

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 XI.

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Socinian scheme. 3°. On the doctrine of the Atonement. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. The death of Christ, according to the Fathers, a sacrifice—expiatory, vicarious, universally necessary. Unreasonableness and hardihood of rejecting a doctrine thus guaranteed. 4°. On the nature and effect of Baptism. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. Unanimity of the Fathers on Baptismal regeneration. Variety of forms in which they assert it. The effect of Baptism, according to them, the work of the Holy Ghost. Their account of it meant to apply to infants as well as to adults. Evidence for Infant Baptism. The office of sponsors recognised. The benefit not ascribed to the *opus operatum*, but represented as contingent on the observance of the Baptismal promises. Strictness of the early Church in this particular.

§ 3.

On the Doctrine of the Atonement.

THE next great doctrine on which the testimony of the early Fathers is directly opposed to the Socinian scheme, and which has already been incidentally touched in one or two quotations made for other purposes, is that of the *Atonement* by the Blood of Christ. The Racovian Catechism, after assigning as causes for the death of the Saviour, that it was necessary in order to his subsequent resurrection and exaltation, and as a proof of God's love and Christ's own towards us, proceeds to ask, "Is there not some other cause for the death of Christ?" To which it makes answer, "None at all; although Christians at this day commonly think that Christ by his death merited salvation for us, and fully satisfied for our sins, which opinion is fallacious, erroneous, and very pernicious."¹ And Dr. Priestley, a leader of a section of the same school in modern times, affirms that "The whole doctrine of the Atonement, with every modification of it, has been a departure from Primitive Christianity."²

¹ Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. viii.

² History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. i. p. 154.

Now certainly if the unanimous voice of the early Church is to rule us at all in the interpretation we put upon Scripture, it is clear that neither the Catechism of Socinus, nor the dogma of the disciple of Socinus, is to be received for a moment. The array of authorities which might be produced from the Fathers in support of this assertion is absolutely overwhelming. One knows not which to select, or where to stop in the selection.

We find Barnabas seeing in the Law intimations that "The Lord was eventually to offer up his flesh (the receptacle of his Spirit) as a sacrifice for our sins;"¹ that when the heifer was burned, the ashes put into vessels, and the people sprinkled with the ashes that they might be purified from their sins, the heifer meant Christ.²

We find Clemens Romanus saying that the spies required of Rahab a sign, namely, "that she should hang a purple thread out of her house, thereby signifying that there would be redemption through the blood of the Lord for all who believe and hope in God."³ We perceive him applying the language of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah to Christ, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."⁴ We have him declaring that "Through the charity which Jesus Christ our Lord felt for us he gave his blood for us; his flesh for our flesh; his life for our lives."⁵

We hear Ignatius talk of "*purging the water (i. e. of Baptism) by his Passion*"⁶; boast that "the archives which he for his part consulted were those uncorrupted ones of the *cross, death, resurrection of Christ, and faith in him, by whom he hoped to be justified.*"⁷

We discover Justin Martyr speaking of the death of Christ, not as an event which "Procured the reversion of death passed upon Adam and his posterity at the Fall, and so the resurrection of mankind in general, the wicked as well as the righteous to a future life," which was what Dr. Priestley saw in it,⁸ but as a sacrifice expurgatory of moral guilt. By the

¹ Barnabas, § 7.

² § 8.

³ Clem. Rom. Ad Corinth. I. § xii.

⁴ § xvi.

⁵ § xlix.

⁶ Ignatius, Ad Ephes. § xviii.

⁷ Ad Philadelph. § viii.

⁸ History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. i. p. 237.

serpent on the pole or cross in the wilderness, "It was proclaimed that the power of the serpent which wrought the fall of Adam was dissolved, and that there was *salvation* for those who believed in him whom the cross expressed, from *the wounds of the serpent*, which are evil deeds, idolatries, and other iniquities."¹ "The Father of all chose that his Christ should *take on himself the universal curse for all men of every nation*."² The prophecy of Jacob pointed to "The passion which Christ should undergo, when he would *purge by his blood* those who believed in him ;"³ the word *καθαίρειν*, (and the same may be said of *καθαρίζειν* in a previous quotation from Ignatius,) evidently having a reference to the defiling quality of sin, which Christ came to put away by the sacrifice of himself ; and not at all to the purpose, if by the offering of Christ nothing more was meant than his delivering himself to die as a preliminary to his entering into heaven, there to discharge his priestly functions for us⁴ ; or his reversing the sentence of death passed at the Fall, and procuring the resurrection of mankind. "Those who have not clean hands should *wash* and be *clean* . . . not as though all the waters of the sea could cleanse sin, but as though the bath of salvation could . . . through faith in the blood of Christ ;"⁵ still *ἀπολούεσθαι* and *καθαρίζειν* the terms used ; and in relation solely to the effect of the bloodshedding of Christ. Finally, the mystery contained in Joshua the high priest having his filthy garments taken from him, as recorded in the third chapter of Zechariah, was significant of our sins being put away from us through the name of Jesus.⁶

We find Irenæus, in his turn, insisting on the same doctrine over and over again, as if it was above all doubt or dispute, affirming that "The Lord suffered for our salvation ;"⁷ "ransomed us by his own blood ;"⁸ "redeemed us from the Fall by his blood, to the end that we might be a holy people ;"⁹ that he "reconciled us to God by his Passion ;"¹⁰ that he "called to him all that mourned, and gave remission of sins to those who had been led captive, and loosed them

¹ Justin Martyr, Dial. § 94.

² § 95.

³ Apol. I. § 32.

⁴ Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Priestly Office, pp. 163, 164.

⁵ Justin Martyr, Dial. §§ 12, 13.

⁶ §§ 115, 116.

⁷ Irenæus, II. c. xx. § 2.

⁸ V. c. i. § 1.

⁹ III. c. v. § 3.

¹⁰ III. c. xvi. § 9.

from their bonds ;”¹ that “God made the Gentiles clean by the blood of his Son ;”² that “he descended from the Father, took flesh, suffered death, and consummated the scheme of our salvation ;”³ that “David, when he said, Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no sin, was setting forth beforehand the forgiveness through his advent, whereby he blotted out the hand-writing of our debt and nailed it to the cross ; so that as by the tree we were made debtors to God, by the tree we should obtain remission of our debt ;”⁴ that “Jesus who *suffered for us*, who sojourned among us, the same is the Word of God ;”⁵ that “we should declare with thanksgiving wherefore the Word of God took flesh and suffered.”⁶

We read in Melito⁷ that “God suffered with Israel on his right hand,” the Gentiles being on his left. How could such an awful phrase as this present itself, except to a mind conscious of the immense difficulty attending the expiation of sin, and the precious offering required in order to effect it? Indeed, the true nature of those sufferings is expressly asserted in the next fragment of the same author, taken from a catena or running commentary on Genesis—“There came a ram for the slaughter instead of Isaac the just man, that Isaac might be loosed from his bonds. This ram being put to death ransomed Isaac. In like manner the Lord being slain saved us, and being bound set us free, and being sacrificed became our ransom”⁸—where Christ’s sacrifice is clearly designated as *vicarious*, Christ substituted in our stead as the ram was in Isaac’s—an authority completely in contradiction to the Racovian Catechism, which, having asked the question, “What is the meaning of these words, that Christ died for us?” makes answer, “This expression, ‘for us,’ does not signify in our stead, but on our behalf.”⁹

We observe that Clemens Alexandrinus, different as his mode of writing and reasoning is from that of the Fathers we have been hitherto considering, still agrees with them in giving clear expression to this fundamental doctrine. Like Melito, he finds the scene of Calvary in that of Mount

¹ Irenæus, III. c. ix. § 3.

² III. c. xii. § 7.

³ III. c. xviii. § 2.

⁴ V. c. xvii. § 3.

⁵ I. c. ix. § 3.

⁶ I. c. x. § 3.

⁷ Routh. Rel. Sacr. vol. i. p. 116.

⁸ Ibid. p. 117.

⁹ Racovian Catechism, Of Christ’s Prophetic Office, ch. viii. p. 134.

Moriah—"Isaac was the son of Abraham, as Christ was the Son of God; he was a victim as the Lord was, yet was not offered up, as was the Lord; only Isaac bare the wood of the *sacrifice*, as the Lord bare the *cross*, and he laughed in a figure, prophesying that the Lord would fill us with joy, *redeemed as we are from destruction by the Lord's blood*. Isaac, however, did not actually suffer, which was well, for he resigned the initiative of the Passion to the Word. Moreover, by not being put to death he intimated the Divinity of the Lord; for Jesus after his burial rose again, not having suffered" (*i. e.* either not in his Godhead or not permanently) "even as Isaac was released from the sacrifice."¹ Again, how undeniably is the vicarious nature of Christ's sacrifice declared in the following paragraph, the very antithesis turning on it! "He who suffers for his love of God, suffers for his own salvation; and again, he who dies for his own salvation, endures for the love of the Lord. For he for whom he suffered being himself Life, was content to suffer, in *order that by his Passion we might live*."² And the same may be said of this other, "I will give thee daily the drink of immortality," (it is the Saviour who is represented as speaking,) "I will be thy teacher in heavenly lore. I contended for thee unto death. *I paid thy death* which thou owedst for thy sins aforetime and for thy unfaithfulness unto God."³ Once more, how universal is the necessity of this sacrifice! "The Apostle, though he had distinctly said already that he regards the salvation in Christ of the just (*i. e.* of the just who lived before Christ) and of us to be one and the same, nevertheless adds, when speaking of Moses, that he 'esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt'"⁴—this again a sentiment altogether opposed to that of the same Catechism on the same subject; where to the question, "Is none justified without faith in Christ?" (*i. e.* however, a Socinian faith,) the answer supplied is, "None at all. But this is to be understood of that time since Christ hath been revealed . . . For as to the time that went before the revelation of Christ, this cannot be affirmed thereof."⁵

Nay more, as I argued in the last section, that the Trinita-

¹ Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. v. p. 111.

² Stromat. IV. § vii. p. 583.

³ Quis dives salvetur, § xxiii.

⁴ Stromat. IV. § xvi. p. 609.

⁵ Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. xi. p. 152.

rian sense imposed by the early Fathers on texts which, strictly speaking, perhaps, could not be adduced in evidence of it, or where the correctness of such application might be disputed, served to show very clearly that the doctrine of the Trinity was in undisputed possession of their minds, so may I say the same with respect to the doctrine of the Atonement. Thus it is a well-known fancy of Barnabas, that when Abraham circumcised all the males in his house, being in number 318, thereby saving them from being cut off from the congregation, the incident typified the crucifixion of Jesus and its consequences—the 18 being expressed by the letters $\iota \eta$, the initials of Jesus, and the 300 by the letter τ , the figure of the cross, so that the number 318 translated meant Jesus crucified.¹ No one would think of accepting this reasoning of Barnabas as sound and trustworthy, or be satisfied that the doctrine of Christ crucified and its results are fairly deduced from the premises; but every one would, nevertheless, draw this conclusion from the commentary of Barnabas, that the doctrine of the Atonement was considered by him to be a very prominent feature in the Gospel scheme, and to be true beyond denial; and this the rather from his daring to find it where he does. Had it been one of doubtful acceptance, he would not have ventured upon so questionable an expression of it; still less would this notion of his have maintained its ground so long as to be repeated by Clemens, and with as little misgiving as it had been broached by Barnabas.²

Tertullian adds his testimony to that of those we have already reviewed. "What, then," says he, in his "De Coronâ," "was the crown which Christ Jesus wore for either sex? It was a crown of thorns and briars, in token of *the sins* which the earth of our flesh hath brought forth unto us and which *the power of the cross hath taken away*, overcoming the sharpness of every sting of death in the sufferings of the head of the Lord."³ How emphatic a declaration of the doctrine of the Atonement is contained in the following passage! How difficult would it be to devise expressions that should convey

¹ Barnabas, § 9.

² Clem. Alex. Stromat. VI. § xi. p. 781.

³ Quale, oro te, sertum pro utroque sexu subiit? Ex spinis, opinor, et tribu-

lis, in figuram delictorum, quæ nobis protulit terra carnis, abstulit autem virtus crucis, omnem aculeum mortis in Domini capitis tolerantia obtundens.—Tertullian, De Coronâ, c. xiv.

it with greater authority! Tertullian is arguing against the early heretical notion that Jesus was merely a phantom, and in setting forth the consequences which would ensue from such a fact if it were true, There could be no such thing in that case, says he, as faith in Christ's passion, "because a phantasm could not really suffer; so that *the whole work of God would be overturned.* The death of Christ, *the whole weight, and benefit of the Christian profession,* that death which the Apostle insists upon so impressively as real, making it *the entire foundation* of the Gospel, of our salvation, and of his preaching, would be denied; for 'I have delivered unto you,' says he, 'first of all how that Christ died for our sins, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day.'"¹ How could the sacrifice of the death of Christ be more amply estimated than by such terms—that the whole weight and benefit of the Christian profession was derived from it—that it was the entire foundation of the Gospel and of our salvation? And how naturally does the Apostle's language, as quoted to confirm these views, conspire with them! Certainly if we must look anywhere for a fuller declaration of the momentous doctrine we are contemplating, it must be Tertullian himself, who in another place, when dealing with the same heresy, exclaims against its advocate with a vehemence scarcely excusable, but still most apt for my present purpose,² "O most wicked of men, who" (by supposing Jesus a phantom) "excusest the murderers of God. For unless Christ really suffered, he did not suffer at their hands at all. *Spare the one single hope of the whole world.*" It is not necessary, I think, to produce further evidence (which, however, might most easily be done) from this Father. Let us, then, turn to another.

"The body" (of Jesus), says Hippolytus, "though dead as to its human nature, has in it a mighty virtue of life; for

¹ Sic nec passiones Christi ejus fidem merebuntur: nihil enim passus est qui non vere est passus. Vere autem pati phantasma non potuit. Eversum est igitur totum Dei opus. Totum Christiani nominis et pondus et fructus, mors Christi negatur, quam tam impresse Apostolus demandat, utique veram, summum eam fundamentum Evangelii constituens, et salutis nostræ, et prædica-

tionis suæ. Tradidi enim, inquit, vobis in primis, quod Christus mortuus sit pro peccatis nostris, et quod sepultus sit, et quod resurrexerit tertiâ die.—Adversus Marcionem, III. c. viii.

² Scelestissime hominum, qui interemptores excusas Dei. Nihil enim ab eis passus est Christus, si nihil vere est passus. Parce unicæ spei totius orbis.—De Carne Christi, c. v.

that which does not proceed from dead bodies in general, proceeded from it, even blood and water, in order that we might know what power unto life the virtue possessed which was enshrined in that body, so that it did not seem like other dead bodies, but could pour forth for us *the causes of life.*"¹

Proceed we next to Origen; and still we shall find the argument for this vital doctrine only gathering further strength. "Let a man once lose his soul," says he, "or damage it, and if he gain the whole world he cannot find a ransom for it. For the soul which is made in the image of God is more precious than all things. There is only one who hath been able to give a ransom for a soul already lost, even he who hath *purchased us by his own precious blood.*"² Again, "We maintain that he received a human body from a woman, that he might live in it; and which might be capable of a human death. Accordingly, we say, that besides other matters, he fought a great fight by means of his human body, tempted in all things like other men, but not like other men a sinner, but totally without sin; for it is clear to us that he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; and that not knowing sin, *God delivered him up as pure for all that had sinned.*"³ Again, Celsus objects that Jesus, after disgracefully hiding himself, was taken. To this Origen replies by showing that the surrender of Jesus was voluntary. "I contend that if by 'being taken' be understood that he suffered capture against his will, he was not taken, for at the fitting time he allowed himself to fall into the hands of men, as the Lamb of God, *in order that he might take away the sin of the world.*"⁴ And again, shortly afterwards, "to the sequel of the argument," says he, "we have already made answer, by showing that Jesus was not taken as a fugitive, but that of his own accord *he gave himself for us all.*"⁵ And again,

¹ Hippolytus, p. 281. In a fragment of one of his Homilies.

² Εἰς μόνος δεδύνηται δοῦναι ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ἀπολλυμένης πρότερον ψυχῆς ἡμῶν, ὁ ὠνησάμενος ἡμᾶς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τιμῷ αἵματι.—Origen, Exhortatio ad Martyrium, § 12.

³ Τρανῶς γὰρ ἡμῖν φαίνεται, ὅτι ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· καὶ μὴ γνόντα αὐτὸν ἀμαρτίαν, ὡς καθαρὸν

παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων ὁ Θεός.—Contra Celsum, 1. § 69.

⁴ Ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ φησι καὶ ὅτι ἐάλω· εἶποιμ' ἂν, ὅτι εἶπερ τὸ ἀλῶναι ἀκούσιόν ἐστι, οὐκ ἐάλω ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἑαυτὸν γὰρ ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ καιρῷ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν, ὡς ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵν' ἄρῃ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.—11. § 10.

⁵ Ἀπελογησάμεθα περὶ τῶν ἐξῆς

in nearly the same terms, "The Son of the Mighty God suffered of his own free will for the salvation of mankind."¹ And in another place he adopts an opinion respecting the Messiah to come, which Celsus had assigned in the first instance to the Jews; "that the world had been so full of wickedness, as to make it necessary that one should be sent from God in order that the unrighteous might be punished, and that all things might be purged similarly to what happened formerly at the flood"²—a very strong declaration surely of the scale on which the Passion of Christ acted in expiating the sin of man. Again, Celsus having suggested that Jonah was more fit to be exalted to a Deity than Jesus, Origen observes that Celsus must have written this merely to fill his book, "preferring Jonah who preached repentance to the single city of Nineveh, to Jesus who preached repentance to the whole world, and who effected far more than Jonah: and wishing us to proclaim him a God who certainly lived three days and three nights marvellously and wonderfully in the belly of the fish; yet not thinking that he who undertook to *die for mankind*, and to whom God had borne witness by the prophets, was worthy of the honour next after the God of the universe, on account of the great things he had done in heaven and earth."³ And once more, "Touching Jesus, therefore, so far as the things done in him are done by the Godhead in him, they are holy; but so far as he was man, being endowed above any other man with a consummate share of self-reason and self-wisdom, he endured, as a wise and perfect man, whatever it was necessary for one to endure, who was *doing everything for the whole human race*, or rather for all reasonable creatures. And there is nothing incongruous in his dying as a man, and in his death being set forth not only as an example of dying for religion, but also as a thing which effected the beginning and progress of the overthrow of evil and of the

καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων, δεικνύντες, ὅτι οὐ φεύγων ἑάλω ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀλλ' ἕκων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν ἑαυτόν.—Origen, *Contra Celsum*, § 11.

¹ Πάσχει γε ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ μεγίστου Θεοῦ βουληθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας.—1V. § 73.

² Ἰουδαῖοι δὴ παρ' αὐτῷ λέγουσι, πληρωθέντα τὸν βίον πάσης κακίας δείσθαι τοῦ καταπεμπομένου ἀπὸ Θεοῦ

ἵν' οἱ μὲν ἄδικοι κολασθῶσι, τὰ δὲ πάντα καθαρῆ, ἀνάλογον τῷ πρώτῳ συμβάντι κατακλυσμῷ.—§ 20.

³ Τὸν δ' ἀναδεξάμενον ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἀποθανεῖν, οὐκ ἤθελε Κέλσος, μαρτυρούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἄξιον εἶναι τῆς δευτερευούσης μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ὄλων, δι' ἃ ἐποίησεν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνδραγαθήματα, τιμῆς.—VII. § 57.

devil, who had got possession of the whole world."¹ Let this suffice, though numberless other passages might be produced from Origen bearing upon the same subject, and to the same effect.

If we appeal to Cyprian, we still only receive further testimony to the primitive character of the doctrine of the Atonement. For instance, "Let us then," says he, "betake ourselves to prayer . . . , after our Lord's example, who went out into a mountain to pray; and his prayer was for us, and not for himself . . . ; but if he laboured and watched in prayer for us, how much rather ought we to do so for ourselves; first of all entreating the Lord himself, and then making *satisfaction to the Father through him*."² Again, "Let it not be matter for our execration, that you have begun the glorious first-fruits of your confession, by being beaten with clubs. The body of the Christian does not shudder at the club; for *all the hope of the Christian lies in the tree*. The servant of Christ hails the symbol of his salvation. Redeemed by the tree to life eternal, by the tree is he advanced to his crown."³ Cyprian's several books of "Testimonies against the Jews," are dictated from first to last in a thoroughly Anti-Socinian spirit. Thus chap. xvi. of the first book has for its title, "That the old sacrifice is done away, and the new sacrifice established;" chap. xxiv. "That the Jews can obtain pardon of their sins in this manner only, by washing away the blood of Christ, whom they slew, in Christian Baptism, and by passing over to the Church and obeying its precepts;" chap. vii. of the second book, "That Christ is God who was to come, the Illuminator and Saviour of the human race;" chap. xxi. "That in the Passion and sign of the Cross is all virtue and power;" chap. xxvii.

¹ Ὑπέμεινεν, ὡς σοφὸς καὶ τελείος, ἄπειρ ἐχρήν ὑπομείναι τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντος τοῦ γενοῦς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἢ καὶ τῶν λογικῶν, πάντα πράττοντα. Καὶ οὐδὲν ἄποπον, καὶ ἀποτεινθέναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ οὐ μόνον παράδειγμα ἐκκείσθαι τοῦ ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ εἰργάσθαι ἀρχὴν καὶ προκοπὴν τῆς καταλύσεως τοῦ πονηροῦ καὶ διαβόλου, πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν νεμερημένον.—Origen, Contra Celsum, VII. § 17.

² Quod si pro nobis ac pro delictis nostris ille et laborabat, et vigilabat, et precabatur, quanto nos magis insistere

precibus et orare, et primo ipsum Dominum orare, tum deinde per ipsum Deo Patri satisfacere debemus?—Cyprian, Ep. vii. § 5.

³ Quod autem fustibus cæsi prius graviter et afflicti, per ejusmodi pœnas initiastis confessionis vestræ gloriosa primordia, execranda nobis ista res non est. Neque enim ad fustes Christianum corpus expavit, cujus est spes omnis in ligno. Sacramentum salutis suæ Christi servus agnovit. Redemptus ligno ad vitam æternam ligno proventus est ad coronam.—Ep. lxxvii. § 2.

“That no one can come to God the Father, but through his Son Jesus Christ.”

Now it certainly does appear to me that it is impossible to withstand such a cloud of witnesses as this; of whose evidence, however, be it remembered, I have only laid a small part under contribution. It seems most unreasonable, in the face of so clear an assertion of the Atonement, so universally made by the Christian writers of the first three centuries, to pretend that this doctrine does not really exist in Scripture after all; that the texts which are supposed to express it (and a vast number of such texts it must be admitted there are) are quite misunderstood when such a doctrine is deduced from them; and that all the Fathers who lived during the generations which immediately succeeded Christ and the Apostles, were under a mistake in imagining that they taught it. And accordingly, though we may not be always disposed to acquiesce in the interpretation which a particular Father imposes upon a particular passage of holy writ; yet when all of them, whether dwelling in Judæa, in Rome, in Asia Minor, in Gaul, in Alexandria, in Carthage, or elsewhere, concur in construing a large class of texts, which the Bible contains, as significant of the Atonement, without any misgiving at all; the Church, too, testifying to the same in her Councils, Creeds, and Liturgies, from the beginning—can we imagine that there is room for error? And can we contemplate the hardihood of those who reject a doctrine thus guaranteed, and take the consequences, without wonder and alarm? I, for one, am fully persuaded that numbers of Socinians have been made by the study of the early Fathers having passed into desuetude—speculation usurping the place of testimony—and, if I am right in this persuasion, need we inquire further into “the Use of the Fathers?”

§ 4.

On the Sacrament of Baptism.

ANOTHER leading feature in the Socinian school is the gross manner in which it depresses the nature and efficacy of the two Sacraments: and here, again, the Fathers are entirely opposed

to its teaching. "What think you concerning the baptism of water?" is a question in the Racovian Catechism. *A.* "That it is an external rite, whereby men, coming from Judaism or Gentilism to the Christian religion, did profess openly, that they acknowledge Christ for their Lord. *Q.* Do infants belong to that rite? *A.* By no means, for neither have we in the Scripture either precept or example thereof; nor can they, as the thing itself showeth, acknowledge Christ for their Lord. . . . *Q.* What think you of them that think they are regenerated by this rite? *A.* They are exceedingly mistaken, for regeneration is nothing but the transformation of our mind and will, and composure of them to the doctrine of our Saviour Christ, as the very word (regeneration) doth intimate. But such a transformation cannot have place in infants who know not good and evil, much less that a thing of so great moment should be incident to them. But that those of perfect age, in whom the transformation of mind and will hath place, should be regenerated by water, is so distant from truth, that it seemeth to carry a face of idolatry with it, whilst that is ascribed to a gross elemental thing, which is only to be ascribed to God himself and his Word," &c.¹

Of original sin, which lies very much at the root of this question, I shall have a more convenient occasion to speak presently, when I come to consider the bearing of the Fathers on the subject of Calvinism; and when in showing that they did not hold the total corruption of our nature by the Fall, I shall necessarily show that they did hold, in a very ample manner, the doctrine of original sin, which the Socinian expressly denies. "There is no such thing as original sin," says this Catechism.² Taking credit, then, for being able to prove this point when the time arrives, I will in the meanwhile request my hearers to accompany me in the development of the sentiments of the Fathers on the Sacrament of Baptism; on the great dignity of the mystery, and on the persons to whom it is fitting to administer it.

Now there is scarcely a form in which the doctrine of regeneration in Baptism can be asserted, directly or indirectly, which we do not discover in the early Fathers. Thus Hermas, without using the term itself, fully appropriates the meaning

¹ Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. iv.

² c. x. Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est.

of it, as in other passages, so in the following, "Before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is subject to death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from *death*, and given over to *life*. But that seal is water; into which mankind descend, in bondage to *death*, but come out of the same made over to *life*."¹

"Then they are led by us to the water," says Justin Martyr, "and are *regenerated* by the same process of *regeneration* by which we were ourselves *regenerated*: for they then receive the laver in the water, in the name of God the Father and Master of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ said, 'Unless ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"²

"When our Lord gave to his disciples the power of *regeneration* to God," writes Irenæus, "he said to them, Go teach all nations *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."³ Again, in commenting on the history of the blind man, whom Jesus restored to sight, Irenæus considers Jesus to have *created* the blind man's eyes out of the clay, that member having been left imperfect at his creation in the womb: and argues that as he was born defective in his frame through original mal-formation, and was born in sin through the original transgression, he had not only need of his generation being completed by the clay, but of his *regeneration* being effected by the *laver*; and therefore Jesus sent him to wash in the pool of Siloam, in virtue of which he was able to see and recognise his Saviour.⁴ Again, having charged the heretics with inventing rites of initiation of their own, he says they had acted thus at the suggestion of Satan, "to the rejection of Baptism, which is *regeneration*

¹ Hermas, III. § 16.

² Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδωρ ζῆτι, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὄλων καὶ δεσπότητος Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν "Ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.—Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 61. See also § 66.

³ Potestatem regenerationis in Deum dans discipulis dicebat eis: Euntes do-

cete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti.—Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 1.

⁴ Et quoniam in illâ plasmatione, quæ secundum Adam fuit, in transgressione factus homo indigebat lavacro regenerationis; postquam linivit lutum super oculos ejus, dixit ei: Vade in Siloam, et lavare; simul et plasmationem et eam, quæ est per lavacrum, regenerationem restituens ei. Et propter hoc lotus venit videns, ut et suum cognosceret plasmatorem, et disceret homo eum, qui donavit ei vitam.—V. c. xv. § 3.

to Godward;”¹ whilst the very ceremony which these heretics thus substituted for Baptism, and the effects they ascribed to it, reflect light, as is usual in such cases, on the Sacrament itself, as understood by the Fathers and the Church. For they affirmed that this initiation of theirs, or ἀπολύτρωσις “was necessary for those who had received perfect knowledge, in order that they might be regenerated unto that virtue or power which is above all; indeed, that without it, it would be impossible to enter the Pleroma, since it is that which conducts them to the depths of Bythus.”² But it is not to any mechanical properties of water that Irenæus ascribes these spiritual results, as the Socinian Catechism would intimate was the Catholic prejudice; it would be strange if he did; but to the operation of the Holy Ghost, which, when connected with the washing of water by a mystical union, that derives all its virtue from God’s appointment, regenerates. “Our bodies,” says he, “receive that union which is to incorruption through the laver; our souls, through the Spirit; wherefore both are necessary, since both avail to the life which is of God;”³ the meaning being this, that the body is invested with a capacity for rising again, and becoming immortal together with the soul, by means of the Spirit operating upon it through the soul, the confederate of the body, in the laver of Baptism.

Theophilus teaches the same doctrine of regeneration, though under a figure of his own, and it adds very greatly to the force of the evidence, by which it is shown that the doctrine itself was fully acknowledged and received in the Primitive Church, that it should be asserted under such a vast variety of forms. Thus Theophilus finds it in the very history of the creation: “God blessed the creatures,” says he, “that were made out of the waters,⁴ for a token that men would receive repentance and remission of sins by water and the bath of regeneration; even all those who come to the

¹ Εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως.—Irenæus, I. c. xxi. § 1.

² Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι τοῖς τὴν τελείαν γνώσιν εἰληφόσιν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα δύναμιν ὄσιν ἀναγενηννήμενοι. * Ἄλλως γὰρ ἀδύνατον ἐν τὸς Πληρώματος εἰσελθεῖν ἐπειδὴ αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰς τὸ βάθος

(τοῦ Βυθοῦ) κατάγουσα αὐτούς.—I. c. xxi. § 2.

³ Corpora enim nostra per lavacrum illam, quæ est ad incorruptionem, unitatem acceperunt; animæ autem per Spiritum. Unde et utraque necessaria, quum utraque proficiunt in vitam Dei.—III. c. xvii. § 2.

⁴ Gen. i. 21, 22.

truth and are *born again*, and experience a blessing from God ;”¹ whereas the creatures made out of the earth he did not bless.² And here I may repeat an observation which I have already had occasion to make more than once, that an application of this kind of a text to the illustration of a doctrine, which it is difficult to believe had any relation to it whatever, argues very strongly how thoroughly established in the Church that doctrine was, since it even found its way into the earliest commentators on Scripture in a manner which nothing but its universal prevalence could account for. Probably the fact may have escaped the observation of many, that God is said to have blessed the creatures which the waters brought forth, and not to have blessed those which the earth did ; but had it been noticed, the inference that the virtues of the Sacrament of Baptism were prophetically set forth in it, even before man himself, the subject of Baptism, was created, could never have presented itself to the mind of any one who had not assigned to Baptism a most prominent position in the Christian scheme.

Clemens Alexandrinus is equally clear in his testimony, and, like those who have gone before him, often gives it additional effect by the unstudied way in which he supplies, and the unlooked-for quarters from which he draws it. Thus, in describing the training to which Christ the Pædagogus submits the new convert, “He seems to me,” says he, “to form man of the dust ; to *regenerate him by water* ; to make him grow by his Spirit ; to instruct him by his word ; directing him to adoption and salvation by his holy commandments ; that transforming by his advent the earthly man into the heavenly, he might eminently fulfil that Divine expression, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.’”³ Again, when prescribing to females rules for the decoration of the person,

¹ Ἐτι μὴν καὶ εὐλογήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων γενόμενα, ὅπως ἢ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δείγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετανοίαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὑδάτος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσίοντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἀναγεννωμένους καὶ λαμβάνοντας εὐλογίαν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. — Theophilus, Ad Autol. II. § 16.

² Gen. i. 24.

³ Καὶ μοι δοκεῖ αὐτὸς οὗτος πλάσαι

μὲν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ χόσος ἀναγεννῆσαι δὲ ὕδατι· αὐξῆσαι δὲ πνεύματι· παιδαγωγῆσαι δὲ ῥήματι, εἰς υἰοθεσίαν καὶ σωτηρίαν, ἀγίας ἐντολαῖς κατευθύνων, ἵνα δὴ τὸν γηγενῆ εἰς ἅγιον καὶ ἐπουράνιον μεταπλάσας ἐκ προβάσεως ἀνθρώπου, ἐκείνην τὴν θεϊκὴν μάλιστα πληρώσῃ φωνήν· Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν ἡμῶν. — Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. xii. p. 156.

and laying them under certain restrictions, Clemens betrays even here how completely the doctrine we are considering had possession of his mind. "Nor are these infatuated women," says he, "ashamed to set all their affections on this bauble of an oyster shell; whereas they have it in their power to adorn themselves with the holy stone, the Word of God, which Scripture somewhere calls a pearl, even the bright and pure Jesus, the eye in the flesh which is fixed on us, the transparent Word; by whom the flesh is made precious, *being regenerated in the water*: for that shell, engendered in the water, encloses the flesh, and from that flesh the pearl is conceived."¹ Again, still more emphatically, "'Call no man your father upon the earth,'² said the Lord; *i. e.* do not account him who sows you according to the fleshly seed, the author of your being, but rather the concurrent cause or minister of your birth. Accordingly he desires that we being converted, should again *become as children*, knowing him who is truly our Father; *regenerated by water*, which is a sowing after another sort than the common."³ Moreover Clemens enters into many details with respect to this Sacrament, details analogous to those of the birth in the flesh; thus giving a peculiar propriety to the term *regeneration*, and rescuing it from being thought a mere figure of speech, which would bear no close interpretation; details which, I may add in passing, our own Church shows that she does not flinch from, by adopting the terms *Godfathers* and *Godmothers* to designate the parties who promote the spiritual generation of the infant, by taking for him the pledges, or engaging to remind him of them, or both. Thus, "this was the saying, 'Unless ye be converted, and become as little children,' *i. e.* pure in body and holy in soul, by abstaining from all evil

¹ Καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνονται αἱ κακοδαίμονες, περὶ δοτριον ὀλίγον τοῦτο τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν πεποιμημένοι· ἐξὸν ἁγίῳ κοσμεῖσθαι λίθῳ, δὲ Λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν Μαργαρίτην ἢ γραφὴν κέκληκέν που, τὸν διαναγὴ καὶ καθαρὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπόπτην ὀφθαλμῶν, τὸν Λόγον τὸν διαφανή· δι' ὃν ἡ σὰρξ τιμία ὕδατι ἀναγεννωμένη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ δοτριον ἐκεῖνο ἐν ὕδατι γιγνόμενον περιστεγεῖ τὴν σάρκα· ἐκ δὲ ταύτης ὁ μαργαρίτης κτίσεται.—Pædag. 11. c. xii. p. 211.

² Matt. xxiii. 9.

³ Μὴ καλέσητε οὖν ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πατέρα, φησὶν· οἶον, μὴ αἰτίον ἡγήσησθε τὸν σπειραντα ὑμᾶς τὴν κατὰ σάρκα σπορὰν τῆς οὐσίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ συνυῖτιον γενέσεως, μᾶλλον δὲ διάκονον γενέσεως· οὕτως οὖν ἐπιστραφέντας ἡμᾶς αὐθις ὡς τὰ παῖδια γενέσθαι βούλεται, τὸν ὄντως Πατέρα ἐπιγνόντας, δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννηθέντας, ἀλλῆς ταύτης οὐσης ἐν τῇ κτίσει σπορᾶς.—Stromat. 111. c. xii. p. 551.

deeds ; whereby he shows that he wishes us to be such as he *begat us out of the womb of the water* ; for the one birth succeeding the other birth has for its object to advance us to immortality." ¹ Moreover, on the natural birth of an infant, it was usual to give it *milk and honey* ² ; and accordingly in reference to the same food, says Clemens, "As soon as we are regenerated, we are nourished with the good tidings of the hope of rest, even of the Jerusalem that is above ; where, Scripture tells us, it rains milk and honey." ³ And again, in a subsequent part of the same chapter, Clemens touches upon the same custom, and further enlarges on it in the mystical way which is usual with him ; finding in the milk which mixes with water (the only liquid according to him which does so) a parallel to the word which has a like affinity to Baptism, as in the honey which has the property of a cathartic, a parallel to the effect of that Sacrament which purges away sin. ⁴ So that all the incidents of a birth are described as attaching to Baptism, as though the resemblance of the spiritual and the natural process was substantial. How entirely opposed is all this to the character of a theology which finds in Baptism nothing but an external rite, that announces a new convert ; representing as it does so manifestly the Holy Ghost as the active mover in it, and the cleansing from all sin as the blessed effect of it. Regeneration being thus connected with Baptism, it follows that the regenerated are those who are rightly baptized ; or, in other words, are the body of Christians. "We call those who are *regenerated by the same Word, brethren.*" ⁵

Tertullian furnishes still further information on this Sacra-

¹ Τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τὸ εἰρημένον, Ἐὰν μὴ στραφέντες γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία καθαροὶ μὲν τὴν σάρκα, ἅγιοι δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν, κατὰ ἀποχὴν κακῶν ἔργων, δεικνύετε ὅτι τοιοῦτους ἡμᾶς εἶναι βούλεται, οἷους καὶ γεγέννηκεν ἐκ μήτρας ὕδατος· γένεσις γὰρ γένεσιν διαδεχομένη κατὰ προκοπὴν ἀπαθανατίσειν βούλεται.—Stromat. IV. § xxv. pp. 636, 637.

² Barnabas, § 6.

³ Εὐθὺς δὲ ἀναγεννηθέντες τετιμῆμεθα (i. *τιθηνοῦμεθα*, repeating this word from the sentence immediately preceding) τῆς ἀναπαύσεως τὴν ἐλπίδα, τὴν ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐαγγελι-

ζόμενοι· ἐν ᾗ μέλι καὶ γάλα ὀμβρεῖν ἀναγράφεται.—Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 124. Compare also p. 128, note 3.

⁴ Καὶ ἦν ὁ Λόγος ἔχει πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα κοινωνίαν, ταύτην ἔχει τὸ γάλα τὴν συναλλαγὴν πρὸς τὸ ὕδωρ· δέχεται γὰρ μόνον τῶν ὑγρῶν τοῦτο καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸ ὕδωρ μίξιον, ἐπικάθαρσιν παραλαμβανόμενον· καθάπερ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐπὶ ἀφέσει ἀμαρτιῶν. Μίγνυνται δὲ καὶ μέλιτι προσφυσῶς, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ καθαρσει πάλιν μετὰ γλυκείας τῆς τροφῆς.—Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 128.

⁵ Ἡ καὶ ἀδελφούς τοὺς τῷ αὐτῷ Λόγῳ ἀναγεννηθέντας προσαγορεύομεν.—Stromat. II. § ix. p. 450.

ment; and so far is he from depressing it, that references to it abound throughout his works, to say nothing of the treatise which he expressly writes on it. He, too, finds in it the new birth. "Blessed are ye whom the grace of God awaits, as ye come up out of that most *sacred laver of the new birth*, and stretch out your firstling hands to your mother Church with your brethren."¹ Again, "When the soul attains unto the faith, fashioned anew by a second nativity of water and the virtue from above, the veil of former corruption is drawn aside, and it beholds the perfect light. And in this birth it is received by the Holy Spirit, as in the former birth it was received by the spirit of evil."² There is a remarkable passage in the treatise against Marcion, which brings together the several aspects in which Baptism was contemplated by the early Church; and it is impossible to conceive anything more adverse than it is to the Socinian views of this Sacrament throughout. Tertullian is objecting to Marcion the various obstacles which opposed themselves to the theory of two Gods—the one God, the original Creator, of a mixed character—the other not known till Christ revealed him, a God of pure goodness or mercy. "There can be no sacrament of faith," says he, "in this latter; for to what purpose is Baptism unto him enjoined? If it is *the remission of sins*, how shall he be thought to remit sins, who is not thought to retain them, for he would retain them, if he judged them. If it is *absolution from death*, how should he loose from death, who hath never bound unto death? For he would have bound, if he had condemned from the beginning. If it is *the regeneration of man*, how does he regenerate, who hath never generated? For the repetition of an act cannot be predicated of him who hath never done the act at all. If it is *the procurement of the Holy Spirit*, how will he add the Spirit who did not in the first instance contribute the soul? For the soul is, as it were, the substratum of the Spirit."³ We have here, no

¹ Igitur benedicti quos gratia Dei expectat, cum de illo sanctissimo lavaero novi natalis ascenditis, et primas manus apud Matrem cum fratribus aperitis.—Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. xx.

² Proinde cum ad fidem pervenit reformata per secundam nativitatem ex aqua et superna virtute, detracto corrup-

tionis pristinae aulæo totam lucem suam conspicit. Excipitur etiam a Spiritu sancto, sicut in pristina nativitate a spiritu profano.—De Anima, c. xli.

³ Jam nec ipsum fidei ejus sacramentum. Cui enim rei baptismum quoque apud eum exigitur? Si remissio delictorum est, quomodo videbitur de-

doubt, all the aspects in which Baptism was regarded; and what is remarkable, and gives great force to the passage, is this, that it is not intended by Tertullian to be exponential of Baptism; but all these acknowledged features of Baptism are touched on, and severally laid under contribution for the purpose of refuting a theory of Marcion's, which had no direct reference to Baptism. I certainly cannot see how Socinian notions of this Sacrament could have possibly established themselves, had the study of the Fathers been habitually pursued, and that weight been attached to their testimony on such a subject, which can hardly be denied to persons who lived so very soon after Jesus had uttered the command, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And I do think that they take upon themselves a deep responsibility who discourage the reading of these authors; and that at their door may be laid much of the Socinian heresy, which, under a modified form, has affected, and still does affect, the opinions of Churchmen, even of those who in the abstract would be shocked at the idea of being partakers with that sect. In further pursuance of this idea of regeneration in Baptism, or of the life engendered in that Sacrament out of the state of death which preceded it, might be quoted such other passages from Tertullian as the following. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life,"¹ on which observes Tertullian, "This element was in the first instance commanded to bring forth whatever had life, in order that it might not seem strange if water in *Baptism* should be found to *give life*."² "Blessed Sacrament," he again exclaims, in the same treatise, "of this water of ours, by which being washed from the offences of pristine blindness, we are *liberated unto life eternal*."³ And again, when extolling the

licta dimittere, qui non videbitur retinere? quia retineret, si iudicaret. Si absolutio mortis est, quomodo absolvetur a morte, qui non devinxit ad mortem? devinxisset enim, si a primordio damnasset. Si regeneratio est hominis, quomodo regenerat qui non generavit? Iteratio enim non competit ei a quo quid nec semel factum est. Si consecutio est Spiritus sancti, quomodo Spiritum at-

tribuet, qui animam non prius contulit? quia suffectura est quodammodo Spiritus anima.—Adversus Marcionem, l. c. xxviii.

¹ Gen. i. 24.

² Primis aquis præceptum est animas proferre. Primus liquor quod viveret edit, ne mirum sit in Baptismo, si aquæ animare noverunt.—De Baptismo, c. iii.

³ Felix sacramentum aquæ nostræ quæ

merits of martyrdom, which he regards as a Baptism of blood, he concludes, "For it is peculiar to the martyr, that nothing can be imputed to him, seeing that he *puts off life in the very laver,*"¹ which implies that so life-giving is Baptism, that he who dies on the act, no subsequent interval ensuing during which its virtues might be neutralized by sin, would at once find himself in a blessed immortality. Nay, more, in reply to an objection conceived very much in the spirit of the clause of the Racovian Catechism prefixed to these remarks on Baptism, the objection that it is a thing incredible for eternal life to be obtained by our being let down into the water, dipped whilst a few words are said, and raised out of it again, apparently little or not at all more clean, Tertullian asserts that nothing so much hardens men's hearts as the simplicity which appears in the act of God's operations, and the magnificence, under his guarantee, of the effect. "Miserable unbelief," he then exclaims, "which denies to God his own attributes, simplicity and power. Why, no doubt, it is a wonder that *death should be washed away by the laver!*"² Not that he would ascribe such vast results to "a gross elemental thing like water," as the Catechism expresses it, but that the Holy Spirit, having moved on the water at the first, in anticipation of its future field of action—all water receiving from this its original prerogative, the mystery of sanctification, when God has been invoked on it—descending from heaven rests on it and sanctifies it, and being thus sanctified, it at the same time imbibes the power of imparting sanctification.³ Wherefore, in further token that Tertullian assigns the efficacy, not to the element but to the Sacrament, he designates the water which the heathens used

abluti delictis pristinae cæcitatibus, in vitam æternam liberamur.—De Baptismo, c. i.

¹ Proprie enim martyribus nihil jam reputari potest, quibus in lavacro ipsa (l. ipso) vita deponitur.—Scorpiace, c. vi.

² Nihil adeo est quod tam obduret mentes hominum, quam simplicitas divinorum operum quæ in actu videtur, et magnificentia quæ in effectu reprobatur: ut hic quoque, quoniam tantâ simplicitate sine pompâ, sine apparatu novo aliquo, denique sine sumptu homo in aquâ demissus, et inter pauca verba tinctus, non multo vel nihilo mundior

resurgit, eo incredibilis existimetur consecutio æternitatis . . . Pro! misera incredulitas, quæ denegas Deo proprietates suas, simplicitatem et potestatem. Quid ergo? nonne mirandum et lavacro dilui mortem?—De Baptismo, c. ii.

³ Sed ea satis erit præcepisse, in quibus et ratio Baptismi recognoscitur prima illa, quæ jam tunc etiam ipso habitu prænotabatur ad Baptismi figuram, Dei Spiritum, qui ab initio supervectabatur, super aquas intinctorum moraturum.—c. iv.

in their rites of initiation, "aquæ viduæ."¹ He would have expressed himself (as would other of the Fathers when speaking on the same subject) more correctly, had he represented the Holy Ghost as descending on the recipients in their use of the Sacrament, rather than on the element. It is probable, however, and so Dr. Waterland thinks,² that they were all right in the main thing, "It being all one with them to say, in a confused general way, either that the Holy Ghost sanctified the receivers in the use of the outward symbols, or that he sanctified the symbols to their use;" and our own Church seems to recognise the other way of expressing the meaning, when she says, "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin."

Origen ascribes the same importance to Baptism, and speaks of it in the same terms. "Let us bear in mind," says he, in his "Exhortatio ad Martyrium," "of what sins we have been guilty, and that *we cannot receive remission of sins without Baptism*; and that it is not possible, according to the laws of the Gospel, to be a second time baptized for the remission of sins, with water and the Spirit; and that to us is given the Baptism of martyrdom,"³ the argument being that martyrdom would replace the baptized party who had contracted sins since his Baptism in the same position which Baptism had left him in, namely, absolved from sin. Again, in the "De Principiis," when speaking of several ways in which the Spirit is given, he sets Baptism in the foremost place.⁴ And again, the necessity of Baptism being administered in the name of the undivided Trinity is thus expressed in the same treatise, "It seems right to inquire what is the reason why he who is *regenerated by God unto salvation* had need of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and will not receive salvation unless this undivided Trinity be there; and why it is not possible that he should be partaker of the Father and of

¹ De Baptismo, c. v.

² Waterland, Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, ch. v. Works, vol. vii. p. 94, Oxf. Ed.

³ Ὑπομνησθῶμεν δὲ καὶ ὡς ἡμαρτήκαμεν καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ἀφεσις ἁμαρτημάτων χωρὶς βαπτίσματος λαβεῖν καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δυνατὸν κατὰ τοὺς εὐαγγελικοὺς νόμους ἀδύς βαπτισθῆναι ὕδατι καὶ Πνεύματι εἰς ἀφεσιν

ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ ὅτι βάπτισμα ἡμῖν δίδοται τὸ τοῦ μαρτυρίου. — Origen, Exhortatio ad Martyrium, § 30.

⁴ Qui spiritus siquidem divinæ naturæ, id est Spiritus sanctus intelligendus est, sentiemus hoc dictum de dono Spiritus sancti: quod, sive per Baptismum, etc.—De Principiis, II. c. x. § 7.

the Son, without the Holy Ghost.”¹ And once more, in the comment on the Song of Solomon, “The season for pruning is come by faith in my passion and resurrection, for sins are pruned and cut away from men, when remission of sins is given in Baptism;” or, as the Greek has it (for the Greek of the last clause has been preserved), “the season of pruning and putting away sins is by the laver of regeneration,”² which is even more to my purpose than the Latin of Rufinus, whose translation, therefore, in the previous quotation from the “De Principiis” is the less liable to suspicion, inasmuch as the purport of it is confirmed by this fragment still existing in the original language.

Hippolytus happens to be more than usually explicit in the declaration of his sentiments on this question—the manifestation of the Godhead of Jesus at his Baptism, which is the subject of one of his dissertations, leading him to speak of it at some length. “The Father of Immortality,” says he, “sent his Immortal Son and Word into the world, who, coming amongst men to *wash them with water and the Spirit*, and *begetting them again to immortality* of soul and body, breathed into us the breath of life, clothing us with an immortal panoply. If, therefore, man is made immortal, he will be God.³ If he is made God through water and the Holy Ghost after *regeneration of the laver*, he is found to be fellow-heir with Christ after his resurrection from the dead. Wherefore I make proclamation and say, Come all ye families of the earth to the immortality of Baptism. I bring good tidings of life to you who dwell in the darkness of ignorance. Come out of slavery to freedom; out of tyranny to a kingdom; out of corruption to incorruption. And how shall we come? it is said. *By water and the Holy Spirit*. This is the water in communion with the Spirit by which Paradise is watered, the earth enriched, the plants are nourished, animals are generated, and in a word *man is born again and quickened*, in which

¹ Rectum tamen videtur inquirere quid causæ sit, quod qui regeneratur per Deum in salutem, opus habet et Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto, non percepturus salutem nisi sit integra Trinitas nec possibile sit participem fieri Patris vel Filii sine Spiritu sancto.—Origen, De Principiis, l. c. iii. § 5.

² Sed et putationis tempus per fidem

meæ passionis et resurrectionis advenit. Amputantur enim et exsecantur ab hominibus peccata, cum in Baptismo donatur remissio peccatorum. But in the Greek we have, *καὶ ὁδὸς δὲ πάλιν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἐκκοπῆς καὶ ἀφέσεως διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας*.—In Cantic. Canticor. vol. iii. p. 88.

³ 2 Pet. i. 4.

Christ was baptized, on which the Spirit descended in the form of a dove."¹ Again, the old prophets declared, through the Spirit, things to come. "Accordingly they proclaimed the advent of God in the flesh; his advent by means of a birth, growth, conversation among men, and life, from the undefiled and God-bearing Mary; and his demonstration by Baptism, that there was to be a new birth for all men, through the laver of regeneration."²

Cyprian furnishes such a profusion of evidence for the dignity of the Sacrament of Baptism, to the same effect as I have already adduced from Fathers before him, that it is impossible to collect all or half of it within the limits I prescribe myself. "Baptism is a second and spiritual birth whereby we are born in Christ by the laver of regeneration . . . The water alone cannot wash away sins and sanctify the man, unless it has the Holy Spirit . . . That is Baptism, according to the Apostle, wherein *the old man dies*, and *the new man is born*, for he says, *By the washing of regeneration he saved us.*"³ Again, "All, indeed, who come to the

¹ Ὁ τῆς ἀθανασίας Πατήρ τὸν ἀθάνατον Υἱὸν καὶ Λόγον ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Ὁσ ἀφικόμενος εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, λούσασθαι ὕδατι καὶ Πνεύματι. καὶ ἀναγενήσας πρὸς ἀφθαρσίαν ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος, ἐνεψύησεν ἡμῖν πνεύμα ζωῆς, περιαιφίσας ἡμᾶς ἀφθάρτω πανοσιγίᾳ. Εἰ οὖν ἀθανάτος γέγονεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἔσται καὶ Θεός. Εἰ δὲ Θεὸς δι' ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου μετὰ τὴν βήθρας ἀναγέννησιν γίνεται, εὐρίσκειται καὶ συγκληρονόμος Χριστοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν. Διὸ κηρύσω λέγων, δεῦτε πᾶσα αἰ πατριαὶ τῶν ἔθνων ἐπὶ τὴν τὸν βαπτίσματος ἀθανάσιαν. Ζῶν ὑμῖν εὐαγγελίζομαι, τοῖς ἐν τῷ ζόφῳ τῆς ἀγνωσίας ἐνδιατρίβουσιν. Δεῦτε εἰς ἐλευθερίαν ἐκ δουλείας, εἰς βασιλείαν ἐκ τυραννίδος, εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐκ τῆς φθορᾶς. Καὶ πῶς, φησιν, ἐλευσόμεθα; πῶς; δι' ὕδατος καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ Πνεύματι κοινωνοῦν δι' οὗ παρίδεις ποτίζεται, δι' οὗ ἡ γῆ πιαίνεται, δι' οὗ φυτὸν αὐξεί, δι' οὗ ζῶα τεκνογονεῖ, καὶ ἵνα πάντα συνελθὼν εἶπω, δι' οὗ ἀναγεννώμενος ζοογονεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐβαπτίσαστο, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα κατήρχετο

ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς.—Hippolytus, Homilia in Theophania, § viii.

² Διὸ δὴ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ σαρκὸς ἐπιδημίαν τῷ κόσμῳ κηρύξαντες, τὴν ἐκ τῆς παραχράντου καὶ θεοτόκου Μαρίας, γεννήσεώς τε καὶ αὐξήσεως, καὶ τῆς μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἀναστροφῆς καὶ βιώσεως, καὶ τὴν διὰ βαπτίσματος ἀνάδειξιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις γενησομένην ἀναγέννησιν, διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας.—De Consummatione Mundi et Antichristo, § i.

Jewel accounts this treatise clearly spurious (the view of Antichrist, perhaps, not serving the ultra-reformers). Bishop Bull, on the other hand, accounts it genuine, and replies to the arguments of its impugnors. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 3. c. viii. § 4. There are some expressions in it, certainly, with which later times became much more familiar, as *θεοτόκος*, § i. and *μοναχοί*, § vii. That the former expression, however, was in use long before the Nestorian controversy is certain.

³ Nativitas secunda spiritalis sit, quæ in Christo per lavacrum regenerationis nascimur . . . Peccata purgare et hominem sanctificare aqua sola non potest,

Divine laver, in the sanctification of Baptism, put off there the old man by the grace of that laver unto life; and being renewed by the Holy Spirit are purged from the defilement of original sin by this *second birth*. But the sanctity and truth of this second birth appertains still more to you, in whom the lusts of the flesh and of the body are now no more."¹ And again, in the same treatise, he speaks of "Our members, which are the temple of God, being purged from all filth of original sin by the sanctification of the *vital laver*."² Once more, "Whilst I was lying in darkness and blind night, and floating on the unstable sea of this world, ignorant of my life, and a stranger to truth and light, I thought (such at that time were my habits) that the merciful promise of God touching my salvation would be altogether hard to be accomplished, namely, that one should be born again: that quickened unto new life by the laver of the bath of salvation, one might put off what one was before, and whilst the frame of the body remained the same, the man might be changed in spirit and in mind. How is so great a change possible, said I,"³ &c., with much more to the same purpose equally strong. "By the generation of Baptism we are made *children of God*," "an *elect people of God*."⁴ Baptism is the beginning and "origin of all faith, the salutary entrance to the hope of life eternal."⁵

Such is the character which the early Fathers assign to the

nisi habeat et Spiritum sanctum.—Cyprian, Ep. lxxiv. § 5.—Baptisma enim esse in quo homo vetus moritur et novus nascitur manifestat et probat beatus Apostolus dicens: "Servavit nos per lavacrum regenerationis."—§ 6.

¹ Omnes quidem qui ad divinum lavacrum Baptismi sanctificatione perveniunt, hominem illic veterem gratiâ lavacri salutaris exponunt, et innovati Spiritu sancto, a sordibus contagionis antiquæ iteratâ nativitate purgantur. Sed nativitatis iteratæ vobis major sanctitas et veritas competit, quibus desideria jam carnis et corporis nulla sunt.—De Habitu Virginum, § xxiii.

² Scientes quod templa Dei sint membra nostra, ab omni fæce contagionis antiquæ lavacri vitalis sanctificatione purgata.—§ ii.

³ Ego cum in tenebris atque in nocte cæcâ jacerem, cumque in solo jactantis

sæculi nutabundus ac dubius vestigiis oberrantibus fluctuarem, vitæ meæ nescius, veritatis ac lucis alienus, difficile prorsus ac durum pro illis tunc moribus opinabar quod in salutem mihi divina indulgentia pollicebatur, ut quis renasci denuo posset, utque, in novam vitam lavacro aquæ salutaris animatus, quod prius fuerat exponeret, et corporis licet manente compage hominem animo ac mente mutaret. Qui possibilis, aiebam, est tanta conversio, etc.—Cyprian, Ep. i. § 3.

⁴ Prænuntiavit illic per prophetam Deus quod apud gentes in locis quæ in aquosa prius fuissent, flumina postmodum redundarent et electum genus Dei, id est per generationem Baptismi filios Dei factos, adaquant.—Ep. lxiii. § 8.

⁵ Cum inde incipiat omnis fidei origo, et ad spem vitæ æternæ salutaris ingressio.—Ep. lxxiii. § 12.

Sacrament of Baptism ; such are the effects, which according to them flow from it, when nothing interferes to abate its natural force : and this is evident, because whilst they designate it and describe its office in the emphatic terms we have seen they do, they still contemplate it in relation to infants amongst others. In them, therefore, it must operate of its own intrinsic virtue : they are passive recipients of the rite ; as they were of the evil nature which renders the administration of it in their case necessary. You will remember that Justin Martyr speaks of persons of 60 and 70 years of age, of his own time, who had been disciples of Christ *from their childhood* ¹ ; that Irenæus tells of the Saviour having “ come to save all men by himself, all, that is, who by him are *born again* to God, *infants*, children, boys, youths, and elder men : ” ² that Clemens Alexandrinus talks of “ the children that are drawn up out of the water ” ³ in a passage certainly alluding to Baptism : that Cyprian is quite express on the duty of baptizing infants, having written a letter ⁴ on the very subject ; indeed, the question to which the letter is a reply is not, whether Baptism ought to be administered to infants, but whether it ought to be administered before the eighth day after the birth, and this he decides in the affirmative : that an Apostolical Constitution runs thus, “ Baptize too even your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, for he saith, Suffer the children to come unto me. ” ⁵

In order, however, to protect the Fathers from misconstruction, and from the imputation often alleged against them by those who know little of their spirit, that the mere *opus operatum* was all they looked to in Baptism ; and that such formalists were they, that in all cases they rested the efficacy of the Sacrament in the mere act and administration ; I would remind you of the solemn obligations they considered it to lay the parties under, when they were of an age capable of understanding them ; and even of the excessive stringency with which in one particular they drew those obligations tight. These obligations were in abeyance only during child-

¹ Οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ.—Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 15.

² Irenæus, II. c. xxii. § 4.

³ Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xi. p. 289.

⁴ Ep. lix.

⁵ Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ Θεοῦ. Ἄφετε γὰρ, φησὶ, τὰ παῖδια ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με.—Constitut. Apost. VI. c. xv.

hood. The sponsors of the child (for sponsors he had),¹ devolved them all upon him, when his years and understanding allowed him to be aware of his debt ; the child then succeeding to the position of one, who was baptized in his maturer age. Now only bear in mind the precautions by which the Church—as the Fathers represent it, themselves concurring in the propriety of such measures—protected the approach of adults to Baptism : the anxiety she evinced according to them, to impress them with the idea of the weight of personal obligation they were about to incur by participation in that Sacrament. I had occasion to investigate the particulars of the process in a previous Lecture² ; and I shall content myself, therefore, with simply reminding you, that they had to go through repeated stages of probation, first as “*auditores*,” then as “*catechumeni* ;” the whole period occupying several years : that during this novitiate, confessions and promises were exacted of them, to be again repeated when they were to be actually baptized ; and considered to form so integral a part of Baptism that the Sacrament itself is sometimes called *ὁμολογία*³—confessions of faith, promises of obedience to Christ’s laws : that these confessions and promises were to be binding on them for life ; Baptism, so far from having done its office when the rite was completed, having but then begun it. It was the habit of the Christians to keep themselves true to their profession, by calling to each other’s recollection from time to time the pledges they had given for their good behaviour on this momentous occasion, as well as at the other of the Eucharist. “*We are ever after reminding each other of these things*,”⁴ is the emphatic language of Justin Martyr, when he had described the particulars of the administration of Baptism and of the Eucharist in detail. And Tertullian puts the case very vividly by representing baptized persons as *fishes*, the enigmatical name of Christ (*ἰχθύς*) impressed on Christians, “*fishes born in the water, which are only safe whilst they continue in the water*.”⁵ And Clemens extends

¹ Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. xviii.

² Lecture III. Second Series.

³ Clem. Alex. Stromat, V. § xi. p. 689.

⁴ Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν δεῖ τοῦτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμνησσκομεν.—Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 67.

⁵ Sed nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθύς nostrum Jesum Christum in aquâ nascimur, nec aliter quam in aquâ permanendo salvi sumus.—Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. i.

the figure and is not satisfied even with their being in the sea, unless they imbibe and appropriate its "salt;" alleging that in this respect the salt-water fish are faulty, because though living in brine from their birth, when cooked they have no savour in themselves.¹ Tertullian considers that by forfeiting the confessions and promises made at Baptism, we forfeit Baptism.² And nothing is more common in the practical treatises of the Fathers, than to find appeals to Christians to act up to their Baptismal vows. It is quite in the spirit of these early authors that our own Church acts, when in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick she urges the sufferer, not merely in general terms, to call up his self-accusing thoughts, but to do this "by remembering the profession which he made to God at his Baptism," and the more to encourage him to do this, she continues, "Therefore I shall rehearse unto you the articles of your faith," &c. Thus Tertullian, when pressing upon Christians the duty of habitually abstaining from the heathen spectacles, has at once recourse to this argument. "I will advert," says he, "to the obligations our *seal* imposes. When we enter the water, we profess our *belief* in the words of the Christian law; and we witness with our mouths that we have *renounced* the devil, his pomps, and his angels Now if it is apparent that the whole apparatus of the spectacles consists of idolatry, undoubtedly it must be already determined that the testimony of our *renunciation* in the laver appertains to these spectacles."³ Again, when addressing the martyrs, "We were enlisted" (so he reminds them), "in the service of the living God, when we made our *responses* at the Sacrament."⁴ Again, when denouncing various forms of idolatry in which Christians were

¹ Εἰσὶ γὰρ τινες τῶν καὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐπακηκότων τοῖς ἰχθύσι τοῖς θαλασσίοις εὐκότες, οἱ δὲ ἐν ἄλμῃ ἐκ γενετῆς τρεφόμενοι, ἀλῶν ὅμως πρὸς τὴν σκευασίαν δέονται.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § viii. p. 340.

² Cæterum nonne ejeramus et rescindimus signaculum, rescindendo testationem ejus?—Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. xxiv.

³ Ad principalem auctoritatem convertar ipsius signaculi nostri. Cum aquam ingressi Christianam fidem in

legis sue verba profitemur, renuntiassæ nos diabolo et pompæ et angelis ejus ore nostro contestamur Igitur si ex idololatriâ universam spectaculorum paraturam constare constiterit, indubitate præjudicatum erit etiam ad spectacula pertinere renuntiationis nostræ testimonium in lavacro.—Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. iv.

⁴ Vocati sumus ad militiam Dei vivi jam tunc, cum in sacramenti verba respondimus.—Ad Martyres, c. iii.

apt to get indirectly implicated—as for instance in the manufacture of idols, as carvers or sculptors—he once more presses the same consideration; and contends that they who fashion these images which are for the devil's service cannot be said to have *renounced* the devil¹; the habitual influence which Baptism must have upon the life in order to be availing, forming quite a feature of patristic teaching, which speaks far more objectively than modern schools of theology have been disposed to do, and thereby produces a practical impression on the mind, which general exhortation without any such definite reference cannot do. But there is another consideration which proves in a still more undeniable manner how far the Fathers were from regarding Baptism as a mere *opus operatum*—a consideration which shows that their bias was quite in another direction; and, as I said, that they were disposed to regard its obligations as peremptory to a very alarming degree. For it was a notion entertained by several of them, that not more than one heinous sin (if even one) after Baptism could obtain pardon; a notion, which they seem to have formed on Hebrews x. 26, 27,² or on the other still more frequently quoted text to the same effect, Hebrews vi. 4, 5, 6³; so rigorous a fulfilment of the vows of Baptism during the whole subsequent life did they exact. And though some may be disposed to mitigate the harshness of this decree by supposing that they spoke of one public act of absolution by the Church when they spoke of one pardon; and that they were only declaring the impossibility of the Church encouraging a system of sinning and repenting, by frequent condonations, to the hardening of men's hearts—a view of the subject, which the language of Tertullian⁴ very strongly confirms, as well as

¹ Quomodo enim renuntiavimus diabolo et angelis ejus, si eos facimus?—De Idololatriâ, c. vi.

² “For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries.”—See Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xiii. p. 459.

³ “For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made

partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good Word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance.”

⁴ Hujus igitur pœnitentiæ secundæ et unius, quanto in arcto negotium est, tanto operosior probatio, ut non solâ conscientîâ proferatur, sed aliquo etiam actu administretur. Is actus, qui magis Græco vocabulo exprimitur et frequentatur, exomologesis est, quâ delictum Domino nostrum confitemur; non quidem ut ignaro, sed quatenus satisfactio

that of Socrates,¹ quoted by Bishop Bull—still in any case the Fathers are proved to have contemplated Baptism in its *future obligations* with the utmost severity; to have been as far as possible from confining their notion of it to its positive and present grace; and to have been utterly indisposed to relax moral duties, by elevating the dignity of the Sacrament.

confessione disponitur, confessione pœnitentia nascitur, pœnitentiâ Deus mitigatur. Itaque exomologesis prosternendi et humilificandi hominis disciplina est . . . sacco et cineri incubare . . . presbyteris advolvi et caris Dei adgeniculari, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere.—Tertullian, De Pœnitentiâ, c. ix.

¹ Ὡς ἄρα οὐ χρὴ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμαρτηκότας ἀμαρτίαν, ἦν πρὸς θάνατον καλοῦσιν αἱ θείαι γρα-

φαὶ, τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἀξιούσθαι· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μετανοίαν μὲν αὐτοὺς προτρέπειν· ἐλπίδα δὲ τῆς ἀφέσεως μὴ παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδέχασθαι, τοῦ δυναμένου καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος συγχωρεῖν ἀμαρτήματα.—Socrates, Eccles. Hist. I. c. 10.

This is represented in Socrates as a tenet of the Novatiani, asserted by Acesius, one of their Bishops.—See Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. Sec. 1, c. ii. § 4.