-head to know the cause, whether the spring was dry, or whether the failure was between, in the middle—the pipe broken or leaky—in order that this being repaired, the water might be restored to the city, fresh and full? So ought the priests of God to act in keeping the Divine precepts. If the truth is in any particular shaken or damaged, we must revert to the Divine source, to Evangelical and Apostolical tradition, that our conduct may proceed according to the origin it springs from." The terms Evangelical and Apostolical tradition, pointing, it should seem, to the written Gospels and Epistles, to which reference had been made as a standard already in the same letter. In the Council of the 87 Bishops, whose sentiments Cyprian has

¹ Joshua i. 8.² Matt. xxviii. 20.³ Ep. lxxiv.⁴ Ibid.

left on record, Libosus of Vaga said, "The Lord in the Gospel declared, 'I am the truth.' He did not say, 'I am custom.' Therefore, when truth is discovered, custom must give place to it."¹ In the same Council, Felix of Bussacenaë said, "Let no one prefer custom to reason and truth in admitting heretics without Baptism into the Church." Further yet, in the Epistle of Firmilianus the Church of Rome is boldly charged with not conforming in all respects itself to tradition; and tradition is again tested by Scripture. "But that the brethren at Rome themselves do not keep primitive tradition in all particulars, and that they pretend to the authority of the Apostles without ground, one may know from this, that with regard to the time of celebrating Easter and many other mysteries of religion, they seem to observe different customs from others, from *the Church of Jerusalem for instance*—and so in very many provinces, many other things differ according to the difference of places and names, and yet there is no departure on this account from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church. Whereas, Stephanus has dared to break that peace with you, which his predecessors have always maintained towards you in mutual love and honour; and has even dared to defame Peter and Paul, the blessed Apostles, as though the *tradition* had come from them, whereas in their *Epistles* they execrate heretics, and warn us to avoid them."

I am not now determining how far Cyprian is judicious in all his remarks on the subject of tradition; or how far the accidental circumstance of the Bishop of Rome being against him on a great question, and pressing him with tradition, which that Bishop maintained was against him too, drove Cyprian, a man of hot temperament, or Firmilianus, who seems to have been of the same, to disparage tradition unduly, and in a manner, which might be made to recoil on themselves; but I venture to claim these passages as conceived in a spirit utterly adverse to the teaching of Rome on this difficult question; and I venture to claim them too as passages, which she would have been likely to expunge from the manuscripts, had she made no conscience at all about the custody of such documents; and had simply used them in whatever way appeared most for the advantage of the Romish Church—unless, indeed, she was ignorant of the contents of Cyprian's works; which is an

¹ Concil. Carthag. sub Cypriano VII.

alternative that answers my purpose equally well; for she could not interpolate what she did not read.

Again, on the subject of *Absolution*, the language of Cyprian is remarkable for its moderation. Thus even Cornelius himself, the Bishop of Rome, writes in a letter found in Cyprian,¹ as follows. "We restored Maximus to his place in the Church, and received the rest, the people greatly approving. But we *left the whole to God, in whose power all things are reserved.*" In another Epistle Cyprian himself, after saying that no absolution was to be had for schismatics,² however they might get through the preliminary forms, proceeds, "Who under such circumstances would not resign himself to despair?" and adds, the Church then is not to repel penitents; "and inasmuch as there can be no confession in the grave, penitents must be received into the Church again before they die, and must be reserved in it for the Lord, who, when He shall come to His Church, will himself determine who are they that He finds within it."³ Nor are we left at a loss to know the rule by which Cyprian imagines the Deity will act on such occasions. For in another place⁴ of the same Epistle, he says, "Neither do we prejudice the judgment of God, who if He finds the penitence of the sinner full and satisfactory, will ratify that which we have decreed. But if any one have cheated us by a show of penitence, God who will not be mocked, and who knows the heart, will determine from matters which have escaped our eye, and rectify the decision of his ministers." There are several other passages in Cyprian carefully referring to God as the fountain of all pardon, however he may make his Priests the conditional instruments of conveying it.⁵ Would this be the tone in which the Church of Rome would willingly speak on the subject of Absolution? Yet she was the guardian of the manuscripts that put us in possession of the evidence against herself.

With respect to *Purgatory*, Cyprian may here be in some degree wise beyond what is written; but the Church of Rome

¹ Ep. xlvi. § 2.

² *I. e.* as long as they continued in schism. Cyprian is arguing against those who objected to the restoration of the lapsed.—Ed.

³ In *Ecclesiam* debent interius sus-

cipi et in ipsâ Domino reservari, qui ad *Ecclesiam* suam venturus de illis utique, quos in eâ intus invenerit, iudicabit.—Ep. lii. § 29.

⁴ Ep. lii. § 18.

⁵ See *De Lapsis*, §§ xvi. xvii. *Testimoniorum*, III. c. xxviii.

at any rate would find no plea for the monstrous abuses, which have grown up under her teaching, in the writings of Cyprian at least. He appears to consider that the souls of none are so free from the stain of sin when they die, as to be fit at once to enjoy the presence of God, that the last farthing (an expression which we have seen other of the Fathers apply to the remains of sin, which are to be scoured out of the soul by some discipline even after death) is to be paid by all, however good, except the martyrs; they are excused the rigorous exaction.¹ This premised, we read in him such passages as the following, "Believe then, and live ye: and ye who persecute us for a time, rejoice with us for eternity; when ye depart hence, no place will be left for repentance, no *opportunity for making satisfaction* will remain. *Here* it is, that our life is lost or kept. *Here* we must provide for our eternal salvation by the worship of God, and the fruits of faith. *Whilst we are in the world* no repentance is too late. The way to God's indulgence lies open; and access is easy for those who seek and understand His truth. Do you, even at the very last, when this temporal life is on the point of setting, beg pardon of God for your sins; beseech Him confessing and believing; and pardon is granted you: the Divine compassion is accorded to your faith; and at the point of death a passage is made for you to immortality."² And again, "Whatsoever God finds you when he calls you, such will he judge you."³ And again in the same tract, "Behold then the world is shaking, and bespeaks its downfall, not from age, but from its end being come: and do you not give God thanks, who is removing you from the catastrophe?" "Who, when abroad, and on his return home, does not wish for speed? And for a prosperous wind, that he may the sooner embrace those who are dear to him? Paradise is our country. Why do we not hasten to salute our relations, who are there before us? Numbers of parents, of brothers, of sons? What a joy will it be in common to them and to ourselves, to meet together again!"⁴

Here there may be some difficulty in reconciling the former with the latter statements, though perhaps the assertions of Cyprian, on the whole, may be thought to amount to no more

¹ De Laude Martyrii, § xiii.

² Ad Demetrianum, § xxv.

³ De Mortalitate, § xvii.

⁴ §§ xxv. xxvi.

than this, that the fruition of the righteous spirits will not be perfect, though partial fruition there will be for them, till after the judgment, when soul and body shall have been united again, that till then there will be an amari aliquid in ipsis floribus. But however that may be, I only adduce the passages to show that a Romanist, who had to defend his Church on the doctrine of Purgatory, as that doctrine has been practically held by that Church for many years past, would not thank the manuscripts of Cyprian for backing him no better than thus; and that if he knew their contents, and did not meddle with them in order to mend them, it is fair to suppose that it might be his honesty which stood in his way.

Again, the writings of Cyprian seem to furnish evidence, not demonstrative, but all that could be expected under the circumstances, against the practice, much more against the Sacrament, of *Extreme Unction*.¹ At least, I come to such conclusion, from perceiving that on one or two occasions there is no mention made of it, where mention of it might have been expected. Thus, in a letter to the clergy touching the treatment of the lapsed and the catechumens, having observed that there appeared no likelihood of his being able to return to them, and as the summer was coming on, which was a season of sickness, it was necessary that provision should be made respecting the brethren, Cyprian continues, "If any of them shall have received recommendations from the martyrs, and shall find themselves in a dangerous disease, they shall not wait the presence of the Bishop, but after confession made to a Priest, or in his absence to a Deacon, they shall receive imposition of hands from him, and be re-

¹ There is mention made by Irenæus (I. c. xxi. § 5) of a certain party amongst the *heretics*, who communicated their rite of initiation to dying persons by pouring upon their heads a mixture of water and oil, in order to prepare their souls for passing invisibly through the spiritual principdoms and powers, that were opposed to them, and escaping their hands; but it is not to be supposed that the Romanists would claim this as their precedent for *Extreme Unction*.

In Justin Martyr there is a passage where the closing scene of life is touched on without any allusion to

Extreme Unction. It is a comment on the 22nd Psalm, applying it in detail to Christ; and when the verses 20 and 21 present themselves, Justin proceeds: "Then his asking that his soul should be saved from the sword, and from the lion's mouth, and from the paw of the dog, was a petition that no one might get the dominion over his soul; in order that we ourselves, when on the point of departing out of life, may make the same request of God, who is able to turn away from us every shameless, every evil angel, that it may not lay hold of our souls."—Dial. § 105.

stored to the Lord in peace.”¹ Here the death of the parties is contemplated, and the Pax of the Church is to be communicated to them; yet no allusion is made to the rite of Extreme Unction. And this admission of the sick, before death, to the “Peace” of the Church (a vestige of the custom still remaining in our Service for the Visitation of the Sick, which commences with “Peace be to this house!”) is many times referred to in the Epistles of Cyprian, but still without any notice of Extreme Unction. In Ep. xiv. “And when certain of the Lapsed, set themselves to extort by violence ‘Peace’ from the Martyrs and Confessors, I so far yielded, that if any who had a Martyr’s recommendation should be in danger of death, his confession was to be received, hands imposed on him, and he to be restored to the Lord.” And in Epistle xxxi., an Epistle which those of his clergy who lived at Rome wrote to Cyprian, we read, “We have thought that nothing new should be done before the appointment of our Bishop: that until such appointment, those of the Lapsed who should be sick unto death, and whose case, therefore, would admit of no delay, on their penitence and tears should be comforted, but with caution, it being left to God to do what He would with such persons, but we on our sides taking care that no over facility should be laid to our own charge.” I think that in one or more of these passages it would have been natural that some mention should have been made of Extreme Unction, had that rite been then an established usage of the Church. And in the silence there is with respect to it, I still find an argument in favour of the manuscript of Cyprian not having been medicated by the Romanists.

On the whole, indeed, with regard to the Sacraments, the testimony of Cyprian, so far as it goes, is in favour of two only as generally necessary to salvation, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. For so much I infer from the following paragraph in the third book “Of the Testimonies against the Jews:” “It is to little purpose to be baptized and to receive the Eucharist, unless we also abound in good works.”² Why single out these two ordinances as the peculiar means of salva-

¹ Ep. xii.

² *Parum esse baptizari et Eucharistiam accipere, nisi quis factis et opere*

proficiat.—Testimoniorum, lib. III. c. xxvi.

tion, to the exclusion of others, unless there was something in them of more than common efficacy; something in them which set them above other rites of the Church, however other rites might also be called in common parlance *Sacramenta* also?—an inference, I observe by the way, seconded by a passage in Justin of a similar import, where, having mentioned the stick (*ξύλον*) which Elisha cast into the river, and so recovered the ax-head, thereby making the sons of the prophets to proceed in building their house, he adds, “in like manner did Christ recover us, when plunged into the depths of sin, by being *crucified on the wood*, and by purifying us through the *water*, and so did he make a house of prayer and adoration”¹—the two Sacraments of the Eucharist and Baptism here also represented, though indirectly, as the ordinances more especially necessary to salvation. The argument is certainly rather founded on the silence of Cyprian, than on his assertion. But we are not to expect from him a formal declaration that there are two Sacraments (in the sense I suppose), if nobody in his time imagined that there were more. The negative testimony is all that the case admits of. Once more I ask, Is there any symptom of Romish interference with the copies of Cyprian here?

It is true that in Cyprian, as we have found was the fact with other of the Fathers before him, the germ or rudiment of several opinions and practices which eventually became abuses of the Church of Rome, are to be discovered. But it is the germ or rudiment only, and it must be ever remembered in how different a light *we* see these faint beginnings after the abuse has become inveterate and notorious, from that in which they would be regarded whilst they were yet initiative only, and when no such evil consequence could have been anticipated. I discover, for instance, in Cyprian’s picture of the Church, the elements of the Nun; I mean in the mention he makes of virgins who had dedicated themselves to Christ, not, however, it should seem by a vow, but rather by a resolution, and conditionally.² But when Cyprian applauded such self-denial, could he foresee the excess to which the system of the convent was in process of time to prevail, or the evils that were to flow from it? And would he not probably think he was but

¹ Justin Martyr, Dial. § 86.

² Cyprian, Ep. lxii.; De Habitu Vir. | ginum, §§ iv. xxii.

speaking in unison with St. Paul, "I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I?"¹

Again, I detect the shadow of coming events in the language which Cyprian, when speaking against premature and reckless absolution, incidentally uses, with respect to the influence of the Martyrs—That "he believes," *e. g.* "that the merits of the martyrs, and the works of the just, may have great power with the Judge; but it must be when the day of judgment comes, and when, after the consummation of all things here, we shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ;"² his meaning, perhaps, explained by another passage, where he apostrophizes certain confessors in prison, in substance as follows:—"Happy they who have finished their course, and have gone to their Lord's embrace! But your glory is no less, whilst ye tarry and set others an example. Ye fear not death, but rather desire it. Now is the time, brethren dearly beloved, for you to remember me in your prayers, which must be prevailing, for what can you ask from the goodness of the Lord which you do not deserve to obtain?"³—the latter paragraph, I say, seeming to throw light upon the former; and the two taken together to be understood as affirming that the prayers of living martyrs, for the term martyr may be applied to the living, would find such favour in God's sight as would recommend their petitions for others to God, and be found to have done them service at the judgment day. Still, in such language as this, I say, it is possible we may detect the intercession of *departed saints*, as invoked by the later Church of Rome, gradually gaining a footing in the Church.

As again, in the certificates of character or *Libelli* furnished by the Martyrs to those amongst the Lapsed, whose welfare they felt interested in, certificates which were honoured in the Church, and which admitted the bearers of them again into communion with the Church,⁴ I can imagine I recognise traces of the Indulgences of Papal Rome; more especially as these *Libelli* themselves were greatly abused, insomuch that Cyprian has to lay the issue of them under regulations⁵; common

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 8.

² De Lapsis, § xvii.

³ Ep. xv.

⁴ Ep. x. Ep. xiv.

⁵ Ep. x.

friends of the Martyrs and the Lapsed inducing the Martyrs to give certificates on the faith of their recommendation to persons with whom they were themselves unacquainted, and in whose character they were often grossly deceived, and if I understand a particular expression rightly these dishonest go-betweens, in some instances, making a sale of their services. "But this may be brought about if you regulate those requests which are made to you by religious considerations, taking care to understand and repress those who, having a respect to persons, either pay compliments by means of your favours, or make a pecuniary profit by means of this unlawful negotiation of theirs."¹ The sanction given to these Libelli by the Church, might or might not be indiscreet even at the time, though we must consider of what importance it was to the Church that her Martyrs in those days should be treated with the highest honour—persecution warring against the Church, and bent on extirpating it—we must remember how much the propagation of the true faith depended on the steadfastness of the confessor, and how reasonable, therefore, it was to brace him up to his arduous conflict by every subordinate motive which might weigh with him. But however that may be, it would be hard indeed to visit the Primitive Church with our condemnation for allowing these Libelli (putting them, too, under restrictions), because *we* happen to know, what it was impossible she should, that they might be stepping-stones to Papal Indulgences.

I say that in Cyprian we may discover such foretastes of future opinions and practices of the Church of Rome, as these are examples of; but they are surely not of a character to imply that his writings have been tampered with by Romanists. The Romanists would not have been likely to content themselves with representing questionable features of their Church in the distance, so very faintly as this, or have made no other use of antiquity to sanction their abuses, than this inadequate one. Take them all as the faithful picture of Cyprian's own times, and everything falls into its right place; they become usages very likely to prevail under the circumstances of the Church at that period, and such as might be supposed to grow

¹ Hoc autem totum potest fieri, si ea quæ a vobis petuntur religiosâ contemplatione moderemini, intelligentes et comprimentes eos, qui, personas acci-

pientes, in beneficiis vestris aut gratificantur, aut illicite negotiationis nundinas aucupantur.—Ep. x. § 3.

no less naturally in the course of subsequent generations into the malpractices that succeeded. This theory, which is the obvious one, renders all recourse to Papal interpolation as needless, as such provision is inadequate to explain all the particulars of the case.

In all that I have been saying in this and the two last Lectures, my immediate object has been to show from internal evidence, on a general survey of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, that when Daillé and others would disparage *these* Fathers at least—for I predicate nothing with respect to such as are of a later date—by charging them in the mass as alloyed by Romish interpolations, and, consequently, as unworthy of our trust, they are not dealing fairly by them; nor yet by those persons, who, but for the false impression of them they have thus received, might have been disposed to read them and judge for themselves of their merits. But, for argument's sake, let these Fathers be as full of Romish interpolations and corruptions as you please, they still do bear, as you have seen, very strong testimony to very many capital points in favour of the practice and doctrine of the Church of England, and against those of the Church of Rome. Take them as they are, with all their reputed imperfections on their heads, and still this is true of them; and the more you insist on their imperfections, the more you make that testimony tell: since, if carrying so much weight, as you say they do, they still run for the Reformers, what would they do, if they were not weighted at all?

Surely this must have been the impression on Jewel's mind, when he ventured on his famous challenge—and the impression on the minds of the Non-jurors, when they, as I believe they did, renewed it—and the impression on Archbishop Wake's, when he translated and put into circulation several of their writings—and on Archbishop Potter's, when he edited one of them—and the impression of both the one and the other, when by their influence and example, they directed, as no doubt they did, that attention to these writers at Oxford, which caused several of them to be put forth from the press of that University—and the impression of Bishop Pearson, Bishop Bull, and Bishop Beveridge, when they respectively defended and made such liberal use of them—and of Dr. Waterland, when he drew so many of the weapons of his warfare from the same armoury. These men did not think they were abetting the

cause of Rome, when they were thus bringing into notice the works of the Primitive Fathers; but, on the contrary, fancied that they were opposing it in a manner the most legitimate, and the most likely in the long run to be successful. And it would not be a thing which the Church of England would have to lament, if she had these divines for her living champions now, in the room of many others who undertake her defence on other principles.

Neither can I persuade myself to believe that the outcry against these Fathers, raised by Daillé and the foreign Churches, and joined in by Dissenting communities at home so loudly since, and to this day, is altogether prompted by apprehensions of Rome, however it may be convenient to make that the pretext. I suspect that this jealousy of them arises from the opposition they evidently offer to the latitudinarian notions on religious matters which have established themselves both abroad and in this country since the Reformation, through causes which I enumerated in my first Lecture, and which notions had not occupied the minds of the Reformers themselves. How can Non-episcopalians or Anti-episcopalians bear such phraseology with patience as *χωρὶς τούτων*, i. e. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, *ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται*¹—and observe them representing, as a matter of course, secession from the Episcopal Church as heresy and schism²? How can they do more than pity the pains they take to trace the succession of the Bishops in the Churches up to the Apostles themselves, and the stress they lay upon the continuity being unbroken³? How can the various sects with which the country abounds lend their countenance to writers, in whom are found such passages as the following, passages which, if they do not reflect upon their own practices throughout, they must feel do so in many particulars. “In the first place, it is a matter of uncertainty who is a catechumen, who a believer; they as-

¹ Ignatius, Ad Trallianos, § iii., quoted by Bishop Pearson on the Creed. Article ix.

² Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesiâ esse et ecclesiam in episcopo, et si quis cum episcopo non sit, in ecclesiâ non esse; et frustra sibi blandiri eos qui pacem cum sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt et latenter apud quosdam communicare se credunt,

quando ecclesia, quæ catholica et una est, scissa non sit neque divisa.—Cyprian, Ep. lxi. § 8.

Novatianus in ecclesiâ non est, nec episcopus computari potest, qui evangelicâ et apostolicâ traditione contemptâ, nemini succedens a se ipso ortus est.—Ep. lxxvi. § 3, et alibi.

³ See Irenæus, III. c. iii.

semble alike, hear alike, pray alike—heathens with them, if such chance to come in. They throw what is holy to the dogs, and give their pearls, though not real ones, to the swine. They call that simplicity, which is, in fact, the prostration of discipline; and our concern for it, pandering. They are for peace everywhere, with everybody; for they care not what differences there may be among themselves, provided they co-operate for the destruction of the one simple truth.”¹ “The Catechumens are perfect before they are taught. The very women are heretics; and how saucy are they! how bold are they to teach, to contend, to exorcize, to make promises of healing, perhaps even to baptize. Then the ordinations of these heretics are rash, light, inconstant. Now they appoint neophytes; now persons employed in secular affairs; now apostates from us, in order that they may hold them by the love of distinction; seeing that they cannot by truth. Nowhere is promotion more easy than in the camp of the rebels; for to be found there is enough to secure advancement. Accordingly, one is Bishop to-day; another, to-morrow: he is to-day a Deacon, who is to-morrow a reader: to-day, a Presbyter, who is to-morrow a layman (laicus); for they assign priestly offices even to laymen.² And what shall I say touching the ministration of the Word? their object being not to convert the heathen, but to subvert us.”³ Is not a sentence like this enough to condemn the author of it in the eyes of multitudes of persons in this country, letting alone the question of Popery, which is the side more convenient to attack him on? And the whole tract “De Præscriptione Hæreticorum,” one of the most valuable of his works, is written in a spirit like this. What quarter could Tertullian expect with such a vein in him as we have here? How should those who are not impressed with the great dignity of Baptism be satisfied with those who call it the laver in which we are regenerated⁴; the ordinance by which, through the Spirit, there is regeneration to God⁵; the

¹ *Simplicitatem volunt esse prostrationem disciplinæ, cujus penes nos curam lenocinium vocant. Pacem quoque passim cum omnibus miscent: nihil enim interest illis, licet diversa tractantibus, dum ad unius veritatis expugnationem conspirent.*—Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xli.

² *Nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.*—Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xli.

³ *Cum hoc sit negotium illis, non ethnicos convertendi, sed nostros evertendi.*—c. xlii.

⁴ Justin Martyr. Apolog. I. §§ 61, 62.

⁵ Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 1.

bath which cleanses away the filth of the soul¹; that, by which the likeness of him who was first formed after the image of God is restored²; that by which sin, whether original or actual, is removed³; and who describe it in numberless other phrases, which I may produce hereafter when the question of Baptism comes before us, all calculated to enhance the importance of this great mystery? Or how shall those who regard the Eucharist as no more than a commemorative supper, be content to give currency to the opinions of those who speak of it as an ordinance consisting of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly⁴; as in some sense or other an oblation, perhaps such in the unconsecrated elements, perhaps such in the representation of the Passion, or perhaps such in both⁵; or again, who love to enlarge upon it as the Communion of the Body of the Lord, the Communion of his Blood⁶; as that which having received the Logos of God⁷ imparts it to the soul, and, through it, immortalizes the body, with more to a like effect, which may be examined on a future occasion? How can those whose theology inclines them to depress the virtue of the Sacraments as the appointed means of grace, look with favour upon authors who exalt those Sacraments so emphatically? Or how, again, can those, who either reject our Book of Common Prayer, or partially assert it, or consent to bracket it, regard with any other feelings than those of distaste primitive writers, who bear witness both to the general style of it, as well as to the early observance of Saints' Days⁸; of Daily Prayers in the Congregation⁹; of Fasts¹⁰; of an Offertory¹¹; and much more? How very few of our newspapers, by which our theology is now a good deal regulated, would approve of any part of this evidence; or have any opinion of men who had left such matters on record!

I have drawn your attention to this feature in the writings of the early Fathers, in order that you may give them fair play. They are to be read with caution, no doubt; and there are not many books of which you may not say the same with

¹ Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. ix. p. 282.

² Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. v.

³ Cyprian, Ep. lix.

⁴ Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 5.

⁵ IV. c. xvii. § 5; c. xviii. § 2.

⁶ V. c. ii. § 2.

⁷ § 3.

⁸ Cyprian, Epp. xxxiv. xxxvii.

⁹ Epp. xxiv. xxxiv.

¹⁰ Tertullian, De Jejuniis, c. xiii.; Clem. Alex. Stromat. VII. § xii. p. 877.

¹¹ Ibid.

truth. But do not take for granted, that all who accuse them of ministering to Popery, are set against them for that reason; for they may be set against them for ministering to many other things far better than Popery. And whilst you use all diligence to detect any interpolations, corruptions, or omissions, by which they have been abused, and express natural indignation against the instruments of such frauds, be they who they may, do not conclude simply because Daillé may tell you so, or anybody else, that there is nothing left in them which can be received with confidence; but use your own sense, and be honest enough, and industrious enough, to discriminate.