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OF THE

LAWS OF THE CHURCH.
THE THIRD BOOK.

CHAPTER I.

THE SOCIETY OF THE CHURCH FOUNDED UPON THE DUTY OF COMMUNICATING IN THE OFFICES OF GOD'S SERVICE. THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST, AMONG THOSE OFFICES, PROPER TO CHRISTIANITY. WHAT OPINIONS CONCERNING THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD IN THE EUCHARIST ARE ON FOOT.

If God had only appointed the profession of Christianity to be the condition qualifying for the world to come, leaving to every man's judgment to determine, what that Christianity is, and wherein it consists, which it is necessary to salvation he profess, and what that conversation is which his salvation requireth; there had been no cause, why I should go any further in this dispute. But having shewed, that God hath appointed the sacrament of baptism to be a necessary means to salvation, limiting thereby the profession of Christianity, which He requireth to be deposited and consigned in the hands of His Church, whom He hath trusted for the maintaining and propagating of it*: I have thereby shewed, that He hath appointed all Christians to live in the communion of the Church; the effect of baptism being, to admit unto full communion in those offices, wherewith God is served by His Church. It is plain enough to all, that have the use of reason, what that communion of the Church and the society thereof is able to effect, and hath effected, in preserving the rule of Christianity, wherein the salvation of Christians consisteth, free and entire from the infection of men's devices, expressly or by consequence destructive to it; as well as the conversation of Christians from unchristian manners. But if the Church be trusted to exact the profession of Christianity of all, that require by baptism to be admitted unto the communion of the Church; it must, by consequence, be

* Bk. II. Of the Covenant of Grace, cc. ii. sq.
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intrusted to exact of them also the performance of that, which they have professed, that is, undertaken to profess. For, the profession being the condition upon which they are admitted to the communion of the Church, the performance, or at least a presumption of the performance, must needs be the condition upon which they enjoy it. Upon this ground, the Church becomes not only a number of men, but a society, corporation, and communion of Christians in those offices, wherewith God hath declared that He will be served by Christians. For upon supposition of such a declaration or such a law of God it is, that the Church becomes a body or corporation of all Christians, though under several commonwealths and sovereignties of this world; as there are in all states several by-corporations, subsisting by some act or law of the sovereign powers of the same. For if God had not appointed, what offices He will be served with by His people at their common assemblies: there could be no ground, why the Church should be such a society founded by God, there being nothing appointed by God for the members of it to communicate in.

§ 2. But were there nothing but the sacrament of the Eucharist acknowledged to have been delivered by God to His people, to be frequented and celebrated by them at their common assemblies; that alone would be enough, to demonstrate the foundation and institution of the communion and corporation of the Church by God. For, of a truth, the rest of those offices, wherewith God requires to be served by Christians, are the same, by which He required to be served by His ancient people before Christianity; setting aside that difference, which the diverse measure of the knowledge of God in this and in that estate must needs produce. Though there is no serving of God by the blood of bulls and goats, nor by other ceremonies and sacrifices of Moses' law, under Christianity; yet were the praises of God, the hearing of His word read, and the instructing and exhorting of His people in it and to it, together with the sacrifice of prayer, frequented by God's people under the Law, as still God is served and is to be served with them under Christianity.

b See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vi.

c Corrected from M.S. ; "with," in orig. text.
And, upon this account, I have truly said elsewhere, as I conceive it, that the corporation of the Church is founded upon the privilege, which God hath granted all Christians, of assembling themselves for the service of God, though supposing that the powers of the world should forbid them so to do. For this privilege consists in nothing else, but in that command which God hath given His Church, of serving Him with these offices. Whereupon it necessarily ensues, that, notwithstanding whatsoever command of secular powers, they are forbidden to serve God in the communion of them that are not of the Church; seeing they cannot be commanded to serve God in the communion of the Church, but they must be forbidden to serve God in the communion of them which are not of the Church. And upon this ground stands all the power, which the Church can challenge, in limiting the circumstances and conditions upon which men may communicate in these offices. Which as it may justly seem of itself inconsiderable to the world and the powers that govern it; so, when those powers take upon them to establish the exercise of it by their laws, if they maintain not the Church in that power, which of right and of necessity it had from God before they professed to maintain Christianity, they destroy in deed that, which in word they profess. But if they take upon them to maintain it in the right, which originally it had, to limit the said circumstances by such rules, as by the act of secular powers become laws to their people; then must the power of the Church become as considerable, as it is indeed in all states and commonwealths, that retain the Christianity which they had from the beginning, in this point. This being the ground, and this the matter, of ecclesiastical laws, and the sacrament of the eucharist being that office proper to Christianity, in order to the communion whereof, all laws, limiting the circumstances and conditions of the said communion, are devised and made; it seems requisite to my design, in the first place, to void those controversies concerning the same, which all men know how much they have contributed to the present divisions of the Church. For the determination of them will be, without

4 Right of Ch. in a Chr. State, c. i. § 1—4.
doubt, of great consequence, to determine the true and right intent of those laws, which serve only to limit those circumstances, which are only the condition of communicating in this, and those other offices, concerning which there is no other controversy on foot to divide the Church but that which concerns the said circumstances.

§ 3. Now, what differences concerning the sacrament of the eucharist are matter of division to the Church, I may suppose all the world knows; the opinion of transubstantiation being so famous as it is: which importeth this,—that, in celebrating this sacrament, upon pronouncing of the words with which our Lord delivered it to His disciples, "This is My Body, this is My Blood," the substance of the elements, bread and wine, ceaseth and is abolished, the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ coming into their stead, though under the species of bread and wine; that is to say, those accidents of them, which our senses witness that they remain. In opposition whereunto some have proceeded so far as to teach, that this sacrament is no more than a mere sign, and the celebration and communion thereof, barely, the renewing of our Christian profession of believing in Christ crucified, Whom it representeth, importing no spiritual grace at all to be tendered by it from God; which may justly seem to be the opinion of the Socinians, and properly


"Est ergo, sive Eucharistia, sive Synaxis, sive Cœna Dominica, nihil aliud quam commemoratio, qua iui qui se Christi morte et sanguine firmiter credunt Patri reconciliatos esse, hanc vitalem mortem annunciant, hoc est, laudant, gratulantur, et prædictam." Zuingleus, De Vera et Falsa Religione; Op., tom. ii. p. 212. b. Tigur. 1581: and see the chapter at length, and his Subsidium de Eucharistia (ibid., pp. 244. a, sq.), and his other tracts against Luther and the Lutheran doctrine (ibid., pp. 272. a, sq.).—"Patet ergo in his verbis Pauli, Nonne communicatio Sanguinis," &c., "communicationem non pro eur accipie, pro quo haec tenus acceperunt theologoi, sed pro communicatione ecclesiae, hoc est, quod quisque hoc pacto se ecclesiae probat, et inquit tamen præstito sacramento." Id., Ad Matth. Rutling. Eccles. De Cœna Dom. Epist., ibid., p. 157. a.—And so Ecolampadius, Bullinger, &c.—So also, at length, Socinus, De Usu et Fine Cœna Domini, Op., tom. i. pp. 756—775; and Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. iv. c. 22. pp. 301—351.—The decisive passages from Zuingle may be found collected in a tract entitled Sensus Clausi. V. J. J. Zimmermanni de vero et legitimo usu S. Cœnae, &c.
to give the name of Sacramentaries to all that profess it. For, in reason and justice, we are to difference it from the opinion of those, that hold it for a sign appointed by God, to tender the Body and Blood of Christ, spiritually to be received by it of as many as with a lively faith communicate in it. Though these also cannot pretend to make it any more than a sign, by virtue of that consecration which makes it a sacrament; seeing it is the faith of him that receives it, as they say, which makes it the Body and Blood of Christ spiritually, though truly and really, to him that so receives it. There is, besides, another opinion, extremely distant from this last: in regard that, whereas this ascribes the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist to the faith of them that receive it (which is after the consecration of the sacrament, inasmuch as it is exercised in receiving the same), the other extreme opinion, that I speak of, attributes it to the hypostatical union of the two Natures in the Person of Christ; the consequence whereof they will have to be this, that the perfections of the Godhead are communicated to the human Nature in the Person of Christ, exalted to the power of gathering and conducting His Church through this world to the world to come; because this power, being to be exercised in our nature, requires and imports the attributes of the Godhead, to the executing, and in the executing, of it. For seeing the Manhood of Christ cannot communicate with His Godhead in giving this spiritual assistance to His Church, but first it must be present; and seeing this assistance is given by the sacrament of the eucharist; of neces-


h The passages from Luther may be found in Hospinian, Hist. Sacram. P. Altera, pp. 5. a—18. a: but the Ubiquitarian doctrine was more fully developed by his followers, e.g., Brentius, De Personali Unione Dvarum Naturarum in Christo, et Ascensu Christi in Cœlum, ac Sessione Ejus ad Dextram Dei Patriæ, qua Vera Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Presentia in Cena explicata est et Confirmata, 4to. Tubing. 1581. See also the works of Seinecer, Chemnitus, Hesiusius, &c.: the note to Mosheim, Eccles. Hist., Bk. iv. Cent. xvi. Sect. i. c. ii. § 20. vol. iii. p. 117. ed. Soames, 1850; Cosin's Hist. of Trans., c. ii. § 8—13; and below, c. iii. § 7—15.
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sity, they think, the Body and Blood of Christ must be present in the eucharist, to give this assistance, by virtue of the hypostatical union ordained for that purpose. And so this opinion becomes extremely opposite to the last; because [that'] attributes the presence, and so the receiving, of the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament of the eucharist, to that faith which takes effect after that consecration which makes the sacrament; whereas this attributes the same to the hypostatical union of the Manhood with the Godhead in Christ, taking effect without exception after His exaltation to glory, which it is manifest is so long since past and done before the celebration of it.

CHAPTER II.

That the natural substance of the elements remains in the sacrament. That the Body and Blood of Christ is nevertheless present in the same, when it is received; not by the receiving of it. The eating of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross necessarily requireth the same. This causes no contradiction nor impropriety in the words of our Lord.

This being the question, wherein I am now to give judgment; and no more required of a divine, than to give such a meaning to those few Scriptures which depose in it, as may no way contradict the rule of faith: I shall (without considering how to content those factions which these opinions have made) content myself by delivering that opinion, which I conceive best satisfies the plain words of the Scripture, without trenching upon any ground of Christianity, within which the meaning of the Scriptures is to remain.

§ 2. I say then, first, that if we will not offer open violence to the words of the Scripture, and to all consideration of reason that may deserve to direct the meaning of it, we must grant, in the first place, that the bodily substance of bread and wine is not abolished nor ceaseth in this sacrament by virtue of the consecration of it.

§ 3. And of this, I conceive, the manifest words of the Scripture, wheresoever there is mention of this sacrament, are

1 "it," in orig. text.
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Evidence enough. Matt. xxvi. 26—29: "And when they were eating, Jesus took bread, and having blessed brake and gave it to His disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body: and taking the cup, He gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is that Blood of Mine of the New Testament, which is shed for many unto remission of sins; and I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of this production of the vine, till I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom." In St. Mark, I can imagine no matter of difference but this (Mark xiv. 24, 25): "This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many; verily I say unto you, that I will not drink of that which the vine brings forth till I drink it new in the kingdom of God." In St. Luke thus (xxii. 17—20): "And taking the cup [and giving thanks], He said, Take this and divide it amongst you; for I say unto you, that I will not drink of that which the vine brings forth, till the kingdom of God come: and He took bread, and having given thanks brake it, and gave it to them, saying, This is My Body Which is given for you; do this in remembrance of Me: likewise also the cup, after having supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My Blood, which is shed for you." St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23—32: "For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered to you: that the Lord Jesus, in the night that He was betrayed, took bread, and having given thanks brake it, saying, Take, eat, this is My Body Which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of Me: likewise also the cup, after having supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in My Blood; this do, so often as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me: for so often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, ye declare the Lord's death, till He come. Therefore, whoso eateth this bread or drinketh this cup unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ. But let a man examine himself, and so eat of [this\(^1\)] bread, and drink of [this\(^k\)] cup. For whoso eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body. Therefore many among you are sick and weak, and many fall asleep. For if we did discern ourselves, we should not be condemned. But when we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that

\(^1\) Corrected in MS.; "the" in orig. text.
we be not condemned with the world." And again, 1 Cor. x. 16, 17: "The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ? for as the bread is one, so we many are one body: for we all partake of the same bread."

§ 4. Had not a man as good bid the Scripture be silent (for he will believe what he list notwithstanding the Scripture), as set all this evidence upon the rack, to make it deny that which it cries aloud? For when St. Matthew tells us, that our Lord "took bread, and having blessed brake and gave it, saying, This is My Body;" that He "took the cup, and having given thanks gave it to them, saying, This is My Blood:" is it not as manifest, that He says, "This bread is My Body—this wine is My Blood," as that He says, "This is My Body,—this is My Blood?" Unless we think, that "This" can demonstrate any thing, but that which had been spoke of afore in the process, without giving any mark to know what it is that He meant to demonstrate. There is none of them that deny this, but will be puzzled to say himself, what he would have the disciples, to whom this is said, understand by "This," forbidding them to understand that which went before. In St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, the difficulty is the same. For is not "This," of which our Lord speaks, the same that He "took?" If you say, not so, because He "gave thanks" before He said, "This is My Body—this is My Blood": at least it must be that, which He "broke

1 See Albertinus, De Euchar., lib. i. c. 8. pp. 35. a.—41. a, reckoning six "principal opinions" on the meaning of the pronoun "hoc:" scil. that it points to "nothing" at all, to the "accidentia panis," to the bread itself (but this either in sensu composito, and taking the verb 'est' transitively—hic panis transit in Corpus Meum,—or not "ut est in se, sed ut est conversa in Corpus Christi," or, thirdly, not "ut panis est sed ut Hoc substantia vel Hoc ens"); or again that it is to be explained "de 'individuo entis' quod in fine verborum est Christi," or "de eo quod continetur sub accidentibus panis;" or lastly of "the Body of Christ," and this either "ut actu presens," or "prout in ccelo est," or as that "quod erit," scil. when the

words of consecration have been pronounced. Albertin (ibid., p. 35. a) aptly cites the words of Catheinianus (Tract. ii. de Verbis quibus Conficatur, &c.), "Lector consideret laborum et angustias usque (pene dixerim) ad necem fere omnium scribentium, dum rogasti quid significet pronomem illud, Hoc, tot et tanta scribunt et adeo varia, ut valeant ad insanian redigere lectorum nimium considerantem."—See also Bramhall, Answ. to Milletière, Works, vol. i. p. 15. Oxif. 1642.

" Respondeo, Dominum accipisse ac benedixisse panem; sed dedisse panem non vulgarum, ut acceperat, sed beneficium, et benedictione mutatum. Intercedit enim inter 'Accepit' et 'De- dict' verbum 'Benedixit,' quod facit, ne omnia verba regant eundem accusa-
after He had given thanks;" and that, of necessity, is the same bread which He "took," as the same wine. For to imagine, that "This" demonstrates bread and wine, which, when He says, "Is My Body and Blood," are then abolished, to make room for the Body and Blood*; is that, which His affirmation "is" will by no means allow, requiring that which it affirmeth to be verified for that time which it demonstrateth, or presenteth to the understanding. So that "This" must be the Body and Blood of Christ, at such time as it is "This;" that is, that bread and that wine, which God's word demonstrateth. In fine, whatsoever it is, which "This" may be said to demonstrate, besides bread and wine, it will be impossible to make appear, that the disciples understood that, which the Scriptures (whereby we must learn what they understood) express not.

§ 5. But this is not all. When St. Matthew says, "I will drink no more of this production of the vine" (which St. Luke says that our Lord said before the consecration of the sacrament); either we must say, that He repeated the same words (which is nothing unlikely, seeing the tender of the cup, at which they were said, is repeated by our Lord; as it is agreed upon, that the Jews at the supper of the Passover did customarily repeat the same; and this answer takes away all imputation of confusion from the text of St. Matthew†). But if any man stand upon it, that these words were said only before the consecration, though they are repeated by St. Matthew after it, at the delivering of the cup;
and, therefore, that it is not called "wine," which is in the cup after the consecration? : if he consider how pertinently he makes St. Matthew bring in this saying upon the delivery of the cup, not supposing that to be wine which was in it, he will find himself never a whit easier by that escape. For how gross were it for him to put these sayings together, "This is My Blood of the New Testament, Which is shed for many to the remission of sins," and, "I say unto you I will drink no more of this production of the vine;" had he not taken that which was in the cup for wine? The same holds in the words of St. Mark, having followed St. Matthew in this.

§ 6. So, when St. Paul makes our Lord say, "Take, eat, this is My Body Which is broken for you:" is it not manifest, that breaking is properly said of bread; of a body of flesh, not without some impropriety, to be understood by that which is common to bread and to a body of flesh? And would St. Paul have used a term, which necessarily refers him that hears it to bread, were it not bread which our Lord brake after the consecration of the sacrament, in resemblance wherewith this Body is said to be "broken," because it was wounded?

§ 7. But when the same St. Paul, speaking of that which they take, which they eat, which they drink (which certainly they do after the consecration, when it is the sacrament), saith, "So oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye declare the Lord's death till He come; therefore, whose eateth this bread and drinketh this cup unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ:" is there then any reason left, why we should not believe bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, when the Word of God says it, but that, whatsoever the Word of God say, we are resolved of our prejudice? And when he saith again, "Let a man examine himself, and

P "Respondeo, ex Luca aperte colligui verba ista pertinere ad calicem vini quem dedit apostolis Dominus post unam agnem paschalis ante consecrationem mysteriorum; ac proinde aliquo Evangelista non narrasse hoc suo loco." Bellarm., De Sacram. Euchar., lib. i. c. 11; Controves., tom. ii. p. 527. D.—"Primo enim Maldonatus, Lucas Brugensis, Stapletonus, Bellarminus, Becanus, a Lapide condedunt Dominum loqui d de vino proprio dicto, non autem de Sanguine Suo;" verum ad dunt, "haec non dicta esse de calicis eucharistico sed de calicem quem dedit Dominus post unam agnem paschalis." Sed haec responsio refutatur a Jan senio, Vasquez, et Gamacheo, Albertini, De Euchar., lib. i. c. 17. p. 111. b. These last maintained, with others, that the words "genimen vitis" are to be taken improperly or figuratively: Albertini, ibid., p. 113. b.
so eat of the bread and drink of the cup;” speaketh he of eating and drinking any thing else, but that which all Christians receive in the sacrament of the eucharist? If any thing can possibly be more manifest than this, it is that which he addeth; arguing, that all Christians “are one body, as the bread is one” (to wit, which they eat), “because they all partake of one bread.” And, therefore, when he saith further, “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?”—I will not insist upon this, that it is called “bread” after the blessing, though St. Matthew observeth, that our Lord calleth it so after “giving of thanks;” because the cup may be called “the cup of blessing which we bless,” before the blessing be past and done: but I say confidently, that to make our Lord say, that the bread is “the communion of the Body,” and the cup (that is, the wine that is in the cup which is blessed, for what else can be understood to be in the cup, with correspondence to bread?) is “the communion of the Blood of Christ;” is to make Him say that which He did not mean, unless He did mean, that that is bread and wine, whereby Christians communicate in the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament of the eucharist.

§ 8. But shall this evidence of the nature and substance of bread and wine remaining in the sacrament of the eucharist even when it is a sacrament, that is, when it is received, either deface or efface the evidence, which the same Scriptures yield us, of the truth of Christ’s Body and Blood, brought forth and made to be in the sacrament of the eucharist by making it to be that sacrament? Surely we must not suffer such a conceit to possess us, unless we will offer the same violence to the manifest and express words of the Scripture.

§ 9. For, of necessity, when our Lord saith, “This is My Body—this is My Blood;” either we must make “is” to stand for “signifieth,” and, “This is My Body—this is My Blood,” to be no more than, This is a sign of My Body and Blood; or else the word “is” will enforce the elements to be called the Body and Blood of Christ, at that time, and for

* Altered in MS. into “either obscure or quite put out.”
that time, when they are not yet received: that is to say, [that it concerns?] them, who think it for their advantage to maintain, that “This is My Body and My Blood” signifies no more but, This is a sign of My Body and Blood, to advise, how they can ground the true and real participation of the Body and Blood of Christ in and by the sacrament of the eucharist upon the Scripture, allowing no more than the signification of the Body and Blood of Christ by that sacrament to be declared in those words of the Scripture, that describe the institution of it. For that a man receives the Body and Blood of Christ spiritually, through faith, in receiving the sacrament of the eucharist, is no more than he does in not receiving the sacrament of the eucharist, if, by the act of a living faith, we do eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood; as, understanding themselves aright, all Christians must needs do. Unless we can maintain, that we receive the Body and Blood of Christ, not only when we receive the sacrament of the eucharist, but also by receiving it, there is no cause why our Lord should say, “This is My Body—this is [My] Blood;” when He delivered only the sign of it to good and bad, and, therefore, not out of any consideration of the quality of them that received it.

§ 10. And what a gross thing were it to say, that our Saviour took such care to leave His Church, by the act of His last will, a legacy, which imports no more than that which they might at all times bestow upon themselves? [For?] let me know, whether the Church could not devise signs enough to renew the memory of Christ’s death, or (if that be likewise included) to express their profession also of dying with Christ by bearing His cross, if our Lord’s intent had been no more than to appoint a ceremony, that might serve to commemorate our Lord’s death or to express our own profession of conformity to the same? For, certainly, they who make no more of it (whom, I said, we may therefore properly call Sacramentaries), cannot assign any further effect of God’s grace, for which it may have been instituted; and yet make it a mere sign of Christ’s death, or of

* Corrected from MS.; “And,” in orig. text.

* So corrected from MS.; “that is to say, whether he that receives them, who,” in orig. text, by an obvious fault of the printer.
our own profession to die with Christ or for Christ. But if I allow them that make it more than such a sign, to have departed from a pestilent conceit and utterly destructive to Christianity, I cannot allow them to speak things consequent to their own position, when they will not have these words to signify, that the elements are the Body and Blood of Christ when they are received, but become so upon being received with living faith; which will allow no more of the Body and Blood of Christ to be in the sacrament than out of it. For the act of living faith importeth the eating and drinking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, no less without the sacrament than in it. Certainly, it is no such abstruse consequence, no such far-fetched argument, to infer; if “This is My Body—this is My Blood,” signifies no more than, This is the sign of My Body and Blood, then is the sacrament of the eucharist a mere sign of the Body and Blood of Christ, without any promise of spiritual grace: seeing that, being now a sacrament, by being become a sacrament, it is become no more than a sign of the Body and Blood of Christ; which though a living faith spiritually eateth and drinketh, when it receives the sacrament, yet should it have done no less without receiving the same.

§ 11. I will here allege the discourse of our Lord to them that followed Him to Capernaum (John vi. 26—63), upon occasion of having been fed by the miracle of five loaves and a few little fishes: supposing that, which any man of common sense must grant,—that it signifies no more than they that heard it could understand by it; and that, the sacrament of the eucharist not being then ordained, they could not understand that He spake of it, but ought to understand Him to speak of believing the Gospel and becoming Christians, under the allegory of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood. But when the eucharist was instituted, the correspondence of the ceremony thereof with the allegory which here He discourseth, is evidence enough, that as well the promise which He tenderereth, as the duty which He requireth, have their effect and accomplishment in and by the receiving of it.

⁴ “The question whether there is here (St. John vi. 51. sq.) any reference to the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper, has been inaccurately put.
§ 12. I must here call you to mind that which I said of the sacrament of baptism; that, when our Lord discoursed with Nicodemus of regeneration by “water and the Holy Ghost,” John iii. (not having yet instituted the sacrament of baptism in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, nor declared the promise of giving the Holy Ghost to them that should receive the same), it must needs be thought, that He made way thereby to the introducing of that ordinance, the condition and promise whereof He meant, by the process of His own and His apostles’ doctrine, further to limit and determine. In like manner I must here insist, and suppose, that He speaks not here immediately of eating and drinking His Flesh and Blood in the eucharist (which His bearers could not then foretell that He meant to ordain); but that, the action thereof being instituted with such correspondence to this discourse, the intent of it may be and is to be argued from the same. Now I have shewed in due place, that the sayings and doings of our Lord in the Gospel are mystical; to signify His kingdom of glory, to the which He bringeth us through His kingdom of grace. So that, when our Saviour fed that great multitude with the loaves and the fishes, which He multiplied by miracle, to the intent that they might not faint in following Him and His doctrine; it is manifest, that He intimateth thereby a promise of grace, to sustain us in our travail here, till we come to our country of the land of promise. When therefore He proposeth the theme of this discourse, saying, “Ye seek Me not because ye have seen miracles” (which serve to recommend My doctrine), “but because ye have eaten of the loaves and were filled; labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth to life everlasting;” He shews two

When cleared of inaccuracy in terms, it will mean, Is the subject here dwelt upon, the same as that which is set forth in the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper? And of this there can surely be no doubt. To the ordinance itself there is here no reference; nor could there well have been any; but the spiritual verity which underlies the ordinance is one and the same with that here insisted on; and so considered, the discourse is, as generally treated, most important towards a right understanding of the ordinance.” Alford upon John vi. 51. And better than this, Bengel in loc. (whom Alford quotes), “Jesus verba Sui scienter in sese posuit, ut statim et semper illa quidem de spirituali fruitione Sui agerent proprie; sed posthaec eadem consequenter etiam in augustissimum S. Cenae mysterium, quum id institutum foret, conveniret.”

* Bk. II. Of the Covenant of Grace, c. ii. § 7; c. x. § 19.
* Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 52, 53.
things: first, that His Flesh and Blood sustain us in our pilgrimage here, because He shews the manna which the fathers lived on in the wilderness to be a figure of it: secondly, that they bring us to immortality and everlasting life in the world to come; by expounding the figure to consist in this, that, as they were maintained by manna till they died, so His new Israelites, by His Flesh and Blood, by eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood which He was giving for the life of the world, never to die. Now, wherein the eating and drinking of His Flesh and Blood consisteth, He shews by His answer to their question upon this; warning them to "work for the meat that lasts unto everlasting life," which He tenders, and "not for" that "which perisheth." The question is, "What shall we do to work God's works?" And the answer, "The work of God is this, to believe in Him Whom He hath sent." I have shewed in due place, that the condition which makes the promises of the Gospel due is our Christianity; to wit, to profess the faith of Christ faithfully, that is, not in vain. Therefore, when our Lord saith, "The work of God is this, to believe on Him Whom He hath sent;" He means this fidelity in professing Christianity. For indeed who can imagine, otherwise, that He should call the act of "believing" in Christ that "work of God," which Christ came to teach God's people? He then, that considers the death of Christ, that is to say, the crucifying of His Flesh and the pouring out of His Blood, with that faith, which supposes all that to be true, and by the consideration of it is induced to resolve and undertake the profession of Christianity; he it is, that eats and drinks the Flesh and Blood of Christ, till he depart from the effect of it: for no man can be thought to feed upon that which he vomits up again. Neither can there be found a more exact correspondence, than that which is seen between the nourishment of the body, in the strength whereof it moves, and those reasons, whereupon the mind frames the resolutions from which a man's conversation proceeds. And because God hath promised to give the Holy Ghost to them that faithfully resolve this; and that as many as have the Holy Ghost, their mortal bodies shall, by the Holy Ghost That dwelleth in them,
be raised to life everlasting (Rom. viii. 11): therefore, they that thus eat the Body and Blood of Christ shall not die, but live unto everlasting. This being the eating and drinking of Christ's Flesh and Blood spiritually by faith, and that, when the sacrament of the eucharist is instituted, the effect of it must needs be the same spiritual nourishment and sustenance of the soul, but by a new means, to wit, the receiving of that sacrament; as the eating and drinking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ spiritually by faith presupposes the Flesh of Christ crucified and His Blood poured forth, so must the eating of it in the sacrament presuppose the being of it in the sacrament, to wit, by the being and becoming of it a sacrament: unless a man can spiritually eat and drink the Flesh and Blood of Christ in and by the sacrament, which is not in the sacrament when he eats and drinks it, but by his eating and drinking of it comes to be there. He therefore spiritually eats and drinks the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, who, considering the profession Christ calls us to with that faith, which supposes Him to have signed His calling by finishing His course upon the cross, resolves to undertake the same, and in that resolution participates of the eucharist. But if the Flesh and Blood of Christ be not there by the virtue of the consecration of the elements into the sacrament, then cannot the Flesh of Christ and His Blood be said to be eaten and drunk in the sacrament; which are not in the sacrament by being a sacrament, but in him that eats and drinks it. For that which he finds to eat and drink in the sacrament, cannot be said to be in the sacrament because it is in him that spiritually eats and drinks it by faith. Either, therefore, the Flesh and Blood of Christ cannot be eaten and drunk in the eucharist; or it is necessarily in the sacrament when it is eaten and drunk in it, in which if it were not, it could not be eaten and drunk in it.

§ 13. This is further seen by the words of St. Paul, when, inferring his purpose (to wit, that Christians ought not to communicate in things sacrificed to idols) upon that which he had premised,—"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of
Christ?"—he addeth, 1 Cor. x. 18—21; "Look upon Israel according to the flesh, do not they which eat the sacrifices partake with the altar? what say I then? that an idol is any thing? or that a thing sacrificed to an idol is any thing? rather, that what the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and I would not have you partake with devils: ye cannot drink the cup of God and the cup of devils; ye cannot partake of the Lord's table and the table of devils."

§ 14. These words manifestly suppose the eucharist to be the communion of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. For as our Lord saith, "This cup is the new testament in My Blood," or "My Blood of the new testament;" so is it manifest, that God, in enacting His covenant, that is, His testament, proceeds (according as the custom was among the most ancient nations of the world) to solemnize the establishment thereof with sacrifice. I have shewed you before*, that the Law was covenanted for with sacrificing holocausts and peace-offerings; the blood whereof was sprinkled on all the people, but the elders in the name of the people feasted upon the remains: Exod. xxiv. 5—11. And among the sacrifices of the Law, those sin-offerings, wherein the priests shared with the altar in behalf of them whose sins they expiated by them, and the peace-offerings, wherein those that offered them, as well as the priests that offered them, shared with the altar, had their effect by virtue of the Law, and the covenant which introduced it; and therefore they contained a new act, by which the covenant was renewed, as to the particular purpose of those sacrifices, and the effect of them in them for whom they were made. Correspondently, the covenant of grace, being enacted by the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, as to God's part (that is to say, so far as to oblige God to grant remission of sins and life everlasting to all those, that are baptized into the faithful profession of Christianity), is renewed in the consecration and communion of the eucharist, whereby that sacrifice is renewed and revived unto the world's end. So that, as those who eat of the sacrifices of the altar (whether by the priests or by themselves) did feast with God, Whose altar had received and consumed a part of those sacrifices; so those, that commu-

---

* Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxvii. § 6.

THORNDIKE.
nicate in the eucharist, do feast upon the sacrifice of our Lord Christ on the cross, which God is so well pleased with as to grant the covenant of grace, and the publication thereof, in consideration of it. This, being evidently that correspondence which the discourse of St. Paul requires, remains manifestly proved by the same.

§ 15. Though, of a truth, the words of our Lord, when He saith, "This is My Blood of the new testament which is shed for you," or, "This cup is the new testament in My Blood which is shed for you," cannot otherwise be understood, than by taking "This cup," or "This" which our Lord speaks of, to stand for the action of giving and receiving the sacrament, not for that which is given and received in it and by it. For, otherwise, how should a cup, or that which is in it, be a testament? But inasmuch as the communion of the eucharist proceeds upon supposition of the covenant of grace, and therefore imports a profession, both on God's part, and on his that receives it, of performing the condition to which respectively they bind themselves by the same; in that regard nothing can be more properly said, than that God tenders by that sacrament all that the Gospel promises, and man, by receiving it, the condition which God covenants for at his hands. Which whether you call the new covenant or the new testament, it matters not; an heir, upon condition of performing the will of the dead, being in the same state with him, that contracteth upon articles.

§ 16. But there is as much said, when our Lord saith only, "This is My Body which is given for you;" if it be rightly understood: that is, supposing the Body of Christ to have been given to be sacrificed for us upon the cross. For he, that tenders this to eat, thereby declares, that he incites to the profession of that covenant, which otherwise appears to have been enacted by that which he tenders.

§ 17. The same sense is contained in St. Paul's words, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8: "Christ your Passover is slain for you; let us therefore feast, not with old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and deceit, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." For if we consider the circumstance of time and place, which our Lord took to institute the sacra-
ment of the eucharist, just when the paschal lamb was eaten; how shall we deny the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross to have been as presently received there, as the sacrifice of the paschal lamb was the subject and occasion of the feast at which He ordained it?

§ 18. But the discourse by which the apostle persuades Christians to separate themselves from the Jews (Hebr. xiii. 10—16), is most pertinent to this purpose; as that which is not to be understood otherwise. Though, when he saith, "We have an altar, whereof those that serve the tabernacle have no right to eat;" I allow, that by "an altar" he means metonymically a sacrifice. For, proving his intent by instancing in those sacrifices for sin, the blood whereof was carried within the veil, being by the Law appointed to be burnt without the camp, or city Jerusalem, he supposes them to figure our Lord Christ, Who suffered without Jerusalem; inferring thereupon, that they ought to go forth of the communion of the synagogue, though they were to suffer persecution at the hands of their brethren for it. But when he proceedeth; "By Him therefore let us offer to God the sacrifice of praise continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His Name; and to do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased:" either we must conceive him to return to his purpose, and to shew, what sacrifice he meant when he said, "We have an altar, of which they that wait upon the tabernacle have no right to eat;" or we can give no reason, what he meant to argue, that the Jews have no right to the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, which Christians pretend not to eat of in any sacrifice but in the eucharist. And surely, if we consider but the name of eucharist, we cannot think it could have been more properly signified, than by calling it "the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of the lips that confess the name of God." For when he proceeds to exhort, "not to forget communi-

* Quae quidem verba" (scil. Heb. xiii. 10). ... "hanc continere sententiam petebit; Christianos necquaquam in cibis Divini cultus rationem collocare debere: idque inde constare, quod, quum tabernaculo serviant, id est, sacerdotum numere fungantur," &c., "edere tamen de victima pro nobis obblata ilia non liceat: propter eara quod tale nunc est facturn sacrificialum (quad Altaris nomine per quandum metonymiam istic in loco exprimitur), de quo illis, qui serviant tabernaculo, seu sacerdotibus, comedere fas non est."—Volkel., De Vera Relig., lib. iv. c. 22. De Coena Domini, p. 346.
BOOK III. Eating’ their goods; do we not know, and have we not made it to appear, that this must be by their oblations to the altar [out of the first-fruits of their goods: whereof the eucharist being first consecrated, the rest served the necessities of the Church? Which, as hath been shewed, was the original of all consecrations and dedications, that have been made in Christianity.

§ 19. If, therefore, the eating of the sacrifice of the cross in the sacrament of the eucharist mean no more, but the signifying and the figuring of that eating of the sacrifice of the cross, which is done by a lively faith (that is, by every one, that considers the death of Christ with that faith, which, supposing all that the Gospel says of it to be true, resolves faithfully to profess Christianity); the question is, why the sacrament of the eucharist was instituted by God, why in those elements, and to what purpose: seeing, without God’s appointment, men could have done it of themselves to the same effect. But if it be manifest, that by the sacrament of the eucharist God pretends to tender us the communion of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross; then is there another presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the sacrament, beside that spiritual presence in the soul; which that living effecteth without the sacrament, as well as in the receiving of it.

§ 20. Which kind of presence, you may, if you please, call the representation of the sacrifice of Christ; so as you understand the word “representation” to signify, not the figuring or resembling of that which is only signified, but as it signifies in the Roman laws, when a man is said “repræsentare pecuniam,” who pays ready money: deriving the signification of it a re presenti, not from the preposition re; which will import, not the presenting of that again to a man’s senses, which once is past, but the tendering of that to a man’s possession, which is tendered him upon the place.

b Rts. of Ch. in Chr. State, c. iv. § 45.
c Added from MS.
d Rts. of Ch. &c., ibid. § 60.
e “Respondeo, verbum Represendandi ambiguum est: significat enim præsentem rem aliquid facere, sive reipsa, sive in signo aliiquo vel imagine. Ac, ut omittam testimonia Ciceronis, et etiam sanctorum Patrum, qui frequenter utuntur hanc vocem significandum rem aliquam vere et proprie præsentem exiberei; Tertullianus ipsae utiusque significatius exempla præbere potest.” Bellarm., De Sacr. Euch., lib. ii. c. 7; Controv., tom. ii. p. 572. D.—See also some quotations from the
§ 21. That this is the intent of the sacrament of the eucharist, one peremptory argument there remains; in the words of St. Paul, when he says, "Whoso eateth this bread and drinketh this cup unworthily, is guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ." For neither can it be said, that the apostle, by way of hyperbole, calls the slighting of God's ordinance, which He hath appointed to signify Christ's death, the crucifying of our Lord again: because it is manifest, that his menace is grounded upon a particular consideration of the nature of the crime, not upon that which is seen in every sin. Renouncing Christianity indeed is truly the crucifying of Christ again, as the apostle shews, Hebr. vi. 6: and unworthily receiving the eucharist is, by just construction, the renouncing of Christianity, because that is it, which renews the bond of observing it. But otherwise it were too cold an expression, to make St. Paul call it the crucifying of Christ, for that which is common to all sins. Nor would it serve the turn. For when it follows, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body;" unless a man "discern the Lord's Body" where It is not, of necessity It must there be where It is "discerned" to be; not made to be there by being "discerned" to be there.

§ 22. It will now be objected, that I hold things inconsistent, and state such a sense of our Lord's words as makes contradictories true. For if bread and wine, remaining bread and wine, can be also the Body and Blood of Christ (that is, unless, granting them to be that which they are, we deny them to be that, which is not that which we grant them to be); there will be no cause, why we should believe any thing to be that which it is, more than that which it is not: all difference being a sufficient ground of that contradiction, which denies any thing to be that which differs from it, that is, which it is not.

§ 23. The difficulty of answering this is the same, which every man finds, when he is put to prove that which is most
BOOK III. evident, or to make that clear by words which all men's common sense admits. Supposing the bread and the wine to remain in the sacrament of the eucharist, as sense informs and the word of God enforces; if the same word of God affirm there to be also the Body and Blood of Christ, what remaineth, but that bread and wine by nature and bodily substance, be also the Bodily Flesh and Blood of Christ by mystical representation (in that sense which I determined even now) and by spiritual grace? For what reason can be imagined, why the material presence of bread and wine in bodily substance should hinder the mystical and spiritual presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, as in a sacrament, whereby They are tendered of grace to them that receive? Shall They be ever a whit the more present in this sense, if the substance of bread and wine be abolished, than if it be not? Certainly, unless we believe the spiritual grace of Christ's Body and Blood in the sacrament of the eucharist to possess those dimensions, which the elements hold (and if so, then are they not there sacramentally and mystically, but bodily and materially); we can give no reason, why the bodily presence of the elements should hinder it. So far is this from being strange to the nature and custom of human speech, that, supposing the invisible presence of one thing in another and with another, which is visibly present, it cannot otherwise be expressed than by saying, This is that; though every man know, what distance there is between their natures. The dove, in which the Holy Ghost was seen to come down and rest upon our Lord, the fiery tongues, in which the Holy Ghost rested upon the apostles, the fire and the whirlwind, in which God's angels attend upon Him and upon His commands: (in regard whereof it is said, Psalm civ. 4, "He maketh His angels spirits and His ministers a flaming fire"): are they not as truly said to be the Holy Ghost, or those angels, as the Holy Ghost, or those angels, is said to come down, to rest, or to move, because those things rest, and come down, or move; whereas the Holy Ghost otherwise can neither rest nor come down, nor those angels move, as the fire or the wind moves, in which they are? I know it may be said,

[f See Deut. xxxiii. 2, compared with Acts vii. 53, and Gal. iii. 19, and Hebr. ii. 2: and Exod. xix. 16—18, compared with Hebr. xii. 18.]
that neither the dove nor those tongues are called the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures: nor do I intend to build upon any supposition that they are. This I say: whosoever understands the capacity of words, serving for instruments to signify men’s minds, may firmly conclude, that they may as well be said to be the Holy Ghost, as it may be said, that the Holy Ghost came down, because the dove came down. For can there be any occasion for a man of sense to conceive cloven tongues of fire to be the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, because they are called the Holy Ghost, in regard they are used to demonstrate the presence of It; when no man complains, that any man of sense hath occasion to mistake the Godhead to move, because the Holy Ghost is said to come down in the bodily shape of a dove?

§ 24. I know it may be said, and is said, that in the text of the Psalm, that I quoted, it is not to be translated “winds,” but “spirits,” or “spiritual substances:” because the apostle, having alleged it to shew the difference between them and our Lord Christ (Hebr. i. 7, 14), inferreth, that “they are ministering spirits,” signifying thereby, not “winds,” but that which Christians signify by the name of “spiritual substances.” And I yield, that they are so called (not only in the common language of Christians, but in the apostle also here, and by our Lord speaking in the common phrase of God’s people, when He saith, “A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have,” Luke xxiv. 39) upon occasion of that appearance of God’s majesty, which is either presented to, or described by, the prophets in the Old Testament, with His throne attended by angels, the visible signs of whose presence are whirlwind and fire. So, in the place quoted, Psalm civ. 2 [, 3]: “That puts on light for a robe, stretches the heavens as a curtain, lays the beams of His chambers in

---


h "Angelos facit spiritus, i.e. spirituals essentias (in quo differunt a Christo, Qui non est spiritus creatus sed creator omnium), non corporea." Genebrardus, and Ainsworth, ap. Poli Syn. ad Psalm. civ. 4.
the waters, makes the clouds His chariot, and walks upon the wings of the wind;" whereupon follows, "That makes His angels spirits" (or winds,) "and His ministers a flame of fire;" which answers "winds," not "spiritual substances." Compare the description of God's appearance, Psalm l. 3,—"Our God shall come and shall not keep silence, a consuming fire shall go before Him, and be very tempestuous round about,"—either with the visions of the prophet (Ezekiel i. and Daniel vii.), or with the description of the same laid down Psalm xviii. 10.—14; and you will have reason to say as I do: especially when you read, "He rode upon a cherub and did fly, He came flying upon the wings of the wind;" where a "cherub" in the first clause is "the wind" in the second, the same sense being repeated, according to the perpetual custom of the Psalms.1 So, when angels appeared in the shape of men, was it not true to say, This is an angel, but we must suppose the nature of man abolished? If the Holy Ghost and angels be of spiritual nature, the Flesh and the Blood of Christ bodily, then are they at as great distance from the dove, from the tongues, from the fire, from the wind, from the men in which they appeared, as the Flesh and Blood of Christ from the elements of the eucharist. Nor is the mystical and sacramental presence of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the eucharist, ever a whit more destructive to the bodily presence of the elements, than the invisible presence of the Holy Ghost or angels, to the visible presence of those things in which they were.

§ 25. Nay, if I may, without offence, allege that which is most pertinent to this purpose, not being usually alleged in it; that manner of speech which all orthodox Christians use, in calling the Person of our Lord Christ either God or Man (according to the Nature which they intend chiefly to signify), or in ascribing the properties of each Nature to the said Person, respectively to the subject of their speech, hath no other ground than this which I speak of. For all affirmatives, philosophers know, signify the subject that a man speaks of to be the very same thing with that which is attributed to it. As, when 'this wall' is said to be 'white,' 'this


2 Compare the well-known fragment
wall' is the same subject with 'this white.' Therefore, when a thing is said to be that, which in nature we see it is not (as when a man's picture is said to be he); the saying, though extremely proper, if you regard what use and the elegance of speech requires, is improper to the right understanding of the nature of the things we speak of; though a man would not be so well understood commonly, if he should go about to explain his meaning by more or other words: as, I conceive, I am not so well understood in writing thus, as our Lord was, when He spoke the words that I endeavour to clear. When, therefore, the properties of the Divine Nature are attributed to the Manhood of our Lord (supposing, as all good Christians do, that neither Natures nor properties are confounded), what can we say but this, that by such attributions as these, in the language of His prophets the apostles, God would have us understand a supernatural conjunction and union of two Natures in one Person of our Lord? And what shall we then say, when the name of Christ's Body and Blood is attributed to the bread and wine of the eucharist, but that God would have us understand a supernatural conjunction and union between the Body and Blood of Christ and the said bread and wine, whereby they become as truly the instrument of conveying God's Spirit to them who receive as they ought, as the same Spirit was always in His natural Body and Blood? For it matters not, that the union of the two Natures is indissoluble, that of Christ's Body and Blood only in order to the use of the elements; that is, speaking properly, from the consecration to the receiving: the reason of both unions being the same, that makes both supernatural, to wit, the will of God passed upon both, and understood by the Scriptures to be passed upon both, though to several effects and purposes.

§ 26. Therefore, I am no way singular in this sense. All [The Confession of Augsburg] they of the Confession of Augsburg do maintain it before me; and think it enough to say, that it is an unusual or extraordinary manner of speech, when one thing is said to be another of a several kind and nature, but which the unusual and extraordinary case that is signified, both expounds and justifies. 1 They indeed maintain another reason of this presence, and

1 So e.g. Chemnitz, Fundamenta &c. SS. Cœns, c. iv. pp. 17, 18.
therefore another manner of it. For if, by virtue of the hypostatical union, the omnipresence of the Godhead is communicated to the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the eucharist, then is the Flesh and Blood of Christ there, not only mystically, but bodily. But if, supposing both the elements and the Flesh and Blood of Christ bodily present, it may nevertheless truly be said, "This is My Flesh—this is My Blood;" how much more, if, as I say, the elements only be there bodily, but the Flesh and Blood of Christ only mystically and spiritually? And therefore I find it reasonable for me to argue, that the sense of so many men, both learned and others, understanding the words of our Lord in this sense, ought to convince any man, that it is not against common sense; and therefore, tending so much to make good the words of our Lord and the holy Scripture, is not to be let go.

§ 27. I do not intend, nevertheless, hereby to grant, that the sense of these words "This is My Body—this is My Blood," for, "This is the sign of My Body and Blood," is a true sense, because abundance of learned as well as ordinary people take it so to be. But, well and good, that it might have been maintained to be the true sense of them, had no more been expressed by the Scripture in that busi-

ness. For then, I suppose, the sense of the Church (of which I say nothing as yet) could not have evidenced so much more, as I have deduced by consequence from the rest of the Scripture. But, the mystical presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist being further deduced from the Scripture by good consequence, I conceive the common understanding of all those men, who, granting that, do not grant the elements to be abolished, sufficient ground for me, that the signification of these words, "This is My Body—this is My Blood," inforceth it not. Whereas, on the other side, the substance of the elements is not distinguishable by common sense from their accidents (for whether the quantity and the matter be all one or not, whether, beside the matter and accidents which the quantity is invested with, a substantial form be requisite, is yet disputable among philosophers); and, therefore, no reason can presume, that the

---

See below, c. iii. § 10.

See Albertinus, De Euchar., lib. i. c. 21. pp. 133. b, sq. "In quo refutatur Transubstantiatio ex eo quod quantitas panis et vini post consecrationem in Eucharistia mane, quan-
CHAP. II.
apostles, to whom these words were spoken, did understand "This," of which our Lord speaks, to signify the sensible accidents of bread and wine, severed from the material substance of the same. I may therefore very well undertake to say, that this sense of the words is more proper, than conceiving the substance of bread and wine to be abolished, the effect of grace to the Church remaining the same. For the property of speech is not to be judged by the signification of a single word, but by the tenor of the speech wherein it stands, and the intent of him that speaks, declared by his actions, and the visible circumstances of the same. Now our Lord, having taught those to whom this was spoken, that the eating of His Flesh and drinking of His Blood is done by living faith, must be supposed, by appointing this sacrament, tendering His Flesh to eat and His Blood to drink, to limit and determine an office, in the doing whereof His Flesh and Blood is either eaten and drunk, or crucified, according to the premisses. If then the eating and drinking of His Flesh and Blood out of the sacrament be merely spiritual by living faith, shall not the presence thereof in the sacrament be according? Shall it not be enough, that They are mystically present in the sacrament, to be spiritually eaten by them that receive Them with living faith, to be crucified of them that do not? Is it any way pertinent to the spiritual eating of Them, that They are bodily present? Is it not far more proper to that which our Lord was about (tending, without question, to the spiritual union which He seeks with His Church), that He should be understood to promise the mystical, than the bodily, presence of Them in the sacrament, which is nothing else than a mystery by the proper signification and intent of it? I grant an abatement of that, which the terms of "Body and Blood" were originally imposed to

titas autem eadem realiter sit cum materia:"—to which argument, "respondent adversarii varie: primo enim nonnulli, referente Suarezio, fatentur, quantitate sua materiae nullibi futuram," &c. "secundo alii respondent, in illo casu materiae confusuram vel ad punctum invisibile, vel ad spatium aliquid divisibile, ita tamen (sicut Fonseca) ut tota sum esset in qualibet parte ejus," &c. "Postremo respondet Suarez, Si auferatur quantitas et conservetur substantia, et nulla alia mutatio localis in substantia fiat, manifesta substantia cum eadem presentia substantiali," &c., &c. Albertin., ibid., p. 134. —See also the preceding chapter, pp. 125, b, sq. : "In quo probatur substantias panis et vini manere eo quod accidentia non possint esse sine subjecto."
BOOK signify; being, without question, that which is visible and subject to sense. But if the nature of the action which our Lord was about, of the subject which His words express, be such as requires this abatement, then cannot the original sense of these words be so proper for this place, as this abatement.

§ 28. Here I will observe, that the Council of Trent itself, Sess. xiii. cap. i.º, speaketh so warily in this matter, as not to exclude all manner of tropes from the right sense of these words: saying; "Indignissimum sane flagitiurn est, ea a quibusdam contentiosias et pravis hominibus ad fictitos et imaginarios tropos, quibus veritas Carnis et Sanguinis Christi negatur, contra universum Ecclesiae sensum detorquerti"—"It is indeed a very great indignity, that they are, by some contentious and perverse persons, wrested aside to contrived and imaginary tropes, whereby the truth of Christ's Flesh and Blood is denied, contrary to the whole sense of the Church." They were wiser than to impose upon all their divines a necessity to maintain, that there is no trope in the words, "This is My cup of the new testament;" which so many of their predecessors had granted, because it could not be denied. Which being granted, must needs take place in "This is My Body," by necessary consequence.

[Of tropes.] § 29. And, surely, the common principles of grammar and rhetoric will enforce it; when they inform us, that tropes are used as clothes are, either for necessity, because there are more things (much more conceptions) than words to signify them (for thereupon necessity constrainst to turn a word to signify that, which it was not at first intended to signify, and that is a trope), or for ornament, to express a man's mind with more elegance. Compare then our ordinary way of expressing the conceptions of the mind by words, which is...

---

* "Plurimi etiam ex ipsis adversariis, vi veritatis adacti, non modo fatentur, sed et nobiscum contendunt, 'hanc locutionem, hic calix Novum Testamentum est, non posse accipi in proprio sensu, sive calix accipiatur pro vascuine potorio sive synecdochice pro Sanguine in poculo contento, sed tantummodo improprie, figurate, et per metonymiam.' Ita Maldonatus ipse met alias: Salmero, De Valentia, Roffensis, Canus, Jansenius, Justinianus, Tena: et Roffensis quidem, 'Palam est,' inquit, 'et res dilucida est;' Canus, 'Omnino liquet;' Jansenius, 'Certum est;' De Valentia, 'Oportet.' Nec modo id aiunt sed etiam probant,' &c.—Albertin., De Euchar., lib. i. c. 11. pp. 71. b, 72. a: and see also ibid., c. 14. pp. 83. b, sq. for other instances.  
common to all languages, with our ordinary way of expressing the objects thereof to our minds by the said conceptions. If a word be diverted to signify that conception, which it was not first imposed to signify, because there was no other at hand imposed to signify the present conceit; logic and grammar will make this a trope, though rhetoric do not, because it was not used for ornament, but for the necessary clothing of a man’s mind in terms intelligible. The trial whereof is, if the subject you speak of cannot truly be said to be the thing which is attributed to it: as the bread and wine, which our Lord blessed, cannot be said to be His Body and Blood. For if the subject matter, signified by the Scripture elsewhere, require, that the Body and Blood of Christ be thought present; then is the property of the terms to be abated, so as they may serve to signify that presence: voiding all dispute concerning the significiation of words (which those that hold transubstantiation could never, nor never will, agree upon among themselves, because it stands upon terms of art, the use whereof no man’s conceit can overrule); that, which the necessity of our common faith requireth, being once secured, as here.

§ 30. For the reason being rendered, why the eucharist was instituted, and why it is to be frequently, notwithstanding that the Body and Blood of Christ may always be eaten and drunk by a living faith (to wit, because the reviving of our Christianity by receiving the sacrament, reviveth the promise of Christ’s Body and Blood, being the means to convey His Spirit); it will not concern the purpose thereof, that It should be present by transubstantiation, abolishing the nature of the elements. For though it hath been boldly said, by those who dispute controversies, that the Body of

---

Footnotes:
2 “Sequitur, horum accidentium medio ac ministerio, sicut per eadem ante panis, ita nunc Corpus ac Sanguinem vene a nobis contrectari, manducari, circumgestari, carni nostrae imisscri, dentibus teri. . . . sensibiliter sacrificari.” Al anus, De Euchar., lib. i. c. 37. p. 435, 4to. Antv. 1576.—“ Respondo, Corpus Christi vere ac proprie manducari etiam corpore in eucharistia.” Bellarm., De Sacr. Euch., lib. i. c. 11; Controv., tom. ii. p. 519. C.—“ Petrus Martinus, doctor Compluten sis, ait per manducationem oralem carnis Christi fieri unionem realem et substantialem carnis Christi cum carne nostra.” &c. Albertinus, De Euchar., lib. i. c. 32. p. 246. a. from Vasquez, who refutes the assertion: and see also other quotations to a similar purpose in
Christ is "really and substantially resident in, and united to," our bodies; that "grace and charity, cooled by sin, are inflamed in the soul by the Body of Christ immediately touching" our bodies; that "the seed of our resurrection is thereby sowed in our mortal bodies:" first, none of this is true, unless you understand it with the same abatement,—that the Body of Christ, received in the sacrament by the body of him, whose soul hath living faith in Christ, is the seed of the life of grace and glory both to his soul and body;—because otherwise a dead faith should receive the same: secondly, none of this would hold, if transubstantiation be true; because, rendering the Body of Christ invisibly present, no man's body whatsoever can immediately touch it.

§ 31. And therefore it is no marvel, that so many excellent school doctors have acknowledged, that, setting the sense of the Church aside (of which I will say what shall be requisite by and by) transubstantiation cannot be concluded from the Scriptures. Whose judgments I carry along with me,
for the complement of that prejudice which I advance, toward the right understanding of the sense of the Church; to wit, that, whatsoever the present Church may have determined, the Catholic Church did never understand that which the Scripture necessarily signifieth not.

§ 32. Now let us see, what our Lord says to His disciples, being scandalized at those things which I shewed you that He taught them in the synagogue at Capernaum, of attaining everlasting life by eating His Flesh; John vi. 58—63. "Is this it which scandalizeth you?" saith He. "What then if you see the Son of Man ascend where He was afore? it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak to you, are spirit and life." The spiritual sense, in which He commandeth them to eat and drink His Flesh and Blood, is grounded upon that difference between the promises of the Law and the Gospel, which I settled in the beginning." For, by virtue thereof, that manna, which maintained them in the desert till they died, is the figure of His Body and Blood, That maintains us not to die. Whereupon St. Paul saith, 2 Cor. iii. 6; "The spirit quickeneth, but the letter killeth:" not only because the Law covenants not for the world to come; but also, because it was no further the means to procure that righteousness which giveth life, than the Spirit of Christ was intimated and furnished under the dispensation of it: whereupon St. Paul argues, that the Jews have as much need of Christ as the Gentiles, because the Law is not able to bring corrupt nature to righteousness. Wherefore the reason, why they were scandalized at this doctrine of our Lord's, was not merely because it was difficult to understand (He having so plentifully expressed His meaning, and inculcated it, by often beating the same discourse there, and otherwise made the condition of His Gospel intelligible to His disciples), but because it was hard to undergo, importing the taking up of His cross; as I have said. For it is evident by common

lum non explicavit, expresse ab ecclesia accepimus, aclicit conversionem panis in Corpus Christi:—see Albertin., ibid., c. 16. p. 102. b.—Other quotations to the same effect may be found in Albertinus, as just cited; from whom Cosin, and probably Thorndike also, borrowed their quotations. See also Jeremy Taylor, Real Presence, sect. 2. § 1—3. vol. vi. pp. 19—21. ed. Eden. * Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. xii. § 6, sq. ; xiii. § 1, sq. ² Above, § 11, 12.
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experience in the world, how men find, or how they plead, their minds to be obstructed in the understanding of those spiritual matters, which if they should grant their understandings to be convinced of, there were no plea left them, why they should not conform their lives and conversations to that light, which themselves confess they have received. So that the scandal was the same, that the rich man in the Gospel took, when he was told, that, besides keeping God's commandments, one thing was wanting, to part with all he had, and take up Christ's cross; to wit, for the observing of His commandments. And this scandal He intends to take away, when He refers them to His ascension into heaven; because then, and from thence, they were to expect the Holy Ghost, to enable them to do that which the eating and drinking of His Flesh and Blood signifieth spiritually. And His words He therefore calleth "spirit" and "life," because they are the means to bring unto the communion of His Spirit, wherein spiritual and everlasting life consisteth. So that, the Flesh of Christ being exalted to the right hand of God, and His Spirit (Which first made Itself an habitation in His Flesh) being sent down to make Him an habitation in the hearts of His people, those, who upon faithful consideration of His cross faithfully resolve to undertake it, do by the Spirit eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. Therefore, when, in correspondence hereunto, He pretends to institute the sacrament of the eucharist, that they, who eat His Flesh and drink His Blood in that sacrament, may eat and drink the same spiritually (as, unless they crucify Him again, they cannot choose but do); it behoves indeed, that He procure the Flesh and Blood of Christ to be there by the operation of that Spirit, Which framed Them for an habitation to Itself in the womb of the Virgin (that so the receiving of His Flesh and Blood may be the means of conveying His Spirit): but how is it requisite, that They be there in bodily substance, as if the mystical presence of Them were not a sufficient means to convey His Spirit, Which we see is conveyed by the mere spiritual consideration and resolution of a lively and effectual faith?

§ 33. St. Paul writes thus to the Corinthians: "I would not that you should be ignorant, brethren, how that all our
fathers... did eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of the spiritual rock that went with them; now that rock was Christ:"
1 Cor. x. 1, 3, 4. The meat and drink of the fathers in the wilderness can no otherwise be understood to be spiritual, than as I have proved the law of Moses to be spiritual; that is, as, intimating spiritual promises, it intimates a contract for spiritual obedience. So St. Paul's argument holds:—if they, who were sustained by God in their travel to the land of promise, not keeping their covenant with God, fell in the wilderness; then shall it not serve our turn, that, being baptized, we are fed by the eucharist to everlasting life, if we perform not that, which by our baptism we undertake. The rock, then, and the manna were spiritual meat and drink, because they signified the Flesh and the Blood of Christ crucified for us: which who so believes as thereupon to undertake Christianity, our Lord, when He had not yet instituted the eucharist, promiseth, that he shall be nourished by His Flesh and Blood to life everlasting; the effect of which promise all Christians find, that by the assistance of His Spirit overcome the world in approving themselves Christians. When our Lord annexed the promise of His Spirit to His baptism and eucharist by instituting those sacraments, He tied the spiritual eating and drinking of His Body and Blood to the sacramental, in respect of all them, whom the affirmative precepts of using those sacraments should oblige. Christ, then, was the food and the drink of them, who attained salvation under Moses' law; because by the faith of Christ to be crucified they were saved, as we by the faith of Christ crucified. But to follow God in hope of salvation by Christ to come, is not the same?, as to undertake that Christianity, which by His coming He hath taught us. The signs of good things to come fed only those, that were led by the promise of them: the rest found by them only the nourishment of their bodies in their travel to the land of promise. But when our Lord, having promised His Flesh and Blood for food to those souls, that should conform themselves to His cross, instituteth the eucharist, and con-

7 Corrected in the errata to the folio edition into "is the same;" but by an obvious error.

THORNDIKE.
fineth the spiritual eating and drinking of His Flesh and Blood to it, so far as the precept thereof obligeth; shall He not be understood to promise His Body and Blood by that sacrament, without which He will not grant it to those, that are tied to the sacrament and neglect it? The presence of His Body and Blood in the sacrament is that, which makes good the promise of His Body and Blood, made before the instituting of the sacrament to them, who are obliged to use the sacrament by the institution of it.

CHAPTER III.

That the presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist depends not upon the living faith of him that receives, but upon the true profession of Christianity in the church that celebrates. The scriptures that are alleged for the dependence of it upon the communication of the properties. They conclude not the sense of them by whom they are alleged. How the scripture confineth the flesh of Christ to the heavens.

If these things be true, it will be requisite that we acknowledge a change to be wrought in the elements by the consecration of them into the sacrament. For how should they come to be that which they were not before, to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ, without any change? And, in regard of this change, the elements are no more called by the name of their nature and kind, after the consecration, but by the name of that which they are become. Not as if the substance thereof were abolished, but because it remains no more considerable to Christians; who do not nor are to look upon this sacrament with any account of what it may be to the nourishment of their bodies by the nature of the elements, but what it may be to the nourishment of their souls by the Spirit of God assisting in and with His Flesh, mystically present in it. But this change consisting in the assistance of the Holy Ghost, Which makes the elements, in which it dwells, the Body and Blood of Christ; it is not necessary, that we acknowledge the bodily substance of them to be any way abolished.
§ 2. Nay, as I am persuaded, that the presence of Christ in the eucharist cannot be better expressed, than by that term which the Council of Trent useth, calling it a "sacrament," and saying that the Flesh and Blood of Christ is "sacramentally" there; so there is nothing more demonstrative to me, that no such thing as the abolished of the elements is revealed by the Scriptures, than that the sense of them is so fully satisfied by this term. So that the "anathema," which it decreeth against them that do not believe them to be abolished, can by no means be grounded upon the Scriptures. Nor do I think the term any less fit or serviceable, because it serves them to signify the local presence of Christ's Body and Blood under the dimensions of the elements, the substance of them being gone. For I shall not be obliged to grant, that the "sacrament" of Christ's Body and Blood can properly be understood, supposing the sign and the thing signified to be both the same subject; the dimensions of the elements being become the dimensions of Christ's Body and Blood, and, by the means of them, all the bodily accidents of the elements subsisting in the same. And, therefore, the sacramental presence of Christ's Body and Blood cannot properly be maintained; unless, acknowledging the true being and presence of the thing signified, we acknowledge also the sign to remain.

§ 3. But if a man demand further, how I understand the Body and Blood of Christ to be present "in," or "with," or "under," the elements, when I say, they are "in," and "with," and "under," them, as "in," and "with," and "under," a sacrament mystically; I conceive I am excused 17 of any further answer, and am not obliged to declare the manner of that which must be mystical, when I have said what I can say to declare it. Only I will take leave to tell him, that he will remain nevertheless obliged to believe the


* "Si quis dixit Christum in Eucharistia exhibitum spiritualiter tantum manducari, et non etiam sacramentaliter ac realiter, anathema sit." Ibid., Can. 8; ibid., p. 809. C.
truth both of the sign and of the thing signified (and that
by virtue of the sacrament; that is, of the consecration that
makes it a sacrament, not of the faith of him that receives
it): though I answer not all that he demands, upon the
question, what the sacramental presence of the Body and
Blood of Christ in, or with, or under, the elements of the
eucharist signifies.

§ 4. I would now consider wherein the consecration of
the eucharist consists, that I might thereupon infer, what
kind of presence it enforceth. But I hold it fit, first, to set
aside those two opinions: the one whereof (I said) ascribeth
it to the faith of them that receive, being accidental to the
consecration, and not included in it; the other, to the hyp-
ostatical union, and that communication which it inferreth
between the properties of the united Natures.

§ 5. That which I have already said, I suppose, is enough
to evidence the mystical and spiritual presence of the Flesh
and Blood of Christ in the elements, as the sacrament of
the same; before any man can suppose that spiritual pre-
sence of them to the soul, which the eating and drinking
Christ’s Flesh and Blood spiritually by living faith impor-
teth. Only, that I may once conclude, how faith effecteth
the sacramental presence in the elements, as well as the
spiritual in the soul: I will distinguish between the outward
profession of Christianity, which maketh us members of
God’s visible Church; and the inward performance or faith-
ful purpose of performing the same, which makes a man of
that number whom God owns for heirs of His kingdom,
whether you call that number an invisible Church or not.
And then I say, that it is the visible profession of true
Christianity, which makes the consecration of the eucharist
effectual to make the Body and Blood of Christ sacramen-
tally present in the elements of it; but that it is the in-
visible faithfulness of the heart, in making good or in re-
solving to make good the said profession, which makes the
receiving of it effectual to the spiritual eating and drinking
of Christ’s Body and Blood. For supposing, that God hath
instituted and founded the corporation of His Church upon
the precept, or the privilege, of assembling to communicate

b Above, c. i. § 3.
in the offices of His service, according to Christianity: whenever this office is tendered to God out of that profession which makes men members of God's Church, there the effect follows, as sure as Christianity is true; where otherwise there can be no such assurance. But if eating and drinking the Body and Blood of Christ in this sacrament unworthily, be the crucifying of Christ again, rendering a man "guilty of His Body and Blood;" then is not His Flesh and Blood spiritually eaten and drunk, till living faith make Them spiritually present to the soul, which the consecration maketh sacramentally present to the body. And it is to be noted, that no man can say, that this sacrament represents or tenders and exhibits unto him that receiveth, the Body and Blood of Christ (as all must do, that abhor the irreverence to so great an ordinance, which the opinion that it is but a bare sign of Christ crucified necessarily engendereth), but he must believe this; unless a man will say, that that which is not present may be represented, that is to say, tendered and exhibited presently down upon the place. It is not therefore that living faith, which he that receiveth the eucharist, and is present at the consecrating of it, may have and may not have, that causeth the Body and Blood of Christ to be sacramentally present in the elements of it: but it is the profession of that common Christianity, which makes men members of God's Church; in the unity whereof, wheresoever this sacrament is celebrated (without enquiring, whether those that are assembled be of the number of those, to whom the kingdom of heaven belongs), thou hast a legal presumption, even towards God, that thou receivest the Flesh and Blood of Christ in and with the elements of bread and wine, and shalt receive the same spiritually for the food of thy soul, supposing that thou receivest the same with living faith. For one part of our common Christianity being this, that our Lord Christ instituted this sacrament, with a promise to make by His Spirit the elements of bread and wine sacramentally His Body and Blood; so that His Spirit, That made them so (dwelling in them, as in His natural Body), should feed them with Christ's Body and Blood, that receive the sacra-

* See above, c. i. § 2. note d.
BOOK III. The sacrament of Them with living faith: this institution being executed, that is, the eucharist being consecrated according to it, so sure as Christianity is true, so sure the effect follows. So that the faith, which brings it to effect, is the faith of them, who, believing God's promises, proceed to execute His ordinances, that they may obtain the same. Whereas those, that would have justifying faith to consist in believing a man's own salvation, or the decree of God peremptorily passed upon it, and the sacrament of the eucharist to be appointed for a sign to confirm this faith (which is nothing else but the revelation of this decree), are not able to say, how the signifying of the eating of Christ's Body and Blood conduces to such a revelation as this, or why any such thing is done, which conduceth not to the purpose. Besides that, having shewed wherein justifying faith indeed consists, I have by that means made it appear, that the sacramental nourishment of the soul is the means of the spiritual nourishment of the soul, as well as the resemblance of it.

§ 6. Here, indeed, it will be requisite to take notice of that which may be objected for an inconvenience; that God should grant the operation of His Spirit, to make the elements sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ, upon the dead faith of them who receive it to their condemnation in the sacrament, and therefore cannot be said to eat the Body and Blood of Christ (which is only the act of living faith) without that abatement which the premisses have established; to wit, in the sacrament. But all this, if the effect of my saying be thoroughly considered, will appear to be no inconvenience. For that the Body and Blood of Christ should be sacramentally present in and under the elements (to be spiritually received of all, that meet it with a living faith, to condemn those for crucifying Christ again, that receive it with a dead faith); can it seem any way inconsequent to the consecration thereof by virtue of the common faith of Christians, professing that which is requisite to make true Christians, whether by a living or a dead faith? Rather must we be to seek for a reason, why "he that eateth this bread and drinketh this cup unworthily," should be "guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ," as "not discerning" It;

Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Grace, c. vii.
according to St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29: unless we suppose the same sacramentally present, by virtue of that true Christianity, which the Church professing, and celebrating the sacrament, tendereth it for spiritual nourishment to a living faith, for matter of damnation to a dead faith. For if the profession of true Christianity be, as of necessity it must be, matter of condemnation to him that professeth it not truly (that is to say, who, professing it, doth not perform it); shall not his assisting the celebration and consecration of the eucharist produce the effect of rendering him condemned by himself (eating the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament out of a profession of Christianity, which spiritually he despiseth), for not fulfilling what he professeth? Or that living faith, which concurreth to the same as a good Christian should do, be left destitute of that grace, which the tender of the sacrament promiseth, because the faith of those who join in the same action is undiscernable? Certainly, if the sacramental presence of Christ's Body and Blood, tendering the same spiritually, be a blessing or a curse according to the faith which it meets with; it can by no means seem unreasonable, that it should be attributed to that profession of Christianity, which makes it respectively a blessing or a curse according to the faith of them for whom it is intended.

§ 7. As for that opinion, that makes this presence to proceed from the hypostatical union passed so long before; it stands upon those scriptures, which seem to signify, that those properties, wherein the majesty of Christ's Godhead consists, are really communicated to [His*] Manhood, in the doing and for the effecting of those works, wherein that assistance, and grace, and protection, which He hath promised His Church upon His exaltation, consisteth. St. Paul writeth to the Colossians, that "it pleased, that all fulness should dwell in Christ" (in Whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," as he expresseth himself more at large, Col. ii. 9, that they by Him might be filled); "and by Him to reconcile all things to Himself, making peace by the

---

* Misprinted "this," in folio edition. See e.g. for this (the Lutheran) doctrine, the authors cited below, § 10. note m, § 11. note n; and especially Chemnitis, De Hypostatica Durarum Naturarum in Christo Unione, de Com- municatione Idiomatum, &c., cc. iv., sq. pp. 13, sq., in fin. Fundament. Sane Doctrinæ, &c. de SS. Coena, fol. Witteb. 1610. The passages of Scripture referred to by Thorndike are cited by Chemnitis, ibid., c. xxiv. pp. 130, sq.
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Blood of His cross, by Him I say, whether things on earth or in the heavens: and you, being once estranged, and enemies in your mind, through evil works, yet now hath He reconciled through the Body of His Flesh, by death, to present you holy and without spot and blameless before Him. Here, it is plain enough, that our reconciliation is ascribed to the Flesh of Christ’s Body (as to His Blood afore, “In Whom we have redemption, even the remission of sins, by His Blood;” Col. i. 14, 19—22); to wit, for “the fulness of the Godhead,” dwelling “bodily” in Christ. When our Lord saith, “All things are delivered Me by My Father” (Matt. xi. 27), in order to the revealing of His Gospel, that is, to the making of it effectual; when He saith, “All power in heaven and earth is given Me” (Matt. xxviii. 18): a question is made, how given, if a necessary consequence of the hypostatical union? I answer: because the exercise thereof was limited by the appointment of God, and the purpose for which He caused the Word to dwell in our flesh; Which, though of force to do all things, should not have had right in our flesh to execute that, which God had not appointed. And therefore is our Lord Christ justly said to receive that power of God, which by degrees He receiveth commission to exercise. The sitting of Christ at the right hand of God, I have showed, that the apostle makes an argument of Divine

---

Session of Christ at the right hand of God.

“Transylvani” (i.e. Georg. Blundrus, Franciscus David, and the extreme Socinians) “objection  illud Matth. ult., 'Data est,’ &c. "Inde enim sequi videtur, ut non ab eterno nec ex natura, sed duo gratia et tempore, Christus omnipotentiam quamdam habeat.” Bellarm., De Christo, lib. i. c. 8; Controv., tom. i. p. 320. B.—The Lutherans, as e.g. the Liber Concordiae (see below, § 11) p. 780, lay down, that “ratione illius Hypostaticæ Unionis Christus dicit, etiam secundum Humanam Suam Naturam, ‘Mih data est omnis potestas in celo et in terra.’” Chemnitis, however, ut supra, having treated in c. xx. pp. 99—102, “de dominis hyperphysicis Humanæ Naturæ in Christo ex Hypostaticâ cum Divina Naturæ του Λόγου unione collatis,” proceeds in c. xxi. pp. 103—107, to establish, “quod præter dona illa habituæ, de quibus dictum est, alius summus gradus κοινωνίας ponendus sit, quo, propter Hypostaticam cum Divinitate unionem, assumta Humanæ Naturæ in Christo communionem unioni correspondentem habet, cum attributis, quæ Divinae Naturæ Verbi propria sunt;” which he calls “communicatio Majestatis;” so that “non esse quidem de essentia unionis hypostaticæ istam communicacionem, sed tamen consequi ad unionem hypostaticam talen communicacionem et quidem realem, ita ut Naturæ humanae vere sit omnipotentia et omnipresencia,” &c. (Bellarm., De Christo, lib. iii. c. 9; Controv., tom. i. p. 478. B.). But Brentius (e.g. De Personali Unione Durum Naturarum in Christo, &c. qua Vera Presenzia in Conna explicata est, fol. 8. a. Tubing. 1561) and others appear to lay down the doctrine without any such qualifications.

Bk. ii. Of the Cov. of Grace, c. xiv. § 5.
power and authority, dwelling in our flesh in the person of Christ: Hebr. i. 3; Acts ii. 33, v. 31; Eph. i. 20—22; where St. Paul ascribes the filling of the Church, a work of God alone, to It. And, as He sits on God’s own Throne, so He shall judge all as man, saith our Lord; John v. 21—23, 26—30; and raise them up, and quicken them, to that purpose. For the throne of God, on which Christ is set down, is the seat of His judgment. And therefore, “As I live, saith the Lord” (God in the prophet, Esai. xlv. 23, Christ in the apostle, Rom. xiv. 11), “to Me shall every knee bow, and every tongue shall give glory to God.” To the same purpose is all that you read of anointing our Lord Christ with the Holy Ghost, given Him by God “without measure,” saith the Baptist; John iii. 34: if you understand it, not of the habitual graces poured forth upon the Manhood of Christ from the fulness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in It (of the truth whereof, nevertheless, there is no dispute), but of the very majesty of the Godhead, communicated unto It in the person of Christ; as of a truth I have said\(^1\) that they are to be understood. In fine, not only the merit, but the application \(^2\) thereof, that is, the effecting of the cleansing of our consciences from sin, is ascribed unto the Blood of Christ; Hebr. ix. 14, 1 John i. 7. How, or in what regard, but because “by the eternal Spirit He offered up Himself blameless to God,” as the apostle saith? In which regard only it is, that our nature in Christ is honoured with the worship due to God; because, being for ever inseparable from the Godhead of the Word, it is not to be apprehended or figured so much as in the imagination, but as the Flesh of the Word.

§ 8. This is a brief of the scriptures which they allege\(^1\): to infer, that, seeing He hath promised to feed His Church with His Flesh and His Blood \(^2\) in the sacrament of the eucharist, which cannot be unless They be there; and seeing the like works are performed and executed by the Flesh, that is, the Manhood, of Christ, through the virtue of the Godhead united unto it; therefore it is to be believed,

\(^1\) Ibid., § 10; and c. xv. § 5. De Duabus Naturis, c. xxiv. pp. 130, sq.
\(^2\) So e.g. the Liber Concordiae (as quoted below, § 11); and Chemnitius.
that, by communication of the majesty of the Godhead to the Flesh of Christ, It becomes present, wheresoever His promise, and the comfort and strengthening of His disciples (which is the work of His Mediator's office, whereunto by sitting down at God's right hand He is installed), requires the presence of it.

§ 9. If it be said, that, by this position, the attributes and properties of the Godhead are placed in the Manhood, as their own proper subject, into which they are transferred by the operation of the Godhead (not divesting Itself of them, but communicating them to the Manhood, to be thenceforth properties really residing in It, and therefore truly to be attributed to It); I must do them right, and acknowledge that they utterly disclaim this to be their meaning: confessing thereby, that, if it were, they could not avoid the imputation of Eutyches his heresy, condemned by the great council of Chalcedon; the confusion of the Natures remaining unavoidable, when the properties of the Godhead, being communicated to the Manhood, in this sense, can be no more said to remain the properties of It.

§ 10. I undertake not thus much for the rest of their

[k "In hoc autem negotio nihil novi de ingenio nostro fingimus: sed amplexitumur et repetimus declarationem, quam vetus et orthodoxa Ecclesiae et Sacrae Scripturae fundamenta desumptam, ad nos incorruptam transmittit: videlicet, quod Divina illa virtus, vita, potestas, Majestas, et gloria, assumpta humana natura in Christo data sit. Id vero non eo modo, sicut Patris Filii secundam Divinam Naturam essen
tiam Sumam et omnem Divinas proprietates ab utero communicavit: unde et unius cum Patre essentiae et Ipsi æqualis est. Christus enim tantum secundum Divinam Naturam Patri æqualis est: secundum humanam vero naturam sub Deo est. Ex his manifestum est, nullam nos confusionem, exæquationem, aut abolitionem naturarum in Christo statuere. Etenim virtus vivificandi non eo modo est in carne Christi quo est in Divina Eius natura: viz. ut essentiais proprietas. Communicatio autem illa non facta est per essentiam aut naturalem effusio
gen proprietatum Divinae Naturæ in naturam humanam: quasi humanitas Christi cas per se et a Divina essentia separatas habet; aut quasi per illam communicationem humana natura in Christo naturales ac essentiales suas proprietates prorsus depo

divines; who are commonly called Ubiquitaries, because they are supposed to teach, that the omnipresence of Christ’s Godhead is communicated to His Flesh by virtue of the hypostatical union, so that the Body and Blood of Christ, being everywhere present, necessarily subsisteth in the dimensions of bread and wine in the eucharist. This opinion I hold not myself any way obliged here to dispute: further than by barring it with this exception, that it taketh away that supposition, upon which the whole question concerning the consecration of the eucharist standeth; to wit, that, seeing the presence of Christ’s Body and Blood in the sacrament cannot be attributed to the invisible faith of him that receives, it is necessarily to be attributed to the visible faith of the Church that celebrateth. For, according to this opinion, it is manifest, that the said presence can no way depend upon any thing done by the Church in celebrating the eucharist, being already brought to pass and in being, when the Church goes about it. And this is all the argument that I will use against this conceit;—that all the premisses require (and so will also all that which followeth) the presence of the Body and Blood in the eucharist to be of another nature, and otherwise effected, than can be understood to belong to the elements by virtue of the hypostatical union; though we suppose, that which cannot be granted, that by virtue thereof they are everywhere. Which, therefore,

"In the Liber Concordiae (p. 787, see next note) the position is expressly condemned. "Quod humanitas Christi in omnia loca coeli et terrae localiter extensa sit; quod tamen ne quidem Divinitati tribui debet: quod autem Christus per Divinam omnipotentiam Suam, Corpore Suo... praesens esse possit ubiqueque voluerit" (the phrase is Chemnitz’s limitation of the dogma also, De Dubius Naturis, c. xxx. p. 205): “ubiique imprimit, ubi Suam presentiam illam, ut in sacra Suæ Caæna, in Verbo Suo promisit, hoc Ipsius Omnipotentia et Sapientia optime efficere potest sine transmutatione aut aboli- tione verae Suæ humanæ Nature.” And Bellarmine (De Christo, lib. iii. c. 1; Controv., tom. i. p. 448. A. B), stating the position of Luther’s Confessio de Caæna Domini, seil. "Christi Corpus esse realler praesens in Caæna, quia est ubique; esse autem ubique... quia est in dextera Dei que est ubique;" but that there are “tres modos esse- di in loco;” admits, that of these he denies the first, viz., “localiter, id est, circumscriptive;” and the second, viz., “spiritualiter seu per penetrationem,” and affirms only the third, viz., “ce- lestem et Divinum per unionem hypo- staticam.” And see also a careful statement of the various shades of the Ubiquitarian doctrine, in Le Blanc, Theses Theol., Append. lib. ii. c. 2. pp. 185—187. Even Brentius (De Personali Unione, &c., fol. 1. a), and Heshusius (Veræ et Sacram Confessionis de Praesentia, &c., Defensio, Magd. 1562), protest against the terms “lo- calia praesentia vel inclusio in pane.” That their adversaries endeavoured to force it upon them, see e.g. Zuinglius, Ad Lutheri Confess. Respons. Dure, Op., tom. ii. p. 492: or Beza’s Κρεσ- φαγία, &c., pp. 28, sq. Genev. 1561.
whether their divines do really believe, or only in words, I will not here dispute.

§ 11. Thus much I can say, that, by the agreement of the Churches pretending the confession of Augsburg concerning the articles once in difference among them, contained in the book known by the name of Liber Concordiae, they are not tied to maintain so much. For it is there openly protested, not only in the Preface, but chiefly in the eighth article, concerning this point (pp. 769, 787); that they do not believe the properties of the Godhead to be transfused into the Manhood, nor that the Manhood of Christ is locally extended all over heaven and earth, but that Christ by His omnipotence is able to render His Flesh and Blood present where He please; especially, where He hath promised the presence thereof by instituting the sacrament of the eucharist. And Chemnitus therefore, one of the best learned of their divines, in a book writ on purpose to set forth the grounds of their opinion concerning the communication of attributes, expressly confineth himself to these terms; as you may see, cap. xxx. pp. 205, 206: declaring his meaning by the com-

* The book so called was the work principally of James Andreae and Chemnitus, and was drawn up by them and others at Torgau in 1576, 7, for the purpose of uniting the Lutheran body, on the subject especially of the eucharist. See Mosheim, Book iv. cent. xvi. sect. i. Pt. 2. c. 1. § 39. vol. iii. p. 344, note in Soames's edit. It is quoted in the present volume, and apparently by Thornide himself, from the edition printed at Leipsic, 8vo. 1606, containing the Confession of Augsburg itself, the articles of Smalcald, the major and minor Catechisms of Luther, and other tracts, besides the proper book of Torgau itself; and is entitled, "Concordia: Pia et Unanymi Consensu repetita Confessio fidei et doctrinae Electorum, Principum, et Ordinum Imperii, atq. eorumdem Theologorum qui Augustanam Confessionem amplexuntur: cui e Sacra Scriptura, unica illa Veritatis norma et regula, quorundam articulorum, qui post D. Martini Lutheri felicem ex hac vita exitum in controversiam venerunt, solidas accessit declaratio," &c.

* "Quod vero ad phraes et loquendi modos atinet, qui in hoc concordiae libro, quando de Majestate humanae naturae in Persona Christi ad dexteram Dei collocata et erecta agitur, usurpatur: ut omnes sinistrum suscipienses et offendiculas, quae ex varia significatio vocabuli Abstracti ... existere possent, e medio tolluntur: Theologi nostri disertis et expressis verbis testatum volunt: Majestatem illam humanae Christi naturae extra unionem personalem nequaquam asscribendum esse; nec etiam concedendum, quod humana natura eam Majestatem, vel propria, vel per se (etiam in unione personali), essentialiter, formaliiter, habitiue, subiective ... possiddat. Nam si eam et dicendi et docendi rationem tenemus, Divina et humana Naturae una cum proprietatis suae confunderentur: humana etiam Divinae ratione essentiae et proprietatem exquararet, imo vero tota negaretur." Lib. Concord. Praefat., fol. b. 4.

* See the passages quoted above, § 10. note m, and § 9. note k.

 Comparison of iron red hot; which, though the fire be so in it that they are not discernable, much less separable, and though they may do the act of both natures at once upon the same subject by burning and cutting the same thing, remain notwithstanding distinct in their natures.

§ 12. What then would they have? Why, this being set aside, they say nevertheless, most truly, that in the whole work of the Mediator’s office the Divine nature communicateth with the Human; Which, understanding the necessities of Christ’s members, both intercedes with God for supply, and supplies the same by the proper will of it, which His Divine will always concurring brings to effect. In which regard it is also most truly said, that the properties of the Godhead do communicat with the Manhood, in regard of the concurrence of them, to execute that which It resolveth, being always conformable to the will and decree of the Godhead. This indeed is no more than the faith of the Catholic Church importeth: nor inferreth the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ’s Flesh, as an endowment communicated to reside in it by virtue of the hypostatical union, as thenceforth the proper subject of it; but the concurrence of both Natures to the effecting of those works, wherein the Media-
tor's office is seen, whereupon depends that honour and worship, which the Manhood challenges in the person of Christ, as inseparable from the Godhead, to Which originally that honour is due.

§ 13. And, therefore, I shall never go about to return any manner of answer to any of those scriptures which have been alleged for it, but only this, that they infer nothing to the purpose in hand. For if it could be said, that by virtue of the hypostatical union (that is, by the will of God effecting it) the immensity of the Godhead were so transfused into the Manhood, as to make It present wheresoever this sacrament is celebrated (and so in the elements of it); then were this an answer to the difficulty in hand, but such a one, as would engage him that affirms it in the heresy of Eutyches. But saying no more than this,—that the will of the Man Christ concurs with His Divine power, to do all that His promises to His Church import; and that (the effect of this sacrament importing the presence of His Flesh and Blood) it is necessary, that the will of the Man Christ, by the Divine power concurring to the works of It, should make the Flesh and Blood of Christ present, wheresoever His ordinance requires;—they cannot say, that Christ's Flesh is present in the sacrament of the eucharist by virtue of the hypostatical union, upon those grounds; but that, by virtue of the hypostatical union, the will and promise of Christ is executed by the power of the Godhead concurring with it, and Which it acteth with. Which is to say, that [the effect takes place], not immediately by the hypostatical union, but by means of Christ's promise, which must come to effect by the power of the Godhead, Which the human will of Christ communicateth with. And truly, I conceive, no man ever was so impertinent, as not to suppose the hypostatical union, when there was question, how the promise of the presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the eucharist should come to effect. But, that being supposed and not serving the turn alone, it remains, that we judge it by the institution of the eucharist, and the promise which it contains; that is to say, by those scriptures, out of which the intent of them is to be had, and not by the hypostatical union, which being supposed, the question remains nevertheless. And by the hypostatical union, we doubt not,
but our Lord Christ hath power to represent His Body and Blood, that is, to make it present, where He please; but that must be not merely by virtue of the hypostatical union, but by doing the same miracle which transubstantiation imports, though it be the hypostatical union that enableth our Lord Christ to do it. For though there be a difference between the being of Christ’s Flesh and Blood under the dimensions of the elements, the substance of them remaining, and being reduced by the power of God under those dimensions; and, the substance of them being abolished: yet I suppose all men of reason will say, that the hypostatical union contributes no more to that than to this. And therefore, not doubting, that the sacramental presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist is a very great miracle (taking that to be miraculous, which requires the infinite power of God to effect it, not that, which contains a visible effect thereof, apt to bear witness to that truth, which it is done to confirm), I must remit you to that which hath been already said, to judge, whether the miracle consist in abolishing the substance of the elements, and substituting the Body and Blood of Christ in their stead; or in placing the substance of Christ’s Body and Blood under the same dimensions, in which the substance of the elements subsisteth: or rather than either of both, that it be enough to engage the infinite power of God, that by His Spirit He tendereth the Flesh and Blood of Christ, so sacramentally present in the elements, that whoso receiveth them faithfully, thereby communicates as truly in the Spirit of God according to his spirit, as according to his body he communicates sacramentally in His Body and Blood.

§ 14. Here is the place for me to allege those scriptures, which inform us of the true nature and properties of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, remaining in His Body, even now that It is glorified. For if in the proper dimensions thereof, He “parted from” His disciples, and “went,” was “carried,” or lifted and “taken up, into heaven” (Acts i. 2, 9, 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22; Luke xxiv. 50, 51; Mark xvi. 19); if, in the same visible form and dimensions, He shall come again to judgment (Acts i. 11; 1 Thess. iv. 16); if “the heavens

1 Above, c. ii. § 2, sq.
BOOK must receive Him till" that time (for sure no man will be much tempted with that frivolous conceit, that St. Peter's words, Acts iii. 21, "OV δεὶ οὐρανοῦ διξασθαι," are to be construed, "Whom it behoveth to contain the heavens," but, "Whom it behoveth that the heavens contain;" unless it could appear, how St. Peter should understand the Body of Christ to contain the heavens, not the heavens It), "sitting at God's right hand till His enemies be made His foot- 22 stool" (Psalm cx. 1); if to that purpose He "leave the world" (John xvi. 28), "no more" to be "in" it (xvii. 11), so that we shall have Him no more with us (Matt. xxvi. 11): it behoveth us to understand, how we are informed, that the promise of His Body and Blood in the eucharist imports an exception to so many declarations, before we believe it. Indeed there is no place of God's right hand, by sitting down at which we may say that our Lord's Body becomes confined to the said place: but, seeing the Flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at God's right hand (though, by His sitting down at God's right hand, we understand the Man Christ to be put into the exercise of that Divine power and command which His mediator's office requires), yet His Body we must understand to be confined to that place, where the majesty of God appears to those that attend upon His throne. Neither shall the appearing of Christ to St. Paul (Acts xxiii. 11) be any exception to this appointment. He that would insist, indeed, that the Body of Christ stood over Paul in the castle where then he lodged, must say, that It left heaven for that purpose. For that is the miracle which the text expresseth,—that He was there, Whose ascent into heaven it had reported afore. But seeing the very Body of Christ might, in a vision of prophecy, appear to Paul in the Spirit, without any contravention to that determination, which the Scripture otherwise had expressed; were it not madness to go

* So e.g. Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Lib. de Ascens. Domini: as quoted by Bellarm., De Christo, lib. iii. c. 12; Controv., tom. i. p. 487. A. And see the same Illyricus, De Mystica Sacramentali que seu Externa Praesentia et Manducatione Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Sacra Cena, p. 371. 12mo. 1574.

* The common argument of the Lutherans and Ubiquitarians: see e.g. the books cited above, in § 10. note m.

† It is instanced as such an exception by Chemnitius, De Duob. Naturis., c. xxx. p. 188. Compare also Bellarm., De Sacr. Euchar., lib. iii. c. 3; Controv., tom. ii. p. 672.
about to limit the sense and effect of it, upon pretence of a promise altogether impertinent to the occasion in hand, and every whit as properly to be understood without so limiting the sense of it?

§ 15. This is all the argument that I pretend to maintain upon this consideration: knowing well enough, that it is said indeed, that, the Flesh of Christ remaining in heaven in the proper dimensions thereof, which the exaltation allows, nothing hinders the same to be present under the dimensions of the elements; whether the substance of them be there, which consubstantiation allows, or whether they be abolished, as transubstantiation requires. Which he that would contradict, must enter here into a philosophical dispute, whether or no the infinite power of God can bring to pass either or neither of these effects: that is to say, whether it imply a contradiction, that the Body and Blood of Christ (Which is as sure in heaven as the faith of Christ is sure) should at the same time be present in the sacrament of the eucharist under the dimensions of the elements; whether we suppose the substance of them to be abolished, or to remain present. This dispute I am resolved not to touch at this time: partly for that reason which I have alleged upon other occasions,—because I desire to discharge this book, being written in our mother tongue, of all philosophical disputes, tending rather to puzzle than to edify the main of those that speak English;—partly for a reason peculiar to this point,—because it hath been argued, that, if we deny transubstantiation or consubstantiation as contradictory to reason, there can be no cause, why we should cleave to the faith of the Trinity; which every man sees to be no less contradictory to human reason than either of both. For though I do no ways admit this consequence, because it is evident, that the nature of bodily substance is far better comprehended by man’s understanding, than the incomprehensible Nature of God, which it is impossible to apprehend any thing of but under the resemblance of something belonging to sensible


* E. g. Preface to the Epilogue, § 12.
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substance; yet I am willing to go to issue without drawing this dispute into consequence, referring to judgment, whether the evidence for consubstantiation or transubstantiation be such as for the Holy Trinity out of the Scriptures: that is to say, whether the presence of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the eucharist is so to be understood, as to void the confining of Them to those dimensions, which the Scripture allows Them in heaven (and this as necessarily, by the Scripture, as the Scripture necessarily obligeth to believe the Holy Trinity); whenas it may be, more properly to the nature of the business, understood mystically, as in a sacrament, intended to convey the communion of His Spirit: in the mean time allowing any man, that submits his reason to all that Christianity imports, the sober use of it, in disputing, whether the presence of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the eucharist, as consubstantiation or as transubstantiation requires, be contradictory to the evidence of reason or not.

CHAPTER IV.

THE OPINION WHICH MAKETH THE CONSECRATION TO BE DONE BY REHEARSING THE OPERATIVE WORDS. THAT OUR LORD CONSECRATED BY THANKSGIVING. THE FORM OF IT IN ALL LITURGIES, TOGETHER WITH THE CONSENT OF THE FATHERS. EVIDENCE THAT THERE IS NO TRADITION OF THE CHURCH FOR THE ABOLISHING OF THE ELEMENTS.

Coming now to consider wherein the consecration of the eucharist consists, I find no opinion on foot, but that which hath taken possession by the authority of the school-doctors; that it is performed by the recital of these words, "This is My Body, This is My Blood," in the canon (that is, the canonical or regular prayer for the consecration of the eucharist) of the mass. For those that have set aside this prayer, and do not allow the opinion, that these words are

* "Praevarat tamen hodie opinio constituens in his solis verbis—Hoc est Corpus Meum, hic est Sanguis Meus—panis et vini consecrationem; adeo ut Bellarminus, Vasquez, Becanus, et alii, illam indigentem 'communem Scholasticorum sententiam.'" Albertinus, De Euch., lib. i. c. 4. p. 7. b: having just quoted from Christopher de Capite Fontium a list of seven different opinions held at various times on the point "inter scriptores Catholicos."—See Bellarmin, De Sacr. Euch., lib. iv. c. 12; Controv., tom. ii. p. 832. D: and Vasquez, In Tertiam P. D. Thomæ, Disp. clxxxvii. art. i. c. 3; tom. iii. pp. 312, 313.
operative to the effecting of that which the institution of the
eucharist promises, though they retain the recital of them in
the action, yet have not declared any common agreement,
wherein they intend to maintain the consecration of the
eucharist to stand.

§ 2. And is it not then free for me to declare, that I
could never rest satisfied with this opinion of the school-doc-
tors; as finding it to offer violence to common sense, and
the truest intention of that which we may see done in conse-
crating the eucharist? For when our Lord takes the ele-
ments in His hands and blesses them (or gives God thanks
over them), then breaks the bread, and, delivering them,
bids His disciples take and eat them, because they are His
Body and Blood; is it not manifest, that they are so called
in regard of something which He had already done about
them, when, delivering them, He calls them at that present
time of delivering them, that which He could not call them
afore, His "Body and Blood?"

§ 3. No, say they; that is easily understood otherwise,
from the common customs which men use in civil convey-
ances: nothing being more usual, by several customs of
several nations, than to convey the right and possession of
house or land by delivering writings, testifying certain deeds
done to that effect; to put in possession of a house by deliv-
ering the key, or the post to be held, or putting into the
house; by delivering a turf of the land to be conveyed, to
put into rightful possession of the same; adding the like
words to these—"Here is this house or this land, take it for
thine own."—But in vain.

§ 4. Those that use this escape consider not, that our
Lord said these words—"Take, eat, drink, This is My Body,
This is My Blood,"—when He delivered them: so that, if by
saying these words He made them that which the words sig-
ify, then by delivering them He made them that which
they signify. For so the like words serve, in delivering pos-
session, to express the intent of him that delivers it. To
which overt act of delivering, the right of possession, and the
conveying of it, is as much to be ascribed, as to the words
which animate it by expressing the intent of it. Which if it
be true, then were the elements, which our Lord delivered to
His disciples, consecrated by delivering them. And therefore, by consequence, the eucharist is never consecrated but by delivering of it; seeing, of necessity, the eucharist is consecrated by the same means, as the first, which Christ communicated to His disciples, was consecrated. But this can by no means stand with the intent of them that maintain this opinion: supposing, as they do, that the sacrament is consecrated before it be delivered to them that receive it.

§ 5. And hence starts another argument. For these words, as they are used in consecrating the eucharist, are part of the rehearsal of that which our Lord Christ did, when He consecrated that eucharist which He gave His disciples. And will any reason endure this,—that the eucharist be thought to be consecrated by reciting what Christ said, when He delivered that eucharist which He had consecrated, and not by doing what Christ commanded to be done, when He appointed it to be celebrated? Certainly, he that says, Christ “took bread and blessed it and brake it, saying, Take, eat, This is My Body,” says what Christ did and said, before, and when, He delivered it. He that says further, that He said, “Do this in remembrance of Me,” says, that Christ instituted this sacrament. But to say that Christ instituted this sacrament, is not to consecrate that sacrament which Christ instituted. That is not done but by doing that which Christ is said to have done.

§ 6. And is not Christ said to have “blessed” the elements? Is it not said, that, having “taken” and “blessed” and “broken” the bread, delivering it to His disciples, He affirmed it to be His Body at the present when He delivered it? Can the becoming of it His Body be imputed to the ‘taking,’ or ‘breaking,’ or ‘delivering’ of it? Doth it not remain then, that it be imputed to the ‘blessing’ of it?

§ 7. Here, finding it evident, by comparing the evangelists one with another and with St. Paul, that ‘blessing’ and ‘giving of thanks’ in this case, are both one and the same thing signified by two words; I must needs infer, that blessing the elements is nothing else, but giving God thanks over them (which at the present our Lord had in hand), with intent to make them the sacrament of His Body and Blood. The people of God, in our Lord’s time, were wont to take
nothing for meat or for drink without first giving God thanks solemnly for it, as they had it in hand. You may see how scrupulous they were in this point by the title of "Blessings," the first of the Talmud: where you have those forms of thanksgiving recorded, and the circumstances at which they were to be used, in receiving several kinds; which were, some of them, doubtless, more ancient than our Lord's time. A practice fitting for Christianity to continue; setting aside that "superstitious scrupulosity" of forms and circumstances, wherein the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees consisted. Therefore St. Paul, withstanding those heretics, that taught "to abstain from meats, which God hath made to be participated with thanksgiving by the faithful and such as have known the truth" (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4, 5), adds for his reason,—"Because every creature of God is good, and none to be rejected, received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer:"

the word of God enabling Christians to receive it with a good conscience, so as they may expect God's blessing, which they have desired by their prayers. For is it not manifest, that (having said, that "every creature is good" which a Christian "receives with thanksgiving"), when he adds that "it is sanctified by prayer," grounded on God's words, he includes in that thanksgiving, which he means, prayer to God for a blessing upon it? The creatures of God then are sanctified to the nourishment of our bodies by thanksgiving, with prayer for God's blessing; and shall we think, that that thanksgiving, wherewith they are sanctified to the nourishment of our souls, doth not include prayer to the effect intended, that they may become the Body and Blood of Christ, Which God by this sacrament pretends to feed our souls with? And doth not the execution of our Saviour's institution, when He says, "Do this," consist in giving God thanks for the redemption of mankind, with prayer, that we may be fed by the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the eucharist? Certainly, the word, "Do this," is that which the whole action is grounded upon, as pretending to execute it: and therefore

---

<sup>a</sup> See Service of God at Relig. Assemblies, cc. vii. § 18—23, x. § 49.  
<sup>b</sup> See Tertullian as quoted in Bk. II.  
<sup>c</sup> Of the Cov. of Grace, c. xxxii. § 13.  
<sup>d</sup> See note t.  
<sup>e</sup> So in folio edition; qu. "word."
the effect of it, so far as consecrating the eucharist, is already come to pass, when the Church may say, "This is our Lord's Body—This is His Blood;" as our Lord said, "This is My Body—This is My Blood."

§ 8. But the strength of this resolution, I confess, lies in the consent of the Church; and those circumstances visible in the practice thereof, which, to them that observe them with reason, are manifest evidences of this sense. I have observed, in a book of the Service of God at the Assemblies of the Church (pp. 349—370), the passages of divers of the most ancient writers of the Church, in which "eιχαριστείν," or "giving thanks," is put for "consecrating the eucharist;" unto which add the words of Irenæus in Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. v. 20) concerning the then Bishop of Rome, Anicetus, when Polycarpus was there,—"Παρεχώρησε τὴν εἰχαριστίαν Πολυκάρπῳ" that is, "He gave way to Polycarpus to celebrate the eucharist."—For seeing that this sacrament (that is, the elements consecrated) are called the eucharist all over the Church from this "thanksgiving," the act thereof passing upon them, to give them by way of metonymy this name; what can be more reasonable, than to grant, that it is this act (and not the rehearsal of the words of the Gospel, which relate what our Lord did and said, in instituting as well as 25 celebrating it), by which the consecration is performed: though, on the other side, I insist, that these words have always been rehearsed by the Church in consecrating the eucharist, and ought still to be frequented; and, among them, those which our Lord said when He delivered it, "This is My Body—This is My Blood;" which now the whole School thinks to be the only operative words in that change, which the making of the elements to become the sacrament imports.¹

§ 9. I have also shewed in the same place, that St. Paul,—when he saith (1 Cor. xiv. 16, 17), "For if thou bless by the Spirit, he that fills the place of an idiot" (or private person),

---

¹ c. x. § 38—50.
² The passage is in c. 24, p. 193. D. In c. 20 is another passage of Irenæus respecting Polycarp upon a different subject.
³ "Et quidem Ecclesia Catholica magno consensu docet, illa sola verba ad formam pertinent." Bellarm., De Sacr. Euch., lib. iv. c. 12; Controv., tom. ii. p. 832. D.
⁴ Service of God at Relig. Assembl., c. x. § 38, 40.
"how shall he say the amen upon this thanksgiving? for he knoweth not what thou sayest; for thou indeed givest thanks well, but the other is not edified;"—by "blessing," and "giving thanks," means the consecrating of the eucharist (which those that had the grace of languages among the Corinthians, undertook then to do in unknown tongues, and are therefore reproved by the apostle): because it may appear by the constant practice of the whole Church, that it ended with an "amen" of the people; which St. Paul therefore calls "the amen"—"τὸ ἀμήν," to wit, that was used in that case. And also, that, when he writeth to Timothy;—"I exhort therefore, first of all, to make supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, for all men; for kings, and all that are in eminence, that we may lead a peaceable and quiet life in all piety and gravity;"—he intends to charge, that at the celebration of the eucharist (which here he calleth "thanksgivings") prayers be made, as for all states of men, so especially for public powers and princes: because St. Augustin, St. Ambrose, and the author De Vocatione Gentium ([lib.] i. [c.] 12o), do expressly testify unto us, that the custom which the Church then, and always afore and since, hath had to do this, came from this ordinance of St. Paul, and containeth the fulfilling of it: and because it is manifest by all the forms of liturgy in all Churches, that are yet extant, and by the mention made of the manner of it upon occasion in the writings of the fathers, that the eucharist was never to be celebrated without prayer for all states of Christ's Church. And this indeed is a great part of the evidence which I pretend.

§ 10. There are extant yet, in several languages, several liturgies (that is, forms of that complete service of God, by Psalms and lessons and sermons and prayers, the crown whereof was the eucharist): as that of St. Mark, of St. James, of St. Peter, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, which are the forms

1 Ibid., § 63.
2 See the passage quoted, ibid. § 60 and § 72.
3 See the passage quoted, ibid. § 63.
5 Altered in MS. into "the principal."
that were used in their Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Rome, Cesarea, Constantinople; though not as they had from the beginning appointed, but as prelates of authority and credit had thought fit to add to, or take from, or change, that which they from the beginning had appointed. There is besides the canon of the Roman Mass (that is, the canonical or regular prayer which the eucharist is consecrated with), which is the same in Latin with that of St. Peter in Greece upon the matter (as, of a truth, the Greek is but the translation of the Latin, it seems, for the use of these Greeks in Italy that follow the Church of Rome); and that of St. Ambrose at Milan; three translated out of Arabic by the Maronites at Rome; the Ethiopic translated into Latin; many canons (called by them "anaphora") in the Maronites' Missal lately printed at Rome in the Syriac; one of the Christians of St. Thomas in the East Indies in Latin.

In all these, you shall observe a prayer to begin, where, the deacon formerly saying, "Sursum corda"—"Lift up your hearts," the people answered, "Habemus ad Dominum"—"We lift them up unto the Lord." The subject of it is (at least where any length is allowed it), to praise God for creating the world, and maintaining mankind through His providence with the fruits of the earth: then (after acknowledgement of Adam's fall) for using, first, those means of reclaiming mankind unto God, which we find by the Scriptures, that it pleased God to use; under the law of nature first, by the patriarchs; then, under the law of Moses, by the prophets; then sending our Lord Christ to redeem the world: upon which occasion, rehearsing how He instituted the eucharist at His last supper, prayer is made, that the Holy Ghost, coming down upon the present elements, may sanctify them "to become the Body and Blood of Christ," so that they

1 See Lindanus' Annotat. in Liturg. S. Petri, p. 47. Anvr. 1589.
2 The Missal of St. Ambrose was printed at Milan, folio, in 1522, 1560, 1692; and is also in Pamelius, Liturgie. Latium, tom. i. pp. 293, sq.—Liturg. S. Basil. M., S. Greg. Theol., S. Cyril. Alex., ex Arabico conversa a Victorio Scialach, Accurensi Maronita e Monte Libano, Aug. Vindel. 1604.—The Ethiopic Missal was printed at Rome 4to. 1548, and a Latin translation in 1549: which is also in the Biblioth. P.P., tom. xv., and in Renaudot, tom. i.—The Liber Ministri Missae juxta ritum Ecclesie Nationis Maronitarum (in Syriac and Arabic), Rom. 8vo. 1596: their Missal was printed there in 1594 in Syriac.—For the Liturgy of Malabar, first printed (in a Latin translation) by Abp. Menezes at Coimbra in 1606, see Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x § 42. note q.
which receive them may be filled with His grace. This being so visible in so many of these liturgies; shall we say, that all that follows after the deacon’s warning (“let us give thanks”), makes up that which the ancient Church, after St. Paul, by a peculiar term of art, as it were, calls the “eucharist” or “thanksgiving”? Or that the sacrament, which taketh the name from it, is consecrated only by rehearsing those words which our Lord said, when He delivered it, “This is My Body—This is My Blood?” Especially, all reason in the world enforcing, that the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist (being that which God promiseth upon the observation and performance of His institution and appointment) cannot be ascribed to any thing else.

§ 11. In the Latin Mass, before the rehearsal of the institution, they pray thus:—“Quam oblationem Tu, Deus, in omnibus, quæsumus, benedictam, ascriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris; ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii Tui, Domini nostri Jesu Christi”—“Which oblation, Thou, O God, we pray Thee, vouchsafe to make, in all respects, blessed, imputable, accountable, reasonable, and acceptable; that it may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy well-beloved Son our Lord Christ Jesus.” Then, after the institution:—“Jube hæc perferri per manus sancti angeli Tui in sublīme altare Tuum, in conspectu Divīne Majestatis Tuae; ut quotquot ex hæc altaris participatio sacrosanctum Filii tui Corpus et Sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione cælesti et gratia repleamur”—“Command them to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel unto Thine altar that is above, before Thy Divine Majesty; that as many of us as shall receive the holy Body and Blood of Thy Son by this communion of the altar, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace.” These two parts of this prayer are joined into one in most of those forms which I have named, whether before the rehearsal of the institution or after it. Only, in those many forms which the Maronites’ Missal

1 See Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x. § 34, 37, 42.
3 Ibid., p. 226.
4 See above, § 10. note a. It contains fourteen liturgies (Le Brun, Explic. de la Messe, tom. iv. p. 637); most of which are translated by Renaudot, tom. ii.
BOOK III.

containeth, the rehearsal of the institution comes immediately after the peace: which was, in the apostles' time, that kiss of peace, which they command, going immediately before the deacon's warning to "lift up hearts" to the consecrating of the eucharist: though those words are not now found in any of these Syriac forms. For after the institution is rehearsed, it is easy to observe, that there follows constantly (though not immediately, but interposing some other prayers) a prayer to the same effect with these two; but in two several forms: for in all of them, saving two or three (which pray, that the elements may become the Body and Blood of Christ to the salvation of those that receive, by the Holy Ghost coming down upon them), prayer is made, "that this Body and this Blood of Christ may be to the salvation of the receivers;" which may be understood to signify the effect of both these prayers in so few words; but it may also be understood to signify, that whosoever framed them, conceived the consecration to be made by the rehearsal of the institution premised. Which if I did believe, I should not think them ancient; but contrived at Rome, where they are printed, upon the doctrine of the School now in vogue*. For in all forms besides, the effect of these prayers is to be found; without excepting any of those, which we may have any confidence of that they are come entire to our hands. I demand then, whether I have reason to attribute the force of consecrating the eucharist (upon which the sacramental presence of the Body and Blood of Christ depends) to the recital of what Christ said or did at His celebrating the eucharist, or instituting it for the future; or to the prayer, which all Christians have made, and all either do make or should make, to the express purpose of obtaining this sacramental as well as spiritual presence.

§ 12. Hear how Justin describes the action, Apolog. II.*:—

"Ἀλλάξοντες φιλήματε ἀσπαζόμεθα πανσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν ἕπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προστότῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀρτός, καὶ ποτήριον ὑδατὸς καὶ κράματος καὶ οὕτως λαβῶν, αἶνον καὶ

* Le Brun, p. 640, admits the fact of alterations having been made in them with this view: and so also Renaudot, tom. ii. pp 48, 80, 81.
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δόξαν τῷ Πάτρι τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Αἴγου, ἀναστέψαντι καὶ εὐχαριστήσαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιωθαι τούτων παρ' Αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται ὡς συν- 
τελέσαμος τάς εὐχάς καὶ τήν εὐχαριστίαν, τάς ὅ παρὼν λαός 
ἐπευφημεῖ, λέγων 'Αμήν'—"Having done our prayers, we 
salute one another with a kiss: then" (as I said, that the 
peace was next before the consecration) "is offered to the 
chief of the brethren bread, and a cup of water and wine 
mixed; which he takes, and sends up praise and glory to the 
27 Father of all, through the name of the Son and Holy Ghost; 
giving thanks at large, that we are vouchsafed these things 
at His hands" (to wit, the means which God used to reclaim 
mankind under the law of nature and Moses, and, lastly, 
the coming of Christ and His death and the institution of 
the eucharist): "who having finished his thanksgiving and 
prayers" (for the making of the elements the Body and 
Blood of Christ by the Holy Ghost), "all the people present 
follow with an acclamation saying, Amen." Afterwards he 
calls the sacrament, "Τὴν δὲ εὐχήν λόγου τοῦ παρ' Αὐτοῦ 
eὐχαριστήθησαν τροφήν"—"The food which thanks hath 
been given for, by the prayer of that word which came from 
Him": that is, which our Lord Christ appointed the eu-
charist to be consecrated with, when He commanded His 
disciples to do that which He had done.

§ 13. So Origen (in Matt. xv.) calls the eucharist, "Pa-
nem verbo Dei et per obsevationem sanctificatum"—"Bread 
sanctified by the word of God and prayer." And Contra 
Celsum, lib. viii. d; "Oblatos panes edimus, Corpus sanctum 
quoddam per preces factos"—"We eat the bread that was 
offered, made a kind of holy Body by prayer." Not that 
which is grounded upon that word of God, by which His 
Creatures are our nourishment (as Justin saith afterwards,

b Id., ibid. § 66. p. 83. B.

c "Οὗτος δὲ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ μὲν φαγεῖν, 
παρ' αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγια-
θίστος λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεξείς ἄρτου, 
ἀνφερομένα ἄγαθον τίνος, οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ 
φαγεῖν περισσότερον ἄγαθον τίνος." Origi-
gen., In Matth. c. xv. tom. xi. § 14; 
Op., tom. iii. p. 499. B.

d "Καὶ μετ' ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντων Δημουρ-
γῶν εὐχαριστήσωμεν, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐυχαρι-
στίας καὶ εὐχήν τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι

prosagō̂moven ártoun θεômen, σώμα 
γαμακωστίν διὰ τὴν εὐχήν ἔδωκεν τι καὶ 
ἄγαθον τοῖς μετ' ὑμῖν προσήκεις αὐτῷ 
viii. § 33; Op., tom. i. p. 766. D. E. — 
"Valde dubium est, an in (hoc loco) 
de Eucharistia agat." Albertin., de Eu-
c. 2, p. 361.

* "Εἰπὶ χάπι τὸ ὁς προσφερόμεθα, 
εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν Ποιήτην τῶν πάντων διὰ
that Christians bless God, by the Son and Holy Ghost, for all the food they take); but that word of Christ, whereby He commanded to do that which He had done.

§ 14. St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. Mystag. iii. 1) saith, that "the bread is no more common bread after the calling of the Holy Ghost upon it;" because, he saith afterwards (Catech. Mystag. v. 1), that the Church prays God to send the Holy Ghost upon the elements to make them the Body and Blood of Christ: as I said.

§ 15. So St. Basil calls the form of consecration (which, I shewed you, he affirms to come by tradition from the apostles, as here I maintain it doth), "τὰ ρήματα τῆς ἐπικλήσεως"—"the words of invocation;" to wit, whereby we call for the Holy Ghost to come upon the elements and consecrate them (De Spiritu Sancto, cap. xxvii. 1).

§ 16. St. Gregory Nyssen (De Vita Mosis) saith, the bread is sanctified by the Word of God, Which is His Son: but, to say further by what means, he adds, "In virtue of the blessing;" to wit, which the Church consecrates the eucharist with, as our Lord did.


§ See below, § 46.

κ "Εἶδα... παρακάλουσαν τὸν φιλόθροαν Θεὸν, τὸ Ἁγιὸν Πνεῦμα ἐπουστελλάτα ἐπὶ τὰ παρακελευμα... ἐν πολλῷ τῶν μιν ἄρτων σώμα Χριστοῦ τὸ δὲ οἶκον σῶμα Χριστοῦ." Id., Catech. xxiii. (Mystag. v.) § 7. p. 327. C.

1 Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Assemb., c. vii. § 11.

κ "Τῶν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν περιφλαγμένων δογμάτων καὶ πνευματικῶν, τὰ μὲν εἰς τῆς ἐγγράφου διδάσκαλος ἧμα, τὰ δὲ εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσεως διδασκαλία ἥμα εἰς μοναρχίαν παρεξερεύθη μεθα... οἷον... τὰ τῆς επικλήσεως ρήματα ἐπὶ τὴν ἀναθήματος τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς ἐκχάρισεις καὶ τοῦ σωματού σωμάτω τῆς εὐλογίας, τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἐγγράφων ἥμα καταλελείποντας," S. Basil., De Spiritu Sancto, c. xxvii. § 66; Op., tom. iii. pp. 54. D. E, 55. A.—That ἐκκλησίας here is the prayer of consecration (not the address to the congregation), and ἀναθήματος the consecration itself (not the exhibition of the host to the people), see the note on the passage of the Benedictine editors, Suicer (Thesaur. sub voce ἀναθήματος), and Albertin. (De Ecuchar., lib. ii. Testim. S. Basil. M. c. 2. p. 446).

1 The passage is not from the Vita Mosis, but from the Oratio Catechetica, c. xxxvii.; Op., tom. iii. p. 104. C. D. Paris. 1638: and runs thus.—"Καλῶς οὖν καὶ νῦν τὸν τὸν Θεὸν ἐγγικλησίαν ἄρτος εἰς σώμα τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου μεταποιοῦσα ψυχῶνιμοι καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνῳ τὸ σῶμα ἄρτου τὰ δυναμεῖ ἡμῖν ἡμᾶς ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ σωματός ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ οἰκοδίδον δὲ τὸν Σωματοφυλαῖον ἄρτος εἰς θεῖαν μετέστη δύναμιν, διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ νῦν τὸν Θεόν γίνεται. Ἐκεῖ τὸ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ λόγου χάρις ἀπὸν ἐκποιεῖ σώμα, ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου τὴν σωσάσθαι ἡμῖν, καὶ τὸν τὸν καὶ αὐτὸ ἄρτος ἢν ἐνταῦθα διὰ τὸν θεοῦ σωσάσθαι, καὶ ἀπόστολος ἀπὸν ἐκποιεῖ διὰ τὸν Θεοῦ καὶ ἐκτεθέσθαι." And at the end of the chapter (ibid., p. 105. B.): "ταῦτα δὲ διδώσας τῆς εὐλογίας δωμάτιο πρὸς ἐκεῖνο μεταποιεῖσθαι τῶν φαινομένων τὸν φόνον."
§ 17. Optatus describes the altars or communion tables which the Donatists broke (for they were of wood, not of stone), "Quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit, quo postulatus descend[er]it Spiritus Sanctus"—"On which Almighty God was called to come down, on which the Holy Ghost upon demand did come down."

§ 18. St. Jerome describes the dignity of priests, Epist. [St. Jerem. lxxxv.]: "Ad quorum preces Corpus Christi Sanguisque con-ficitur"—"At whose prayers the Body and Blood of Christ is made," to wit, by God. And In Sophonic iii. 6: "Impie agunt in legem [Christi], putantes eucharistiam imprecantis facere verba, non vitam; et necessariam esse tantum solennem orationem, [et] non sacerdotum merita"—"They transgress the law of Christ, thinking that the eucharist is made by the words, not the life of him that prays over it; and that only the customary prayer, not the works of the priest are requisite."

§ 19. In fine, as often as you read "mysticam precem," or "mysticam benedictionem," when there is speech of the eucharist in the fathers; be assured, that which here I maintain is there understood.

§ 20. True it is, Irenæus ([lib.] v. [c.] 2.1) affirmeth, that [St. Iren.] the bread and the wine, receiving or admitting the word of Irenæus explained.

"Quid enim tam sacrilegum, quam altaria Dei, in quibus aliquando et vos obtulitis, frangere, radere, removere? in quibus et vota populi et membra Christi portata sunt; quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit; quo postulatus descenderit Spiritus Sanctus; unde a multa et pignus salutis aternæ et tutela fidei et spes resurrectionis accepta est?" Optat., Cont., Parmenian., lib. vi c. i. p. 90. ed. Dupin.

—Albertinus quotes the passage, De Euch., lib. i. c. 6. p. 21. a.; misprinting "descendit" for "descenderit."


God ("acciptionia"), become the eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ. But what "word" this is, he declares himself further, when he saith ([lib.] iv. [c.] 34.1): "Panis percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis est"—"The bread that hath admitted the invocation of God, is no more common bread:" to wit, that word of institution, in virtue whereof the Church calleth upon God to make the elements His Body and Blood.

§ 21. Some of them say, it is done by God's word, as the world was made by it. But the world was made by the word of God's command: and in these words, "This is My Body—This is My Blood," command there is none; in these, "Do this in remembrance of Me," there is a command, which includes a warrant or promise: though the effect of it depend upon the execution of the command by the Church; whereas immediately upon God's word the world was made.

§ 22. And this is that word St. Augustin meant, when he said; "Accedat verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum"—"The word being applied to the element, the sacrament is made." But this application is the execution of Christ's ordinance; not, saying that He said, "This is My Body—This is My Blood." For he saith, the Body and Blood of Christ is only that, "Quod ex fructibus terrae susceptum, ac prece mystica consecratum, rite sumimus"—"Which we duly receive, being taken out of the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by the mystical prayer," which I speak of (De Trinit. iii. 4.). To the same purpose, Epist. lix.

§ 23. A saying or two of St. Chrysostom's indeed I remember; that name those words, speaking of the consecration, as by which the Flesh and Blood of Christ became

---


2 lib. iii. c. 4. § 10; Op., tom. viii. p. 798. B.

present in the eucharist. *In ii. ad Tim., hom. ii.*: that, "as the words which our Saviour then spoke are the same which the priest now uses, so is the sacrament the same, and consecrated by Christ," as that was. And *Hom. de Juda* he [seemeth*] to infer the same:—"The words are pronounced by the mouth of the priest, but the elements are consecrated by the power and grace of God: 'This is,' saith He, 'My Body;' by this word the bread and wine are consecrated." Not by the rehearsing of these words, but by virtue of His command, "Do this;" and by virtue of that "blessing" or "thanksgiving," upon which our Lord affirms the elements which He had consecrated to be His Body and Blood. For the meaning may well be referred to the institution of Christ, and the execution thereof by the Church: which St. Chrysostom supposing, may well say, that upon this affirmative of our Lord, "This is My Body—This is My Blood," depends the consecration of the eucharist; not as that which effecteth it, but as that which evidenceth and assureth it, inasmuch as it was said by our Lord Christ, upon supposition of that blessing or prayer which He appointed it to be consecrated with.

§ 24. So the author *De Cena Domini,* in St. Cyprian: that "since our Lord said, 'Do this in remembrance of Me'—"This is My Body—This is My Blood," the bread and the cup, being consecrated by these words, become profitable to the salvation of man." True it is indeed: inasmuch as the

---


a "saith," in orig. text, by an obvious misprint.

b "Sed ex quo a Domino a dictum est, Hoc facite in Meam commemoracionem, Hec est caro Mea, et hic est Sanguis Meus; quotiescunque his ver-
appointment of our Lord Christ is not completely executed by consecrating the eucharist, but by respectively delivering and receiving it; you may truly say, that by virtue of these words, "Take, eat, This is My Body, This is My Blood," that which every man receives becomes the Body and Blood to him that receives it. For as I have said, that it becomes the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, in order to our feasting upon it; so is that which I receive, completely and finally the Body and Blood of Christ to me, when I receive it. But this sense, supposing it already to be the Body and Blood of Christ to all that communicate in it according to Christ’s ordinance, cannot be to the purpose of them, that would have it become such to all that receive it, by virtue of these words, by which it becomes so finally to him that finally receives it.

§ 25. An objection indeed there is (but which lies against the other opinion as much as against this) out of St. Gregory, Epist. vii. 64. Indict. ii.: "Orationem vero Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent; et valde mihi inconveniens visum est, ut precem quam scholasticus composuerat super oblationem diceremus, et ipsam traditionem quam Redemptor noster composuit super Eius Corpus et Sanguinem taceremus"—"But the Lord’s Prayer we therefore say straight after the prayer, because the custom of the apostles was to consecrate the sacrifice of oblation with that alone; and it seemed to me very inconvenient, that we should say over the oblation the prayer which a school-doctor had composed, and silence the tradition which our Redeemer composed, over His Body and Blood.” For if the apostles consecrated the eucharist by saying the Lord’s Prayer, as St. Gregory here seems to affirm, then can there be no tradition of the apostles, whereby a certain prayer is prescribed, as that wherein the consecration of the eucharist consisteth. Therefore, if it should appear, that St. Gregory did indeed believe, that the apostles used the Lord’s Prayer


in celebrating the eucharist with an intent to consecrate the sacrament by the same; I confess, I should rather adhere to St. Basil\textsuperscript{d}, affirming the apostles to have delivered certain words (that is, the meaning of certain words), to call upon God, for the consecrating of the elements into the Body and Blood with. For in so doing I should not prefer St. Basil, but the whole Church (the practice whereof, so general and so original as hath been declared\textsuperscript{e}, could have no beginning but that which our common Christianity pretendeth, from the apostles), before St. Gregory. And truly, that the consecration should end with the Lord’s Prayer, I do easily believe to come from the practice of the apostles; so ancient and so general I find that custom, which St. Gregory maintains. Nor is it any more that St. Jerome hath said in his third Book against the Pelagians\textsuperscript{f}, though he is sometimes alleged for that which St. Gregory saith; “\textit{Sic docuit apóstolos Suos, et quotidie in Corporis Illius sacrificio credentes audeant loqui, Pater noster Qui es in caelis}”—“So taught He His disciples, that believers dare say every day at the sacrifice of His Body, Our Father Which art in heaven\textsuperscript{g}.” By and by: “\textit{Panem quotidianum, sive super omnes substantias, venturum apostoli deprecantur, ut digni sint assumptione Corporis Christi}”—“The apostles pray for daily bread (or above all substances) to come, that they may be worthy to receive the Body of Christ\textsuperscript{h}.” All this concerns the concluding of the consecration with the Lord’s Prayer, as it did always conclude. For straight he allegeth, that as soon as a man is baptized, coming to the communion, he is to say, “Forgive us our trespasses!" But before that form was made which St. Gregory saith Scholasticus composed (whether he mean a man of that name, or, as I conceive, some doctor that professed the Scriptures\textsuperscript{i}), if St. Gregory should tell me that

\textsuperscript{d} See above, § 15.
\textsuperscript{e} Above, § 8—11.
\textsuperscript{f} "Hieronymus etiam sit lib. iii."
\textsuperscript{g} "apostolos quotidie orationem Dominicam solitos dieere in sacrificio; sed non addit solam." Card. Bona, Rer. Liturg., lib. ii. c. xv. § 1; Op., p. 578.
\textsuperscript{h} b: and see Bingham, XIII. vii. § 3, XV. iii. 28.
\textsuperscript{i} "Panem quotidianum, sive super omnes substantias, venturum apostoli deprecantur, ut digni sint assumptione Corporis Christi"—“The apostles pray for daily bread (or above all substances) to come, that they may be worthy to receive the Body of Christ.”

\textsuperscript{f} "De baptismatis fonte surgentes, et regenerati in Dominum Salvatorem; impleto illo quod de se scriptum est, ‘Beati quorum remissam sunt iniquitates et quorum tecta sunt peccata’: statim in prima communione Corporis Christi dicunt, ‘Et dimite nobis debitam nostra;’ quod illis fuerant in Christi confessione dimissum." Id., ibid.

\textsuperscript{g} "Miras nugas de hoc Scholastico quidam scribunt, presentem Eterodoxi Misoliturgi; cum manifestissimum sit
some other form to the same effect was not in use, I could not believe him, believing the premisses. The substance and effect whereof (under the name of "eucharistia," or "the thanksgiving") is that which the Church from the beginning consecrated the eucharist with, by the appointment of our Lord, and according to the practice of His apostles. So Rabanus (De Institutione Clerorum, i. 32') affirms, that "the whole Church" consecrates "with blessing and thanksgiving," the apostles having taught them to do that, which our Lord had done. Walafridus Strabo (De Rebus Ecclesiasticis, cap. xxii.) relates two several opinions concerning this business, as it appears by his discourse: "Et relatio majorum est, ita primitis temporibus missas fieri solitas, sicut modo in pasascœ Paschœ (in quo die apud Romanos missœ non aguntur) communicationem facere solens; id est, presiœ Oratœ Dominica, et (sicut Ipœ Dominus noster prœceptit) commemorœ passionis adhibita, eos Corporœ Dominico communicasse et Sanguini, quœs ratio permittebat"—"And there is a relation of our predecessors, that in the first times mass was done, as now on Good Friday (on which day mass is not said at Rome) the communion is wont to be made; that is, that, the Lord's Prayer premised, and the commemoration of His death applied, those whom reason allowed did communicate in the Body and Blood of our Lord." The practice of the Church of Rome here mentioned is that which still continues, not to consecrate the eucharist either on Good Friday or the Saturday following. For then mass is said so late, that it belongs to Easter day. And on Maundy Thursday the eucharist is consecrated and reserved to be received on Good Friday.


* "In hac die" (scil. Parasceve or Good Friday) "sacramenta penitus non celebratur; sed eucharistiam in Cona Domini" (l.e. Maundy Thursday) "consecratam, peracto officio lectioœm et orationœm et sanctœ crucœ salutationem, resumunt: quia, ut Innocentius Papa testis est, ex eo quod apostoli et amatores Christi eo biduo quo crucifixœs et sepulturœ Salvator est, in marœre constituti, ab omni cibo abstinerent se, hinc traditœ ecclesœm hebœt, biduo memorœ sacramenta non
That any commemoration of Christ's death is made at the CHAP. IV.
receiving of it, as Rabanus saith, I find not. This is certain,
that no man imagines that the eucharist is consecrated by
any thing that is said or done at the receiving of it, but at the
mass on the day before. And this, in the Greek Church, is
called "Δειτουργία τῶν προηγιασμένων"—"The liturgy of
the elements that were consecrated afore," which they use
on other days besides. Therefore this opinion, that the
apostles should celebrate so, would import, that they cele-
brated the eucharist without consecrating of it; that is, that
they never appointed how it should be consecrated: which
neither Rabanus, nor any of these whose opinion he relates,
can maintain; nor, supposing the premisses, is it tenable.
And, therefore, I take the true meaning of St. Gregory's
words to be laid down in another opinion, related afore by
Rabanus:—"Quod nunc agimus multiplici orationum, canti-
lenarum, et consecrationum officio, totum hoc apostoli, et post
eos proximi, ut creditur, orationibus et commemoratione passi-
onis Dominice faciebant simpliciter"—"That which we act by
an office compounded of many and divers prayers, Psalms,
and consecrations; all that the apostles, and the next after
them, did plainly with prayers and the commemoration of
our Lord's passion, as it is thought." For the consecration
may well be understood to be made "plainly, by prayer, with
conmemoration of our Lord's passion;" in opposition to that
solemnity of lessons, Psalms, and prayers, which at the more
so solemn occasions of the Church it was afterwards celebrated
with: though we suppose it to conclude always with the
Lord's Prayer, as St. Gregory requires. And herewith the
words of St. Gregory seem to agree, when he saith, "Ut ad
ipsam solummodo orationem"—"To consecrate at" (or "with"
it alone);" not by it alone. But if this opinion cannot pass
(having indeed no constraining evidence), but that St. Greg-
ory's words will needs require, that they consecrated the

celebrari; sed magis sanctam resurrectionis nostram expectari; et in ipsa
cum leuitia et gaudio speciali sacrificium offerri." Raban. Maurus, De
iii. pp. 23, H. 24, A.

See the passage quoted in the text
to note n ; and for Rabanus in the text,
read Walasridus Strabo.

See Goar, Rit. Græc., pp. 187—
205 : Leo Allat., De Eccl. Occ. et
Orient. Perp. Cons., Append. pp. 1531,
seq.: and Bingham, XV. iv. 12.

The passage is in Walasridus
Strabo as before quoted, p. 959. D:—
"post eos proximus . . . Dominice (ei-
cut Ipsa praecipit) augebant simpliciter."

See above, text to note c.
BOOK III.

Eucharist by the Lord's Prayer alone: I will then say, that the apostles understood the petition of "our daily bread," as St. Cyprian upon the Lord's Prayer does; to wit, of the bread and drink of the eucharist, daily celebrated and received. For, supposing this intent and meaning, there is nothing pretended to be done by the consecration, which that petition signifieth not; praying, that God will "give us this day the daily" food of our souls by the elements presently provided for that purpose. And all this will no way prejudice that which hath been said of the matter and form of the consecration, derived by tradition from the apostles, to be frequented at more solemn occasions of Christian assemblies. For [that] that assembly, which (believing that Christians are justified by undertaking to profess the faith, and to live according to it, and that our Lord hath left us His Body and Blood of the eucharist to convey the Holy Ghost to our souls, that they may be able to perform what they undertake) should pray the Lord's Prayer over the elements proposed with that intent,—I cannot doubt of their receiving the Body and Blood of Christ: provided that, where the occasion will bear more solemnity, the order of the Church received from the apostles be not neglected. Whereas, supposing Christians to believe, that they are justified by believing that they are justified, or predestinate, in consideration only of Christ's sufferings, and that the eucharist is instituted only for a sign, to confirm this faith: though they should regularly use that form of consecration, which I maintain to come by tradition from the apostles; I would not therefore grant, that they should either consecrate the eucharist, or could receive the Body and Blood of Christ by it. Sacrilege they must commit, in abusing God's ordinance to that intent, for which He never appointed it; but sacrament there would be none, further than their own imagination.

§ 26. And upon these premisses I am content to go to issue, as concerning the sense of the Catholic Church in this

---

* Op., pp. 146, 147. See below, § 32.
† Above, § 8—11.
‡ Added from MS.
§ "What order? that order, which I maintain by the reasons premised to be their order, containing more than the Lord's Prayer." Added in MS. in the margin, against the word "order" above in the text.
¶ Corrected from MS.; "ordinances," in orig. text.
point. If it can any way be shewed, that the Church did ever pray that the Flesh and Blood might be substituted instead of the elements under the accidents of them, then I am content, that this be counted henceforth the sacramental presence of them in the eucharist. But if the Church only pray, that the Spirit of God, coming down upon the elements, may make them the Body and Blood of Christ, so that they which received them may be filled with the grace of His Spirit; then is it not the sense of the Catholic Church, that can oblige any man to believe the abolishing of the elements in their bodily substance: because, supposing that they remain, they may nevertheless become the instrument of God's Spirit, to convey the operation thereof to them that are disposed to receive it, no otherwise than His Flesh and Blood conveyed the efficacy thereof upon earth. And that, I suppose, is reason enough to call it the Body and Blood of Christ sacramentally, that is to say, as in the sacrament of the eucharist.

§ 27. It is not here to be denied, that all ecclesiastical writers do with one mouth bear witness to the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist. Neither will any one of them be found to ascribe it to any thing but the consecration; or that to any faith, but that upon which the Church professeth to proceed to the celebrating of it. And upon this account, when they speak of the elements, supposing the consecration to have passed upon them, they always call them by the name, not of their bodily substance, but of the Body and Blood of Christ which they are become.

§ 28. Justin in the place afore quoted—"Οὐ γὰρ ὤς κοινοῦ ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιήθη λόγων Ἰησοῦς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἐσχεν, ὑπό τινι καὶ τῇ εἰρήνῃ λόγου τοῦ πατρὸς ιερού ἐν χειροποιήθη τροφὴν, ἔξ ἢς αἷμα καὶ σάρκας κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφοντας ἡμῶν, Ἐκεῖνον τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦς καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν 31 εἰναι"—"For we take them not as common bread and drink; but, as our Saviour Jesus Christ, being incarnate by the word of God, hath both flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught, that this food, which thanks have been given for by the prayer of that word which came from Him, by the

* Above, § 12, notes a, b.
change whereof are our blood and flesh nourished, is both the
Flesh and Blood of that incarnate Jesus." Where, by com-
paring the eucharist with the Flesh and Blood of Christ in-
carnate (wherin divers of the fathers have followed him), he
justifies that reason of expounding "This is My Body—This
is My Blood," which I have drawn from the communication
of the properties of the several Natures in our Lord Christ in-
carnate. But chiefly, you see, the elements are made the
Body and Blood of Christ by virtue of the consecration; as
by the incarnation human flesh became the Flesh and Blood
of Christ.

§ 29. So Irenæus, [lib.] iv. [c.] 34: "Quemadmodum qui
[est] a terra panis, percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non com-
munis panis est, sed eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constant, ter-
rena et caelestis; sic et corpora nostra, percipientia eucharis-
tiam, jam non sunt corruptilibia, spem resurrectionis habentia"
—"As the bread that comes from the earth, receiving the in-
vocation of God upon it, is not now common bread, but the
eucharist, consisting of two things, the earthly and the hea-
vily; so also our bodies, receiving the eucharist, are not now
 corruptible, having the hope of rising again." For he had
argued afore, that, because our flesh is nourished by the Body
and Blood of Christ (which, if They were not in the eucharist,
it could not be), therefore they shall rise again. By virtue
therefore of the consecration they are there, not by the
faith of him that receives, according to Irenæus.

§ 30. Tertullian (De Resurr., cap. viii.); "Caro Corporae
et Sanguine Christi vescitur, ut [et] anima de Deo saginetur"—
"The flesh feeds on the Body and Blood of Christ, that the
soul may be fattened with God."

§ 31. Origen (In Divers. Loc., hom. v. 1) is the first, that

---
a E. g. Gelasius (see above, c. ii. § 25. note k), and S. Hilary (see below,
§ 34), and Theodoret in his Dialogues,
and many others.
b Above, c. ii. § 24.
c See the passage above, § 20. note r.
d "Πῶς τὴν σάρκα λίγοντι εἰς φθοράν χωρείν, καὶ μὴ μετέχειν τὴν
ζωήν, τὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου
καὶ τοῦ σώματος οὐκ ἔφερον; "H
τὴν γνώμην ἀλλαζέωναν, τὸ τροπθή-
ρειν τὰ εἴρημα καταργεῖσθαιν. Ἡμῶν
dὲ σώματος ἡ γνώμη τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ,
καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστίᾳ βεβαιοὶ τὴν γνώμην.
Προσφέρειν δὲ Αὐτῷ τὰ πίσι, ἐμμελεῖ
knowing less, καὶ ἐναντίον ἀπαγόρευτος,
καὶ ὁμολογούοντες σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματος
ἐγερθεῖν. Ὅσε γὰρ ὁ Κ. Ἡ. lib. iv. c. 34. p. 327.

---
† "Quando sanctum cibum illudque
incorruptum accipis epulum, quando
vitæ pane et poculo fruere, manducas
et bibis Corpus et Sanguinem Domini;
tunc Dominus sub tectum tuum ingre-
advise to "say with the centurion" (when thou receivest the eucharist), "Lord I am not worthy that Thou shouldest come under my roof:" for "then the Lord comes under thy roof," saith Origen.

§ 32. St. Cyprian upon the Lord's Prayer, having said, that [St. Cyprian.]
Christ is our bread, makes that the "daily bread" which we pray for; to wit, in the eucharist: and in his book De Lapsis, makes it to be invading and laying violent hands upon the Body of Christ, for them who had fallen away in persecution, to press upon the communion without penance going afore.

§ 33. The council of Nicea, in Gelasius Cyzicenus ii. 30: [The Council of Nicea, A.D. 325.]
"Μη τῷ προκειμένῳ ἄρτῳ καὶ ποτηρίῳ ταπείνως προσέχωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα σάντες ἡμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, πίστει νοσήμων κειθαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκείνης τραπέζης τὸν Ἀμνὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν αἰροῦντα τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀθύτως ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων θυμεῦνον καὶ τὸ τίμων Ἀντών Σώμα καὶ Αἵμα ἀληθῶς λαμβάνοντας ἡμᾶς."—"Let us not basely consider the bread and the cup set before us, but lifting up our minds, let us conceive by faith, that there lies upon that holy table the Lamb of God That takes away the sin of the world, sacrificed without sacrificing by priests: and that we receiving truly His precious Body and Blood"—

§ 34. St. Hilary (De Trin. [lib.] viii.), censuring the [St. Hilary of Poitiers.]


"Spretis his omnibus atque contentis, vis infertur Corpori Ejus et San-

1 See S. Hilari., ibid., § 15, 16; pp. 956. B. sq.

"Aitn "Atov oiv apophravemvov, kai el- pavtov peri tov qrov, Toutov Mou vevi to sava" tis tovlepis amobvalleiv lainov; kai Atov bevabswalamov kai eipheivov, Toutov Mou vevi to alma: tis enousias pev, legwv miv elivn Atovov to alma; To 3ovov pov tov elivn meta- bebelvov, oikovon aivmati, ev Kav f' tis Galaivovai kai ouk elivxvstov estin, elivn metadvalv eliv alma; el ivhov swmatikov klybeiv, tuvthn thtwmatofor- ygen thv thmovelovun, kai tov oivov tov kumvov elv pollov kallov thv elvplaisiav tov Aivmatos Ativov kai tov Aivmatos doxhmatov elvomologhsetai; "Estrv meta thg thv poleforos, ouv sw- matov kai aivmatov metaelvnavvovn Xristov. 'En tivthv gar artov didtov soi tov Aivma kai ev tivthv ouv ov tivthv soi tov Alma. Yna yev, metadvalv sw- matov kai aivmatov Xristov, elvswimov kai elvnavov Ativov." S. Cyril. Hieros., Catech. ccxii. (Mystag. iv.) § 1-3; Orp., p. 320. A.—C.—"Hv prswixe ouv oiv fiv elivgei thv artov kai thv ouv." Xwma gar kai Alma Xristov, kata thv dekatoth tynkhein elvphagov. El gar kai el aiv- thseis soi toutov elvphallev, alla d' elv- stis se bebaivov. Miv elv thv elv- gswv krypth thv prwima, alla elv thv elvswimov poleforov elvnodevov, Aiv- matov kai Aivmatov Xristov evfazhseis." Id., ibid., § 6; p. 321. B.

"Egfa, agwsaites elavov dva thv xwmatikov thovov elvoun, paraka- louvem thv elvadroun," k.t.l.A. Id., Catech. ccxii. (Mystag. iv.) § 7; ibid., p. 327. C.—See the rest of the passage above, in § 14, note h.
argueth, that, Christ having said of the bread and of the cup, "This is My Body—This is My Blood," Who otherwhiles changed water into wine, we are not to doubt, that we receive His Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine; and, therefore, we are not to look on them as "plain bread and wine, but as the Body and Blood of Christ," He having declared it: all this, by sanctification of the Holy Ghost, according to the prayer of the Church.

§ 36. But I will go no further in rehearsing the texts of the fathers, which are to be found in all books of controversies, concerning this; for the examination of them requires a volume on purpose. It shall be enough, that they all acknowledge the elements to be changed, translated, and turned into the substance of Christ’s Body and Blood; though as in a sacrament, that is, mystically; yet, therefore, by virtue of the consecration, not of his faith that receives.

§ 37. On the other side, that this change is to be understood with that abatement, which the nature and substance of the elements requires, supposing it to remain the same as it was; I will first presume from those very authors which I have quoted.

§ 38. For would not Justin have us take that for bread, which he saith we are not to take for "common bread;" when he saith further, that our bodies are nourished by it, which by the Flesh of our Lord they are not? Would not Irenæus have us think the bread to be the earthly thing, as well as the Body the heavenly, when He says the eucharist consists of both? Tertullian (Ad Uxorem ii. 5⁰) persuades his wife not to marry a Gentile when he is dead; because, when he perceives her to receive the eucharist, and knows it to be bread, he believes it not to be that which Christians call it. Origen, when he tells (upon Matt. xv. 11⁰) that it was called the bread of our Lord, gives no man in his wits occasion to think that the elements vanish. When he saith further,
that it is not the bread, but that which was said upon it, which profits him that worthyly receives it: he would have us take it for what it was, whatsoever it is become. St. Cyprian saith expressly, that it was wine which our Lord calls His Blood; and that the wine of the chalice (to wit, already consecrated) “demonstrates” His Blood: in his epistle against those who consecrated in water alone. The council of Nicea calls it “bread, which the eye of faith discerns to be the Lamb of God.” St. Hilary will have us truly to receive the Body and Blood of Christ (as Justin saith, that our bodies are nourished by it); but he adds, “in sacramento,” to signify the abatement which I speak of, that is, mystically and as in a sacrament. St. Cyril, when he saith, we are not to look upon the elements as “plain,” or “bare,” or “simple” bread and wine, saith, that we may look upon it as bread and wine; though that is not it which profits him that worthily receives it, as Origen said.

§ 39. There are a great many more, that have named and described the elements after consecration by the name of their nature and substance; and say, that the bread and the wine become and are the Body and Blood of Christ. Ignatius, Ep. ad Philadelph. Irenæus, v. 2.—Clemens, Strom.

---

1 “Εἰ δὲ πάν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα εἰς κοιλίαν χορεί, καὶ εἰς δαφράνα ἐκβάλλεται, καὶ τὸ άγιασμένον βρώμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἑστειλάτες, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ διάκονον εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χρυσοῦ καὶ εἰς δαφράναν ἐκβάλλεται κατὰ δὲ τὴν εἰσερχόμενην αὐτῷ εἴλη, κατὰ τὴν ἐναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ὧν ἰδίων γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ ναὸς αἵτων διαβλέψεως.” k.t.l. Id., ibid., in Matth. xv. 17; ibid., p. 499. C, D.


3 See above, § 33, note I.

4 See above, § 34, note k.

5 See above, § 28, note z.

6 See above, § 31, note k.

7 See above, § 35, note n.

8 See above, note q.
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i. 1—Padag. ii. 2.—Tatian, before Irenæus, in Diatesa-
mon, Constitutiones Apostol. viii. 12.—Tertullian, De Ora-
tione cap. vi. 1—Contra Marcionem, iv. 40, iii. 19.—Gregory
Nyssen, De Baptismo. —Origen, Contra Celsum viii. 1—Atha-
nasius, in Synopsis. —Eusebius, in Parallelis Damasceni. —
St. Cyril, Catech. Mystag. i. et iii. 2—Macarius, Hom. xxvii. 1

τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ἐκεί ἐστι Χάμα καὶ Αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὕτως καὶ τὰ ἁμαρταὶ σώματα ἐκ αὐτῶν προσφέρεται καὶ τελεῖται εἰς τὴν γὰρ καὶ διαλύεται ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀνασταθήσεται ἐν τῷ ίδίῳ καρπῷ," κ.τ.λ. Ιδ., ibid., pp. 399, 400.—See
1 "Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ηρωτάτων λα-
βῶν πρῶτον, ἐλάλησαν καὶ εὐχαριστή-
σαν εἰς κλάδας τοῦ οίκου προσθείσης, ἵνα δὴ φάγωμεν λογικά." S. Clem.
Alex., Strom. lib. i. c. 10; Op., tom. i. p. 343. ed. Potter.
2 "Καὶ εὐλογηθέν τε γε τὸν οἶκον, εἰς πάντα,
Λάβετε, πληθυνεῖ τοῦ Μου ἐκεῖ τὸ άίμα,
αἷμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας. . . ." Οτι δὲ οἶκος ἕν
τὸ εὐλογηθέν, ἀποτείχει καλώς, κρός τούτων
μαθήτων λέγων." Οὐ μὴ πιάσῃ τὸν κενή-
τισμὸς τῆς δικτύων ταύτης," κ.τ.λ. 
Id., Predag., lib. ii. c. 2; ibid., p. 186.
3 "Et modo accepto pane, plene
vini calice, Corpus esse Suum et San-
guinem testatus, manducare illos jussit
et ibibere, quod ea futura calami-
tatis Suæ mortis memoria magnificat.
"Tatian, Evang. Quatuar Harmonia, c. xv.,
in Tertio Anno Dominice Prædict.;
ap. Biblioth. PP., tom. vii. p. 86. A. B.
Paris. 1654: falsely ascribed to Am-
monius: see Cave; and Albertin., De
Euch., lib. ii. Testim. Ammonii Alex.
seu potius Tatiani Syrj, p. 319. It is
very questionable whether the work
be genuine: see Cave.
1 "Κατακυρίας τὸ Βιοῦ Χαμά
to the θυσίαν ταύτην, . . . ἡτοι ἐνα-
φύης τοῦ οίκου τούτων Χαμά τοῦ
Χριστοῦ Σου, καὶ τὸ παρθένον τούτο Αἷμα
viii. c. 12; ap. Coteler., PP. Apost.,
tom. i. p. 407.—See Albertin., lib. ii.
Testim. Author. Constit. c. iii.,
p. 380. b.
2 "Tum quod et Corpus Ejus in
pane cenetur." Op., p. 131. D.
1 "Acceptum panem, et distributionem
discipulis, Corpus illum Suum fecit,
Hoc est Corpus Meum dicendo, id est,
figura Corporis Meí. Figura autem
non fuisse, nisi veritatis esset Cor-
pus." Id., Cont. Marc., lib. iv. c. 40;
1 "Venite, mittamus lignum in pa-
orem Ejus, Utique in Corpus. Sic
enim Deus in Evangelio quoque vestro
revelavit panem Corpus Suum appel-
lans, ut et hinc jam eum intelligas
Corporis Suí figuram panii dedisse. Cu-
jus retro Corpus in panem Prophetae
figuravit, Ipsó Domino hoc sacramen-
tum postes interpretatur." Id., ibid.,
lib. iii. c. 19; ibid., p. 408. C.
2 "Ö οίκος ταύτων οἶκος ἐστιν τῶν
κοινῶν; ἀλλὰ δὲν αὐτῶν τὸ μυστήριον
ιερογνωσία, Χάμα Χριστοῦ λέγεται τε
cαι γίνεται." S. Greg. Nyss., In Bapt.
Chriati; Op., tom. iii. p. 370. A.
3 See above, § 13, note d.
4 The only passage at all answering
to the text in S. Athanasius's Synopsis
Scripturæ Sacræ is in the synopsis of the
Gospel of St. Matthew:—" Παρα-
δίδοσιν τὸ μυστήριον έν τῷ λόγῳ
Οὐ μὴ πιάσῃ τὸ δικτυά ταύτης." (Op.,
tom. ii. p. 180. A). And similarly in
the Expositiones in Psalmo; In Ps. lxiv.
9; Op., tom. i. P. ii. pp. 1135. F,
1136. A.
9 "Πολλοί ἀμαρτωλοὶ πρεσβυτεῖροι
ὑπερ προσφοράς, καὶ οὐκ ἀναστή-
ται σε Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ
Αγίω ἀναβείται τῷ προκείμενῳ δόρῳ.
Καὶ ὁ οἶκος γίνεται Χάμα τίμων τοῦ
Κυρίου, τὸ δὲ παρθένον Αἷμα τίμων τοῦ
Sacræ Parallelæ, Lit. II. tit. xxix.;
It is doubtful who this Eusebius was;
but Lequien decides him to have been
later than both Eisus. of Caesarea
and Eus. of Alexandria: see his note
on the passage here cited.
1 "Ὅταν γὰρ ὁ οἶκος καὶ ὁ οἶκος
tοῦ εὐχαριστίας, πρὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἐπικλή-
σεως τῆς προσκυνησίας Θριάδος, οἱ
οἶκοι λατούσι· ἐπικλήσεις δὲ γενομέ-
νης, ὁ μὲν οἶκος γίνεται Χάμα Χριστοῦ,"
ὁ δὲ οἶκος Αἷμα Χριστοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δὲ
τρόπον," κ.τ.λ. S. Cyril. Hieros., Cate-
tech. xix. (Mystag. i.) c. 7; Op., p. 308.
D.—For the third Catechesis, see
above, § 14, note f.
2 "Καὶ ἄνευ τῶν καρπῶν οἱ μεγά-
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§ 40. In fine, the canon of the mass itself prays, that the Holy Ghost coming down may make this bread and this cup


"Hoc quod videtis in altari Dei, etiam transacta nocte vidistis: sed quid esset, quid sibi velit, quam magis rei sacramentum contineret, nondum audistis. Quod ergo videtis, panis est et calix; quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renumiant: quod autem fides vestra postulat inaudenda, panis est Corpus Christi, calix Sanguinis Christi." Id., Serm. cclxxii. Ad Infantes de Sacramento; ibid., pp. 1103. F., 1104. A.

The only passage in S. Jerome’s Comment in Isai. lxvi., lib. xviii., bearing at all on the sacrament, is the following — "Secundum tropologiae possamus dicere: omnes voluptatis magis amatores quam amatores Dei, sanctificari in hortis et in liminis, quia mysteria veritatis non valent intreire, et comederem cibos impictatis, dum non sunt sancti corporis et spiritus: nec commodum carmen Jesu nec bibunt sanguinem Eius:" Op., tom. iii. p. 506. And a little lower, "Christus, Qui non foris sed in domo una et intus comeditur:" Id., ibid. Quoted by Albertini., lib. ii. Testim. Hieron. c. i., p. 588. a.


See above, § 11.

Corrected from MS.; "Holy Ghost’s," in orig. text.
the Body and Blood of Christ. And, certainly, the Roman
mass expresses a manifest abatement of the common and
usual sense of the Body and Blood of Christ unto that sense,
which is proper to the intent and subject of them who speak
of this sacrament; when the Church in the consecration
prays, "ut nobis Corpus fiat dilectissimi Filii Tui Domini
nostri Jesu Christi"—"that they may become the Body and
Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, our Lord Christ
Jesus, to us." No man, that understands Latin and sense,
will say, it is the same thing for the elements to become the
Body and Blood of Christ, as to become the Body and Blood
of Christ to those that receive; which imports no more than
that which I have said. And yet there is no more said in
those liturgies, which pray, that the Spirit of God may make
them the Flesh and Blood of Christ to this intent and effect,
that those which received them may be filled with the grace
of His Spirit. For the expression of this effect and intent
limits the common signification of the words to that which is
proper to this action of the eucharist; as I have delivered it.

§ 41. In the words of St. Ambrose (De iis qui initiantur
myst., cap. xi. b, "Ante consecrationem alia species nominatur,
post consecrationem Caro et Sanguis Christi appellatur"—"Before
the consecration it is named another kind, after the
consecration it is called the Flesh and Blood of Christ,"—no
man that understands Latin, can conceive the word "species"
to signify "the outward appearance," but the substance and
nature of those kinds. For so we call outlandish kinds
"species!," not the appearance of their outward accidents.
And, in the Roman laws, "species annonarie" are the kinds
that are stored up; for men cannot live upon the outward
accidents of them. Therefore, when St. Augustin saith, that
the eucharist consists of two things, "visibili elementorum
specie et invisibili D. N. J. C. Carne et Sanguine," he means,

n See above, § 11.
b De Mysteriis (entitled by Eras-
mus and Gilliotius, "De iis qui initi-
antur mysterialia"), c. ix. § 54; Op.,
tom. ii. p. 639. E. Thordike appears
to have quoted from memory. c. ni.
should be c. ix.: and the passage itself
should run thus,—"Ante benedictione-
nem verborum celestium alia species
nominatur, post consecrationem Corpus
significatur."
that it consists of "the nature and substance of the elements, which is visible," as of "the Body and Blood of our Lord Christ Which are invisible." Again, when St. Ambrose says, that "they are called the Body and Blood of Christ," he signifies that abatement in the property of his words, that requires not the absence of the elements. As when St. Augustin says (in Gratian, De Conssecratione, distinct. ii. can. Hoc est); "Caelestis panis, qui est Caro Christi, suo modo vocatur Corpus Christi, cum re vera sit sacramentum Corporis Christi"—"That heavenly bread, which is the Flesh of Christ, is after the manner of it called the Body of Christ, whereas it is indeed the sacrament of the Body of Christ."

§ 42. The same abatement it is, that St. Cyril afore (Catech. Myst. iv.), the Council of Nicaea, Victor Antiochenus (in Marc. xiv. 22v), and Theodoret (Dial. iii.), signify; when they will us not to consider the elements, but the things which they signify. For does he, that wills us not to consider the bread and wine, intend to say, that there is no such thing there? Or that our interest lies not in them, but in the Body and Blood of Christ which they tender us? Well and good; so said Origen afore.

§ 43. The same abatement is signified evidently by abun-


"In Gratian as above in the text, except the unimportant variation of "qui verer," (or "qua vera") Christi caro est." But the passage is in the main from Lanfranc (as before quoted, c. xiv. p. 179. a.); where it runs thus—"Sicut ergo caelestis panis, qua vera Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur Corpus Christi, Illius videlicet quod visibile, palpabile, mortale, in cruce est suspendum, vocaturque" &c.—omitting wholly the important clause in Gratian, "cum re vera sit sacramentum Corporis Christi." S. Augustin in his Epistle to Boniface (Ep. xcviii. § 9, Op. 267. F.), upon which passage Lanfranc is commenting, merely says,—"Sicut ergo secundum quemdam modum sacramentum Corporis Christi est, sacramentum Sanguinis Christi Sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum sudea sude est."

* See above, § 35, note m.
* See above, § 33, note i.


* See above, § 38, note t.
dance of their sayings, importing them to be called the Body and Blood of Christ, as "types" or "antitypes" (for type and antitype differ not but as relative and correlative); that is, "figures, symbols, images, similitudes, representations, patterns, pledges," and "riddles;" in fine, as "figures" or "sacraments" of the same: not as if they contained not the thing signified (which I have already settled), but because the heavenly grace hides not, nor destroys, the earthly nature. This language then is used by St. Gregory Nazianzen, Orat. xli.,* calling the Passover "a more obscure type of a type:"—by Ephrem, De Inscrutabili Natura Dei¹:—by Theodoret, Dial. i. et ii. et iii.²:—by the Constitutions of the Apostles, v. 13; vi. 29; vii. 26*:—by St. Basil's liturgy:—


² "Ο οὖτε γε Ἡσσηρ ο ἡμέτερος ἐνθάλατο τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὰ μὲν Χριστά τὸ τῶν συμβολῶν τεκμερίων ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ σομβολὸν τῶν τῶν Χριστά. Οὕτως Ίμερλον Ἐσωτόν ὄνομασαι, αὐτά τὸ σομβολόν προσφέροντες." Theodoret., Dial. i. Immutabils; Op., tom. iv. p. 17. D. And a little lower, "τὰ δρόμενα σομβολὰ τὴν τῶν Χριστών καὶ Ἀματῶν προσηγορία τετίμικαν, οὐ τὴν φώνην μεταβαλὼν ἀλλὰ τὴν χαρὰ τὴν φώτη προστίθηκεν." Id., ibid., p. 18. A. And again, "σομβολὰ τὰ καὶ τῶν τῶν." Id., ibid., p. 18. B.—Εἰτε οὖν τὰ μυστικὰ σομβολὰ παρὰ τῶν ἱερανῶν τῆς θεοῦ προσφορῶν, τίνες οὖτε σομβολαὶ τῶν δεσποτικῶν Χριστῶν τοῦ καὶ Ἀματῶν. Τοῦ ὄντως Χριστὸς ἢ οὐκ ὄντως; Τοῦ ὄντως. "Ἀματὰ χρῆ γὰρ εἶναι τῷ τῆς εἰκόνος ἀρχέτυπον καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁγιάζοντες τὴν φώσιν μιμοῦσαν, καὶ τῶν ὅμοιων γράφουσι τᾶς εἰκόνας. Ἀλληθὲς." Ei τὸν τῶν ὄντως Χριστῶν ἀντίτυπον ἐστὶ τὰ θεία μυστήρια, σῶμα ἡ ὄντως τὸν τὸν δεσποτόν τὸν Χριστόν, οὐκ εἰς ὑπερ" τοῖσι φώσιν μεταβαλὼν ἀλλὰ θεῖα ἐδέχετο διάπνευσθαι." Id., Dial. ii. Inconfusus; ibid., p. 84. C. D. And the word σομβολαί again, p. 85. A, B. And see below, § 54. notes y, z.—For the third Dialogue, see above, § 42, note q.


by Gregory Nazianzen again, *In Gorgoniam*:

*De Demonstrat. Evang.*, i. 10; v. 3; viii. 1

*De Matt.*, Homil. lixiii.

*De Palladius, in the life of St. Chrysostom, chap. vii., viii., ix.*

*De Marci xiv.*

*De Dionysius, Eccles. Hierarch.*, cap. iii.

*De Origen.*

*De Matt.*, Hom. xxxv.

*De Pope Gelasius, De Duabus Naturis Christi*

*De Sacramentis, iv. 4, vi. 1*

*De St. Ambrose, De ipsis qui initiantur mysteriis, cap. ix.*

*De Tertullian, Contra*


—in the same homily (§ 4, 787. E) occur the well-known words,—"κύκλοι τῶν λεγομένων, ἑβολὴν ἀναφέρα τὴν μορφήν, τῶν τύπων, τὰ ἱματία, τὰ ὕπο- δήματα; ἰδοὺ Ἀγίων ἅρτης, Ἀγίων ἀντικειμένων... Aὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ἡμών, οὐκ ἰδοὺ πάντως ἠλάλο καὶ ἀλλὰ παρέλαβεν ἀλατίνως ἄνθρωπον..."—with several other passages to the same effect.


*De Seen above, § 42. note p.*


Marc., iii. 19; iv. 14, 40*;—by St. Augustin, Contra Adi- 
Mantum, cap. xii.; In Psalmum iii.; Epist. clxiii.; De Tri-
nitate iii. 46;—by Facundus, bishop of Hermiana in Africa, 
Pro Tribus Capitulis [lib.] ix. [cap.] ult.

§ 44. And, truly, the ancient Christians, when they made a scruple of receiving the eucharist when they were to fast, lest they should break their fast by receiving it (as we un-
derstand by Tertullian, De Oratione cap. xiv.†), must needs understand the nature of bread and wine to remain; unless they thought they could break their fast upon the accidents of them. Nor would it have been a custom, in some places, to burn the remains of the sacrament (as Hesychius, In Levit. viii., witnesseth); or at Constantinople to give them to schoolboys*: had they not conceived the change of the elements to be in order to the use of them, and that this use, and that which is done in order thereunto, expireth, when the occasion of giving them to those for whom the Church intendeth them ceaseth.

§ 45. And upon these premisses I conclude, that, as it is
by no means to be denied, that the elements are really
changed, translated, turned, and converted into the Body
and Blood of Christ (so that whoso receiveth them with
a living faith, is spiritually nourished by the same, he that
with a dead faith, is guilty of crucifying Christ), yet is not
this change destructive to the bodily substance of the ele-
ments, but cumulative of them with the spiritual grace of
Christ’s Body and Blood; so that the Body and Blood of
Christ in the sacrament turns to the nourishment of the
body, whether the Body and Blood in the truth turn to the
nourishment or the damnation of the soul.

§ 46. And upon these terms, if I read in St. Cyril of Jeru-
usalem (where afore¹), that the elements in the eucharist are
not bread and wine, I should think myself very simple to
imagine, that therefore St. Cyril believed transubstantiation;
knowing (as any man that pretends to understand the nature
and use of language ought to know), that any thing may be
absolutely denied to be that, which in some sort it isitted when
a man intends to contest, that in some sort it is not. For so
St. Cyril saith, that the elements are not bread and wine:
to signify, that they are not bare bread and wine, but
mystically the Body and Blood of Christ; that is, as in the
sacrament of it.

§ 47. And, to speak properly, whoso believes transubstan-
tiation, ought not to believe, that the elements are changed
into the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist. For
wheresoever there is a change, there something of the sub-
ject that is changed ought to remain, though it be not sen-
sible; whereas, in transubstantiation, the whole subject of
Christ’s Body and Blood is imagined to be substituted in-
stead of bread and wine, under their dimensions and acci-
dents; which is the absolute ceasing of them to be, and the
beginning of the thing signified, not absolutely to be, but to
be under those dimensions: so that there remains no subject
for that change, which the fathers understand; the accidents
remaining unchanged, the substance of the terms having
nothing common, to bear the passion of that change which
must be attributed to it.

§ 48. But what can be said to them, that affirm in express

¹ See above, § 14.  "Corrected from MS.; “it is not,” in orig. text.
terms, that the substance of the elements remains unchang-
ed? Who are so many, as may very well serve to interrupt
and defeat any pretence of tradition for the ceasing of them.
For there can be no pretence, that anything should belong
to the common faith of the Church, the contrary whereof
it hath been free for men of note and rank in the Church to
profess.

§ 49. The author De Sacramentis in St. Ambrose, iv. 4*:—
"Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut incipient
esse quae non erant; quanto magis operatorius est, ut sint quae
erant, et in aliud commutentur"—"If then there is that
force in the word of the Lord Jesus, that those things should
begin to be which were not; how much more is it so opera-
tive, that, remaining what they were, they be changed into
what they were not?" Lanfranc, I see, Contra Berengarium*,
hath questioned the reading of these words; by saying, that
other copies read, "ut quae erant in aliud commutentur."
But I see also, that he had so little confidence in those
copies, that he held himself obliged to expound the other
reading; and say, that they remain what they were in
their accidents? (which whether it serve the turn, let com-
mon reason judge). I see also, that Guitmund bishop of
Aversa hath owned Berengarius his reading, De Sacram. iii.*:
and therefore have no reason to distrust those*, who affirm that

---

1 * § 16: Op. S. Ambros., tom. ii. p. 369. A. For "incipiant" read "inci-
perent." The Bened. editors give the
reading as above; adding in a note,
that "ita vet. edit. ac Mag., excepto
cod. Ii. id., ubi "quanto magis... quae
erant," totum omissit: ultiam vero
partem Rom. edit. his verbis effert, "ut
quae erant, in aliud commutentur."
Lanfranc appears to be the sole autho-

2 "In quibusdam tamen codicibus
prestata sententia verbis alius inventur
hoc modo: "Siigitur... ut quae erant
in aliud commutentur." Quae litera-
tura plurimum concordat in sententia
cum ea, quae in libro, ab eodem de
mysteriis sive inulians edito, in hae
verba reperitur: "Sermo ergo Christi
potuit ex nihilofacerequodnonerat,
non potest ea, quae sunt, in id mutare
quod non erat?" Lanfr., Lib. de Corp.

3 * "Essc quidem secundum visibilem
speciem testatur quae erant, commutari
vero secundum interiori essentiam in
naturam illarum rerum quae ante non
erant." Id., ibid.

4 De Corporis et Sanguinis Christi
Veritatis in Euchar., lib. iii.: in Bib-
lioth. PP., tom. xi. p. 396. A: where
the passage of S. Ambrose is quoted as
above in the text.

5 * Ut omissum in vetustioribus Lan-
franci editionibus (vid. edit. Basileens-
apud Henric. Petri anno 1655) sim-
pliciter negari tale quid ab Ambrosio
dictum, ac in recentioribus tantum,
quiubus undeim lineae ex nescio quo-
rum codicum sive alia adiecta sunt, hanc
objectionem haberi, quod fraudis etiam
suspicione laborat; quis Lanfranc cre-
dat, cum Guitmundus, Algerus, Yvo,
Gratinus, Anselmus, et aliui innumerii,
omniaque exemplaria tam manucripta
quam edita, excepta Romana editione
nupera et sequentibus ad ipsius nor-
mam depravatis, constanti et unifor-
it is owned by Algerus, Paschasius, Bertram, Ives of Chartres, Gratian, and P. Lombard, in their quotations of it.

§ 50. The words of St. Chrysostom (Epistola ad Cæsarius contra Apollin. b) are these:—"Sicut, ante quam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus, Divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediate sacerdote, liberatus quidem est ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est Dominici Corporis appellatione, et si natura panis in ipso permanet; . . . Divina mundante natura"—"As, before the bread be consecrated, we call it bread, but when the grace of God hath sanctified [it], by the means of the priest, it quitteth the name of bread, and is held worthy of the title of the Lord's Body, though the nature of bread remain in it; so also here, the Divine nature cleansing," &c. Cardinal Bellarmine (De Euchar. [lib. ii. c. 22] b) allegeth, that there is no such epistle of St. Chrys.


b De Sacr. Corp. et Sanguinia, lib. i. c. 7; ap. Biblioth. PP., tom. xii. P. i. p. 416. H.

c Paschasius Radbertus (De Corp. et Sang. Domini, c. l. Op., pp. 1556. E, 1557. A. Paris. 1618), whom Albertinus does not quote, does not cite S. Ambrose expressly: and if he aluded to the passage here in question, which seems improbable, would appear to be (if anything) rather in favour of Lanfranc's reading. His words are—"Enucleasit obsecro considera, utrum ex se suo natura sint singula; vel que demutantur in aliud quod non erant, utrum per ordinem sui juris ut sint mirabilia, aut certe (quod magis fatebere) et illa quæ sunt quâs naturalia, et ista quæ quâs contra naturam veniam, prorsus omnia in voluntate Dei esse," &c. The important words are the same in the edition of Martene and Durand; see below, § 61, note 1.

d Bertram (or Rattram) does not cite the passage; neither does Albertinus mention him: nor can his words, pp. 114, 115 (as publ. at Rouen 1673), be considered an allusion to it. He quotes (pp. 157, 158) from the De Mysteriis, c. ix. (§ 52. Op. S. Ambros., tom. ii. p. 339. C.), "Sermo ergo Christi qui potuit ex nihil facere quod non erat, non potest ea quæ sunt in id mutare quod non erant!"


f De Consecrat. Distinct. ii. can. 55. Panis est: quoting the passage (with its context).

g Sentent., lib. iv. dist. 10. lit. D: quoting the passage:—cited by Albertin as above, in margin.

b S. Chrys., Op., tom. iii. p. 744. C. ed. Montfaucon. Read "habitus Dominici," omitting "est:" and for the last clause (where "mundante" is a confusion of Thorndike's from Martyr's incorrect reading "inundante"). "permanet, et non duo corpora sed unum Corpus Filii predicamus: sic et hic Divina insidente corpori natura," &c. This epistle is extant, except some fragments, only in Latin. Whether it be S. Chrysostom's, see Albertin., lib. ii., Testim. S. Chrys. c. i., pp. 532, a, sq. Harduin published it as genuine, Le Quien denied its genuineness, Montfaucon publishes it in S. Chrysostom's works, but pronounces it spurious. There certainly was an Epistle of S. Chrys. ad Cæsarium: see below, notes n, o. And the objections to it seem to turn mainly on the style: which is rather a feeble ground for denying the genuineness of a work known almost wholly through a translation.

i Added from MS.

k "Respondeo, nihil ejusmodi unquam scripsisse Chrysostomum; neque enim in toto Chrysostomi opere ulius est liber vel epistola ad Cæsarium." Controv., tom. ii. p. 627. A.
sostom's; neither is it found in his works. Peter Martyr reports it, as he found it in a written copy of the library at Florence. And it is found in the Bibliotheca Patrum, and in several pieces collected by Canisius. What would it then avail, that it were not St. Chrysostom's, but some other ancient Church-writer's? For neither the matter of the comparison between the incarnation and the eucharist, nor the terms in which it is delivered, will ever render it suspicious to any man, that observes those conceptions and expressions of the fathers, which I have reported in the premisses.

§ 51. Gelasius, De Duabus Naturis in Christo? —"Certe sacramenta quae sumimus Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Divina res est; propter quod et per eadem Divina efficimur consortes Naturae: et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini"—"Certainly the mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ, which we receive, is a thing Divine; therefore by the means of them we become also partakers of the Divine nature: and yet ceaseth not to be the nature and substance of bread and wine." By and by: "Sicut in hanc transeunt, scilicet

---

1 It is neither in Savile's edition, nor in Morel's, nor in that of Fronto Du-cæus: and Montfaucon's was not published until 1718-38. The tract was really not in print at all in Thordike's time; see below, notes n, o.

2 P. Martyr, Defensa ad Gardiner. de Euchar., P. i. Object. cxxv. p. 285. 30. 1662, quotes the Epist. ad Cæsar-ium; and ibid. Object. cxi. pp. 368, 369, answers Gardiner's reply, that "non est hoc Joannis Chrysostomi sed Joannis cujusdam Constantinopolitani." The MS. which P. Martyr used was given by him to Abp. Cranmer, but appears to have been lost upon the Abp.'s death: see Montfaucon's Monitum prefixed to the tract.

3 This is a mistake, arising from a misapprehension of Albertin's reference, p. 532. a. margin. The Collectanea contra Severianos, which quotes a short passage from 'Chrys. ad Cesa-rium Monachum,' are cited by Albertin as in 'Biblioth. Patr. edit. 4. tom. 4. ad finem' (it is in tom. viii. p. 336. D. ed. 1618): but the Epistle of St. Chrysostom itself is not in the Bibliotheca Patrum at all. It was first published at length (but was immediately suppressed) by Bigot in 1680; then by Le Moyne in his Varia Sacra in 1685, then by Basnage at Rotterdam in 1687, then by Harduin at Paris in 1689, then by Montfaucon in his edition of St. Chrysostom, tom. iii., in 1721: see Montfaucon's Monitum in Epist. ad Cæsarius, and Fabricius, tom. viii. p. 581. ed. Harles.

4 A mistake also, arising from a similar cause. The tract of S. Joh. Da-masc. contra Aæphalos, which cites the passage immediately following that above in the text as from 'Sanci Io-annis Chrysostomi Epistola ad Cesa-rium Monachum,' is in, and is quoted by Albertia from, Canisius, Antiq. Lecttt., tom. iv. p. 211. Ingolat. 1608. (as are also the Collectanea cont. Seve-rianos, referred to above, ibid., p. 238): but the Epistle to Cæsarius itself is not in the 1st edition of Canisius; which was the only one existing in Thordike's time. It was published by Basnage in his edition of the Antiq. Lecttt., tom. v. p. 226. sq. Annt. 1725.


6 Ibid.—"Sicut in hanc, scilicet in Divinam, transeunt, Sancto Spiritu perficiens, substantiam, permanente tamen in sua proprietate naturæ." —

For "permanente" Routh suggests
Divinam, Spiritu Sancto perficienre, substantiam, permanentea in sua proprietate naturae”—“As by the operation of the Holy Ghost they pass into this, to wit, a Divine substance, and yet remain in the property of their own nature.”

§ 52. Ephrem, patriarch of Antiochia, in Photius, Cod. cccxix. t—“Οὗτος καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῶν πιστῶν λαμβανόμενον Σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας οὐκ ἔξισται καὶ τῆς νοητῆς ἀδιαφερέντος μένει χάριτος· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα δὲ πνευματικόν, δὸν γενόμενον καὶ ἐν ὑπάρχου, καὶ τὸ ἴδιον τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας, τοῦ ὄθαντος λέγω, διανοώμει, καὶ δὲ γέγονεν οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν”—“So also the Body of Christ, Which believers receive, neither departs from the sensible substance, nor is divided from the intelligible grace; and spiritual baptism, which becometh and is one whole, preserves the property of the sensible substance, the water I mean, yet loses not that which it is become.”

§ 53. This comparison makes me add here that passage of those extractions out of Theodotus, which is found at the end of Clemens Alexandrinus* :—“Καὶ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον ἀγιάζεται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Ὀνόματος, οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ δύνατα κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον [οἷα ἐλήφθη], ἀλλὰ δυνάμει εἰς δύναμιν πνευματικῆς μεταβεβληται· οὖτος καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ ἔξορκιζόμενον, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα γενόμενον, οὐ μόνον χωρεῖ τὸ χεῖρον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγιασμὸν προσλαμβάνει”—“And the bread” (of the eucharist) “and the oil” (of the chrism, which comparison St. Cyril of Jerusalem† uses in this case) “is sanctified by virtue of the Name” (of Christ); “remaining the same for sensible substance” (for I confidently maintain, that the negative οὐ destroys the sense, as the comparison justifies; for who says, that the oil of the chrism or the water of baptism is changed for substance?), “but for force changed into a spiritual virtue: so also the water, both that [which] is exercised, and that which baptism is done with, not only retains the worse, but also receiveth sanctification.”

“permanentia,” but retains “sua.”
According to Albertin. (lib. ii., Testim. Gelas. c. i., p. 858. b.), “evidenter legendum sua,” and he retains “permanentia.”


† "Ἀλλὰ δὲ χρῆς ὑπονοήσῃ ἐκεῖνο τὸ μόριον φιλῶν εἶναι διὸ περὶ γὰρ, κ.τ.λ. as above, § 14. note f.
§ 54. Theodoret, Dial. I.:—“Ἡβουλ[ήθη] τούτων τῶν θείων
μυστηρίων μετέχουσα μὴ τῇ φύσει τῶν βλεπομένων προσέ-
χειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τῶν ὄνομάτων ἐναλλαγῆς, πιστεῦει τῇ ἐκ
tῆς χάριτος [γεγενημένη] μεταβολῆ. Ο γὰρ δὴ τὸ φύσει σῶμα
ointment καὶ ἄρτου προσαγορεύεσας, καὶ αὐτὰ πάλιν Ἐαυτὸν ἄμπε-
λον ὄνομάτας, Ὁ δὲ τὰ ὅρωμαν σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ Αἴματος
καὶ Σώματος προσηγορία τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλῶν
ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθείκώσ”—“Our Lord would
have those, that receive the Divine mysteries, not regard the
nature of the things they see, but upon the change of their
names believe the change which grace effecteth; for He
Who called His natural body corn and bread, and again
named Himself the vine, honours the visible symbols with
the name of His Body and Blood, not changing the nature,
but adding His grace to it.” And Dial. II.:—“Οὐδὲ γὰρ
μετὰ τὸν ἄγμασμον τὰ μυστικὰ σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίστα-
tαι φύσεως, μὲνε γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὕσιας, καὶ τοῦ σχη-
ματος, καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὁμαλά ἐστι καὶ ἀπτα ὁλα καὶ πρό-
τερον ἄν”—“For neither do the mystical signs after con-
secration depart from their own nature, but remain in the
same substance, and figure, and form, and may be seen and
touched, as afore.” The preface to the Roman edition of
these dialogues, saith, that Theodoret uses this language, be-
cause the Church had as yet decreed nothing in this point a.
An excuse, much like the censure of the Epistles of Isidore
of Pelusium, printed at Antwerp; which are licensed as
containing nothing contrary to faith or good manners b.

was misprinted “Ἠβοῦληθη,” and for
“μετέχουσα” read “μεταβόλητος;” besides the trifling alterations
marked above in the text and margin.

* Id., Dial. ii. Inconfusus; ibid., p.
85. B, C.

* * Ac primum quod de sacrosancte
eucharistiae mysterio dictit charta viii.
p. ii.” &c., “dictem esse videtur ex
eorum sententia, qui falsa assererunt
esse in eo pane Corpus Christi rema-
nente tamen panis substantia: quod
quidem falsum est, cum Ecclesia,“
&c., “pronunciavit substantiam panis
in Corpus Christi transsubstantiari.
Quamquam Theodoretus hoc fortasse
nomine aliqua venia dignus videatur,
quod de ea re ejus tempore ab Ecclesia
nondum fuisset aliquid promulgatum.”

Theodoritii Dialogi Tres contra qua-
dam Hereser, Pref., 4to. Rom. 1647.
per Stephanum Nicolinum Sabiensem,
Chalcographum Apostolicum, cum pri-
vilegio.

* A supplementary volume of Isi-
dore's Epistles was published at Frank-
fort by Schottus in 1629, the “Appro-
batio” of which is dated at Antwerp, to
which latter place Schottus belonged.
If this is the edition to which Thorn-
dike refers, his remark is hardly justi-
sified by the words of the licensor, who
merely describes the Epistles as “par-
tim morales partim sacras, ad S. Scrip-
turne loca explicanda idoneas.” There
does not appear to have been any other
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For if the Church is able to make new articles of faith, then may whosoever licenses books pass this censure; because by the act of the Church, making that which was not so afore, the dead might incur the contrary censure. But, supposing that the Church is not able to do such an act, that, which was not contrary to the faith when Theodoret writ it, can never be contrary to it.

§ 55. I will end with Facundus, because the formal terms of my opinion are contained in his words:—"Sicut sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Ejus, quod est in pane et pocclo consecrato, Corpus Ejus et Sanguinem dicitus: non quod proprius Corpus Ejus sit panis, et pocium Sanguis; sed quod in se mysterium Corporis Ejus Sanguinisque contineat: hinc et Ipse Dominus benedictum panem et calicem, quem discipulis tradidit, Corpus et Sanguinem Suum vocavit"—"As we call the sacrament of His Body and Blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, His Body and Blood; not because the bread is properly His Body, and the cup His Blood, but because they contain in them the mystery of His Body and Blood: whereupon our Lord Himself also called the bread and cup, which having blessed He delivered to His disciples, His Body and Blood." This is, in few words, the sense of the whole Church concerning this business.

§ 56. Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, saith, that the Gnostics "forebore the eucharist, because they believed not the eucharist to be the Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Lord raised again by His goodness." But why believed they not this? Because they would not believe transubstantiation? or because they would not believe, that our Lord Jesus Christ had flesh?

§ 57. Let Tertullian speak; Contra Marc. iv.:—"Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis Corpus Suum illum fecit, 'Hoc est Corpus Meum' dicendo; id est, figura Corporis edition of Isidore's Epistles that had any connection with Antwerp: see Cave, in Isid. Pelusiota.

d De Trib. Capitulis, lib. ix. c. 5; in Biblioth. P. F. Max., tom. x. p. 78. G. 

d "Elygiasian kal poosovxugn anti-

chqtac" (seil. the Gnostics), "Did to mè hìmolagiai thn elxhansian sàrka 

èlva toù xatopos hìmaw 'Ihrìw Xristòw, 

tìn othi tôn ãparrhian hìmaw padovwv, 

ỳn tì xhristòthi ò Patér ëgivnè." 


Mei: figura autem non fuisse, nisi veritatis esset Corpus; caeterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset"—"That bread which He took and distributed to His disciples, He made His Body, saying, 'This is My Body;' that is, the figure of My Body: but the figure it had not been, if the truth of His Body were not; otherwise, an empty thing, such as an apparition is, had not been capable of a figure."

§ 58. For, as Maximus saith (in the third of those Dialogues against the Marcionists, that go under Origen's name), "What Body and Blood was that, whereof He ministered the bread and the cup for signs and images, commanding the disciples to renew the remembrance of them by the same?"

§ 59. As for that which is alleged out of Irenæus i. 9§, [St. Irenæus.] of Marcus the magician and heretic:"—"Pro calice enim vino mixto fingens se gratias agere, et in multum extendens sermonem invocationis, purpureum et rubicundum apparere facit, ut putetur ea gratia ab eis quæ sunt super omnia, eum sanguinem stillare in illius calicem" (lege illum) "per invocationem ejus"—"Making as though he would give thanks for the cup mixed with wine, and enlarging the word of invocation" (by which I said the eucharist is consecrated) "to much length, he makes it to appear purple and red; that men may think, that grace drops the blood thereof from the powers over all into that cup by the means of his invocation." For had Irenæus said, that this magician turned the wine into the substance of blood (in truth or in appearance), it


2 "Ποιησα αὐτοι τοιεραμένα προσποιομένου εὐχαριστεῖν, καὶ ἕνεκειν εὐεργετικῶς τῶν ἄγων τῆς ἐνεκλήσεως, πορφυρα καὶ ἑρώτα μεναινεθαι ποιεῖν ἅνδοξα την ἀπὸ τῶν ὄφει τὰ διὰ χάριν το αἷμα το λαττης στάξιν ἐν τῷ εἴσθησιν ποθήριον διὰ τῆς ἐνεκλήσεως αὐτοῦ."—S. Iren., Adv. Haeres., lib. i. c. 9. p. 57.—Thorandike quotes the old Latin translation, which, says Grabe, "videtur legisse, ποιησα αὐτοι τοιεραμένα εὐχαριστεῖν." The Greek is preserved in Epiphanius.

§ See above, § 7, 11, sq.
might have been alleged, that the Christians (whose sacrament this magician counterfeited, though other Gnostics, as Ignatius saith\(^k\), quite balked the eucharist, and used it not) believed that to be bodily blood which is in the chalice; and that therefore he did it. But when he saith only, that he "made it appear purple and red;" perhaps he used white wine, which by juggling he made seem red. However, there is no appearance, that, because he made that look red which was in the cup, therefore those Christians, whom he laboured thereby to seduce, did believe the bodily substance of Christ's Blood to be in the eucharist, instead of the substance of wine and under the dimensions of it.

§ 60. It remains, that I take notice (in as few words as is possible) of those contentsions that have passed about this presence, and the difficulties which transsubstantiation hath found in getting the footing which it hath in the western Church.

§ 61. The book which Paschasius Radbertus, abbot of Corby near Amiens, writ, under the sons of Charles the Great, to prove, that the Body of Christ in the eucharist is that same which was born of the Virgin, is yet extant\(^1\). Though the more curious find no such thing as transsubstantiation in it, but rather a conceit of the "impanation" of Christ's Body (if such a hideous term may pass); that is, that, the Godhead of our Lord Christ being by the operation of the Holy Ghost united to the elements, the Body and Blood of Christ is by the same means united to the same\(^m\).

\(^k\) Above, § 56, note d.


\(^m\) "Unde nec mirum, si Spiritus Sanctus, Qui Hominem Christum in utero Virginis sine semine creavit, etiam Ipse panis ac vini substantiam carnum Christi et sanguinem invisibili quotidie potentia per sacramenti Sui sanctificationem operatur." Paschasii, ibid., c. iii. p. 1563. A, B. Martene and Durand (p. 391. C) omit "si" after "mirum:" and read, "etiam Ipse panis ac vini substantiam."—"Difficile dictu est quosnam ipsius" (s CEO. Paschasii) "sit sensus, cum tot pugnantia et implicantia proferat. Nam quandoque transsubstantiationem, quandoque potius consubstantiationem; interdum autem impanationem quamdam statuere videtur, quando ait, 'Attende Verbum Quod caro factum est' (lege "Verbum Patris Quod caro est"), 'et Quod semel factum est, quotidie fieri non dubites.' Quid enim aliud haec verba designare possunt, quam panis
§ 62. A conceit not far wide of that, which Rupertus, abbot of Duitsh near Cullen about the year 1110, teacheth; that the bread is assumed by the Word of God to be His Body, as that is His Body which was formed of the flesh of the Virgin. Nor is there in effect much difference between this conceit and that of consistubstantiation (at least according to those, that ground it not upon the ubiquity of our Lord’s Body, but upon His will, executed by celebrating the sacrament), or that of some later Greeks.

§ 63. Damascene (De Fide Orthod. IV. 14.), to contradict the Council of Constantinople against images under Conpronymus (which had recommended the eucharist for the true image of our Lord), maintaineth, that it is not to be called, nor is called in St. Basil’s liturgy, after the consecration, the “type, figure, image,” or “antitype” of the Body and Blood of Christ. Which, nevertheless, Cardinal Bellerine (De Euchar. ii. 15*) judgeth not tenable. The sec-


“De sancto altari panem ipsum et vinum in Corpus et Sanguinem Suum transferendo suscipit, eadem virtute, eadem potentia vel gratia, qua nostram de Maria Virginis carmen suscipere potuit quomodo voluit.” Rup. Tuitiensis (abbot of Tuy or Tuit or Duirs near Cologne), De Officis, lib. ii. c. 2: Op., tom. ii. p. 615.a. Col. Agrip. 1602; (written A.D. 1111); quoted with several other passages to the same purport by Albertin., lib. iii. p. 960. a. And see Bellarm., De Script. Eccl., in Rupert. (pp. 286—288); and De Sacr. Euch., lib. iii. c. 11; Contr. tom. ii. p. 721. B—D.

Compare e. g. lib. ii. c. 9. p. 617. a:—“Verbum Patris carni et sanguini, quem de utero Virginis asumperat, et pani et vino, quod de altari assumptum, medium interviensi, unum sacrificium efficit.”—and just before,—“Verbum Quod humanam acceperat naturam, id est, in carne manum, pectus accepit substantiam. Vita media, panem cum Sue carne, vinum cum Sue jungebat Sanguine.”

* See above, c. iii. § 8, sq.
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cond Council of Nicea, that decreed for images, taking up this man’s doctrine, seemeth to have obliged those that follow to the same terms: that is (as he there expresseth himself), “that God joins His Godhead to the elements, to make them His Body and Blood; and that by the operation of the Holy Ghost, Which took Him flesh of the Virgin; so that they are no more two, but one and the same.” Thus he expresseth the change he pretendeth; which transsubstantiation admits not. The Greeks at Venice, in their answer to the first of twelve questions proposed them by the Cardinal of Guise, published by Lionclavius, will, hereupon, have neither the substance nor the accidents of the elements to remain the same as they were, but to be “transseleminated,” say they, into the Divine substance. It would be great skill to reconcile this with transsubstantiation.

§ 64. But, for the opposition made to Paschasia at the time, the book of Bertram (or Ratrany) yet extant, the re-

[Opponents of Paschasiu.]
membrane of John the Irish Scot, one of the learned men of that time (who is thought, for the hatred of his opinion, to have died by the hands of his scholars the monks of Malmesbury), the opposition of Amalarius of Triers and Rabanus of Ments (expressed by their sense in the works extant, De Officiis Ecclesiasticis, and De Institutione Clericorum), are sufficient witnesses.

§ 65. The recantation of Berengarius, indited by Cardinal Humbertus at Rome [A.D.] 1059, comes not yet home to the business; as it lies in the canon, "Ego Berengarius." For the gloss of the canon law is vain to advise, that, if it be not well understood, it creates as great a heresy as that of Berengarius; in that it says, that "the Body and Blood of

repeatedly: see Cave for its several editions. It was printed also, with a French translation, at Rouen, 12mo. 1673: and in an English translation, at Dublin, 1753; and at Oxford in 1838. Dr. Boileau also in France, and Dr. Hopkins in England, published it, with Prefaces &c., and translations, in 1666, 1688, 1712; and at Amsterd. 1717. Three editions (1542, 1549, 1582) exist in the Bodleian Library, of an early English translation; and a French translation in 1619. See also the art. Ratramn in the Biog. Univ., and Albertin., lib. iii. pp. 929 a, sq. That Johannes Scotus or Erigena (A.D. 858) is mentioned on the holy eucharist, disagreeing with that of Paschasius, and substantially agreeing with those of Ratramn before, and Berengarius afterwards, rests on the testimony of Lanfranc (De Corp. et Sang. Dom., c. iii. Op. p. 171 b), condemning him (Labb., Conc., tom. ix. pp. 1055, sq.), and of a letter of Berengarius first published by Albertin., lib. iii. p. 952 b, and since by D' Achery in his Spicilegium and also in his Vita Lanfr. (Op. p. 18 a), Petrus de Marca and Cossaart go so far as to fancy the tract of Scotus to be identical with that just mentioned of Ratramn's (see Labb., Conc., tom. ix. p. 1053 C). He was slain by his scholars on account of his "inflexam morum duritiern et gravitatem," according to Cave, Art. Joan. Erigena. Others give the account adopted above in the text: see Biogr. Brit., Art. Erigena.


b Written about A.D. 819: publ. in his works, Colon. 1627. See Cave, and Albertin., library iii. pp. 922 b, sq.

"Ego Berengarius," &c. "Consentio autem sanctae Romanae et apostolici sedi, et ore et corde profeitor, de sacramentis Dominicae mensae eam fidem me tenere, quam Dominus et venerabilis Papa Nicolaus et ea sancta Synodus auctoritate evangelica et apostolica tenendam tradidit: scil. panem et vinum, quas in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum Corpus et Sanguinem Domini Nostri Jesu Christi esse, et suscultur, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus attierit." Bereng., Retract, ap. Gratian., De Consocr. Distinct. ii. c. 42. Ego Berengarius.—This is the first retraction of Berengarius, and is far harsher in its terms than the two later retractions imposed upon him. See Mosch., Eccl. Hist., Bl. III. Cent. XI. Pt. ii. c. 3. § 13—18, with notes in Soames's edition.

"Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majori conciliis hæresin quam ipsa habeas." Joan. Semeca, seu Glossa in Gratian, as above quoted. On c. 72. Utrum sub figura, the same Glosser adds, that Berengarius "ibi hyperbole locutus est, et veritatem excessisse." And see Bramhall, Ausw. to La Millet, Works, vol. i. p. 18. note o, and Cosin, Hist. of Transubst., c. vii. § 10: for other schoolmen holding similar language.
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Christ are managed by the hands and broken by the teeth of believers, not only in the sacrament, but in the truth: which, Mirandula in his Apology saith, cannot be clearly understood but in the way of Damascene and Paschasius. And yet (understanding the sacrament to consist as well of the thing signified, as of the sign), though the Body of Christ is not touched nor broke, because the sacrament is not the Body of Christ according to the sensible substance which we touch and break, yet is it truly touched and truly broken as in the sacrament, because the eucharist is truly the Body and Blood of Christ; as the sacrament is, and ought to be, truly that which it signifies and conveys. But as it is hereupon no marvel, that he was brought to a second recantation, in a council at Rome under Gregory VII. 1; so is that a presumption, that transubstantiation was not yet formed.

§ 66. And truly for England, the Paschal homily of Ælfric archbishop of Canterbury, together with those extractions

• "Quæ verba" (Berengarii) "videntur non posse plane accipi in sensu claro et expedito, quæis debet esse verborum confessionis, sic solenniter approbatë, nisi per substantiatiorem paneitatis in supposito Dei, cum Corpore Christi, modo predicto: ita quod sit idem Corpus Christi hominis et panis, et sit integrum in quantum Corpus Christi et litteratura in quantum panis; sicut Christus in cruce moriebatur et vivebat, sed hoc ut homo et illud in quantum Deus." Joan. Picus Mirandula, Apol., c. de Euchar. Sacram.; Op., tom. i. pp. 122, 123. Basil. 1601. In the end of the chapter (ibid., p. 131) he adopts the words of John Semeca cited above in note d.

1 See Cosin, Hist. of Transubst., c. viii. § 12.

2 Translated from Latin into Saxon by Abp. Ælfric about the end of the 10th century: see Twysden's Hist. Vindic. of the Ch. of Engl., c. ix. § 23—27. pp. 189—193; and Soames, Bampton Lectures, pp. 422, sq. First printed (with an English translation) by order of Abp. Parker, by Day, Lond. 8vo. about 1666: thence by Fosse, Acts and Monum., bk. viii. pp. 1142, sq. ed. of 1583: then by Lisle, Anc. Mon., 4to. Lond. 1623 and 1638: and by Wheloc (see next note). It is entitled by Day, "A Sermon of the Paschal Lambe, and of the Sacramental Body and Bloud of Christ our Saviour, written in the old Saxon tongue before the Conquest, and appointed in the regine of the Saxons to be spoken to the people at Easter," &c. And it teaches, that "Nos quidem nonesse spiritualiter Corpus Christi gustamus Ejusque sanguinem bibimus" (ap. Wheloc, p. 469); and again, "Sunt tamen vere post consecratam Corpus Christi et Sanguinis Ejus per spiritualiter sacramentum" (ibid., p. 470); and again, "Multum distat inter virtutem sacrae hujus eucharistiae invisibilem, et visibilem proprium naturæ speciem; naturæ panis est corruptibilis, et vinum corruptibile; et per Divini verbi virtutem vere Christi Corporis et Sanguinis Ejus, non tamen corporaliter sed spiritualiter: multum distat inter Corpus illud in Quo Christus passus est, et Corpus illud quod in eucharistiam consecratur: corpus quidem illud in Quo Christi passus est de carne Mariae nascebat, cum sanguine, osasseque," &c.; "Corpus autem Suum spiritualiter, quod vocamus eucharistiam, de granis multis abesse sanguine et osae, abesse mebre et anima, colligitur: nihil autem inest propteræ intelligendum corporaliter, verum omne est spiritualiter intelligendum" (ibid., p. 471); and so throughout. The homily agrees closely with the tract of Ratramn above cited.
which you read out of him in the annotations upon Bede, are sufficient evidence of a difference between the sense of that time, and after that Lanfranc, Berengarius his adversary, was archbishop of Canterbury.

§ 67. And, Pope Innocent III. having inserted the word transubstantiation in the seventy articles, which he proposed to the council of Lateran in 1215, what is the reason why they passed not the council, as Matthew Paris with others testify, but that they were found "burdensome?"

§ 68. And, Gregory IX., the nephew of Innocent, having contrived these articles into his decretals (though not under the name of the council, but of "Innocent III. in the general council"), though the school doctors, depending on the pope for the most part, not on the council, were content to own them, yet have we no decree of any council for them, till that of 1555 under Leo X.

§ 69. For as for the institution of the Armenians in the Pontificem spectare. Naucherus, Chron., Gener. xii., ad ann. 1215; p. 914. Colon. 1579.—"Nihil dignum memoriam, quod commendari possit, ibi" (i.e. in the Lateran Council of 1215) "actum est nisi quod Orientalis Ecclesia (quod antea inauditum fuit) se subditam Romanae Ecclesiae exhibuit." Godefridus, Annal. ab ann. 1162 ad ann. 1237, in ann. 1215; ap. Freher, Script. Rer. German., vol. i. p. 383. ed. Struvius.—Platina, in Vit. Innoc. III. (p. 165. cum annot. ec. Quaprich. Panvin. fol. Lovan. 1572) has precisely the same words as Naucherus above quoted, from "Venere" to "certabat:" and adds afterwards, that Innocent among other writings "decet pleraque retulit."

"Decretal, D. Greg. Paps IX. Compiliatio, lib. i. c. 1. Firmenter eredimus: being c. i. of the 70 articles of Pope Innocent, and headed "Innocentius III. in Concilio Generalli cap. 1."

"See Cosin, Hist. of Tranubest., c. vii. § 27; and below, § 70. notes s, u, b, d, e.

This appears to mean the 13th Session of the Council of Trent, A.D. 1651 (can. 4. ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 806. C), which was the first Council after the time of Innocent III. which sanctioned and enforced the term transubstantiation. But Leo X. died in 1521; and the Pope in 1551 was Julius III. (1550-1555).
council of Florence (which, though it use not the term of transubstantiation, seemeth to come up to the sense), being advanced after the departure of the Greeks, and not voted by the council, but only published as the act of the pope in the council, it cannot be called the decree of the council; though done in a public session of the council in the great church at Florence.

§ 70. Certainly, adding to the opinions of the school doctors, Scotus, Durandus, Ockam, Cameracensis, Basso-

tio speaks thus of the Presence in the eucharist:—"Ipsorum virtutem virtute substantia panis in Corpus Christi et substantia vini in Sanguinem convertitur" (Labb., ibid. p. 537. D.).

* See the last note; and Cosin's Schol. Hist. Controversiae, vel ilud concomitantium, lib. viii., and Hist. of Transubst., c. vii. § 30.

* "Pro opinione secunda" (scil. "non manere panem nec converti sed desinere per anhumilationem") "potest argui, ... quia ista transubstantiatio non videtur magis probari ex Scriptura quam panem non manere, imo minus. ... Principaliter autem videtur more..." (scil. "non potest probari naturali ratione nec authentitia Biblii sed tantum per dicta sanctorum et determinationem Ecclesiae." Occam, Quodlibet, lib. iv. qu. 29. 2to. Paris. 1487; and similarly, but at greater length, De Corp. Christi. cc. ii. et iii. 8vo. Paris. 1513.—"Est communis opinio theologorum quum teneo propter determinationem Ecclesiae, et non propter aliam rationem." Id., Quodlibet., ibid. qu. 30.—"Hec opinio" (scil. "substantiam panis et vini manere") "esse mutum rationabilis nisi esset determinatio Ecclesiae in contrarium, ... nec contrarium illius habetur ex canone Biblii, nec includit aliquam contradictionem." Id., ibid.

* "Licet ita esse" (scil. "substan-
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CHAP. IV.

other Romanists, that transubstantiation is not in Scripture.

lis", and Gabriel (besides those, who, living since Luther, have acknowledged the same; Cajetan, Fisher, Canus, Suarez, Vasquez, and Bellarmine),—that it is not to be proved

tiam panis non remanere sed simpliciter desinere esse"") "non sequeatur evidenter ex Scriptura, nec etiam (videre meo) ex determinatione ecclesiæ, quia tamen magis favet ei et communi opinioni sanctorum et doctorum, ideo teneo eam." Petrus de Alliaco, Card. Cameraciæ, In IV. Sentent., qu. 6. art. 2; fol. 265. H. svo. Paris.—"Patet quod ille modus" (scil. pane remanente) "est possibilis, nec repugnat rationi, nec authoritative Bibliæ; quo est facilior ad intelligendum et rationabilior quam aliquis aliurum." Id., ibid., P.

"Adducitur ab alia illa authoritative Christi, Hoc est Corpus Meum: sed non cogit, quia dato quod maneret substantia panis, ita bene verificaretur ista, quia hoc non demonstrat substantiam panis." Bassolis, In IV. Sentent., dist. xi. qu. 3. § quantum ad 2. artic. ; fol. 56. a. 1. folio Parim 1617.

"Circus quod notandum, quod quamvis express express tradatur in Scriptura quod Corpus Christi veraciter sub speciebus panis continetur et a fidélibus sumitur, tamen quomodo ibi sit Christi Corpus, an per conversionem aliejuus in Ipsiun, an sine conversione ineipiat esse Corpus Christi cum pane, manentibus substantia et accidentibus panis, non inventur expressus in Canone Bibliæ." Gabr. Bie!, In Canon. Miss., loc. cit., xl. p. 85. a. Lugd. 1642. This book was not written by Bie! himself, but by one Eggeling; see Cave in art. Gabriel Bie! It was however adopted and sanctioned by him.

See the passages cited above, in c. ii. § 31. note t.

"Nisi ritus ecclesiæ tot seculorum usu pariter et Patrum assertionibus esse set comprobatus, nec Lutherus neque alius quisquam ex Evangelii nudis verbis adversus proterrvientem eviceret Corporis Christi presentiam in sacramento færi per cujusvis sacerdotis concentratione." Fisher, Hist. et Rochester, Cont. Captiv. Babylon, c. i. num. 1; Op., p. 220. Wirceb. 1597.—"Iliud aggrediamur et doceamus, quod citra Patrum interpretationem et usum nobis a eadem tradition, nemo probabit ex ipsa nudis Evangelii verbis sacerdotum quempiam his temporibus veram Christi carnem et sanguinem con-

secrare. Non quod res hac jam ambigua sit, sed quod ejus certitudo non tani habeatur ex verbis Evangelii quam ex Patrum (ut diximus) interpretatione, simul et usu tanti temporis quem illi posterius relinquerunt." Id., ibid., c. x. num. 2. p. 227.—"Neque ullam hic verbum" (scil. in S. Matthew) "positum est quo probetur in nostrae missa veram fieri carnis et sanguinis Christi presentiam." Id., ibid. And so also of S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. Paul (ibid.).


Vasquez, in Tert. Parte. D. Thom., Disp. cixx. c. 5. §§ 44—56; tom. iii. pp. 132—135, is occupied in refusing the "Catholicæ, qui ex verbis consecrationis desinensione nobis demonstras, et vini et panis et vini colligi negant." But his own conclusion is simply this—that the words of our Lord taken by themselves might have two senses, a literal and a figurative sense: but inasmuch as only one of these is the sense really intended by them, and inasmuch as the Church has solemnly pronounced the figurative to be that one sense, therefore they do prove transubstantiation.

"Scutus... dicit, non extare locum ullum Scripturæ, ut sine ecclesiæ declaratio evidenter cogat substantiationem admonere. Atqui id non est omnino improbabile. Nam etis Scriptura... videatur nobis tam clara ut possit cogere hominem non protruvem, tamen, an ita sit, merito dubitari potest, cum homines doc-tissimi," &c., "contrarium sentiant." Bellarm., De Sacr. Euch., lib. iii. c. 23; Controv., tom. ii. p. 760. C, D.
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by express text of Scripture, nor by reason grounded upon the same,—that which hath been alleged; if this be not enough, to evidence [an §] interruption of [that b] tradition, which is pretended for transubstantiation, nothing is. For that which Church writers declare that they did not believe when they writ, that they cannot declare, that they received of their predecessors for matter of faith. And that which at any time was not matter of faith,—how far soever the decree of the Church may oblige particular sons of the Church not to contradict it, for the peace of the Church,—yet at no time can ever become of force, to oblige a man to believe or to profess it for matter of faith.

CHAPTER V.

IT CANNOT BE PROVED BY THE OLD TESTAMENT THAT THE EUCHARIST IS A SACRIFICE. HOW BY THE NEW TESTAMENT IT MAY BE SO ACCOUNTED. FOUR REASONS THEREOF, DEPENDING UPON THE NATURE OF JUSTIFYING FAITH PREMISED. THE CONSENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. THE CONCURRENCE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TO THE PREMISES.

I come now to the question of the sacrifice; the resolution whereof must needs proceed according to that which hath been determined in the point now despatched. For having shewed the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist, because it is appointed, that in it the faithful may feast upon the sacrifice of the cross; we have already shewed by the Scriptures, that it is the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross in the same sense, and to the same effect, as it containeth the Body and Blood of Christ, which it representeth; that is, mystically and spiritually and sacramentally (that is, as in and by a sacrament) tendereth and exhibiteth. For seeing the eucharist not only tendereth the Flesh and Blood of Christ, but separated one from the other, under and by several elements, as His Blood was parted from His Body by

§ Corrected from MS.; "all" in orig. text.

h Added from MS.

the violence of the cross; it must of necessity be as well the sacrifice, as the sacrament, of Christ upon the cross.

§ 2. And, without all doubt, it is against all the reason of the world to think, that any more can be proved by any scriptures of the Old Testament, that are or can be produced to depose for the sacrifice of the eucharist, than the sense of those scriptures of the New Testament already handled (which are in a manner all that have any mention of it) will infer and allow.

§ 3. There is much noise made with the priesthood of Melchisedec: of whom we read (Gen. xiv. [18.] 19); “And Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God; and he blessed him, saying, Blessed be Abraham of the most high God, Which owneth heaven and earth;” in reference whereunto the psalmist, speaking of Christ (Psal. cx. 4), “The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec;” and the apostle, taking for granted that he is a figure of Christ in the mystical sense (Hebr. vii. 17), argueth the voiding of the Levitical law from the purpose of setting up another priesthood declared by the psalm; but nowhere, in all that chapter, which is all spent about the exposition of it, so much as intimateth the priesthood of Christ to consist in any thing but in offering up to God in heaven His own Body and Blood sacrificed upon the cross, to make expiation for the sins of His people, and to obtain of God that grace and assistance, that comfort and deliverance, which their necessities from time to time may require. Be it granted nevertheless, that, seeing of necessity Melchisedec is the figure of Christ, those things which Melchisedec is related to have done are also necessarily figures of things done by our Lord Christ. For, otherwise, were not the mystical sense of the Old Testament a laughing stock to unbelievers, if it should hold in nothing but that which the Spirit of God hath expounded in the New Testament by our Lord and His apostles? I have therefore, to the best advantage, translated the

---

*a Bellarm., De Sacr. Euchar., lib. i. c. 6; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 958. D—973. B: in which chapter “In missa verum sacrificium offerri probatur ex primo testimonio Scripturæ et ex sacerdotio Melchisedech.”

1 So Bellarmine, ibid., p. 966. A—D.
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words of Moses;—"For" (not, "and") he was the priest of the living God:—that whoso will may argue thereupon, that his bringing forth bread and wine was an act of his priesthood; which if I would deny, no man can constrain me by virtue of those words to acknowledge it. But I cannot therefore allow that translation, which says, "Obtulit panem et vinum,"—that, as priest, he "offered bread and wine" in sacrifice to God:—the Hebrew word אָשָׁנָה so evidently signifying "pro-tulit," not "obtulit;" he "brought forth," not that he "offered:" that he "brought forth bread and wine," to refresh Abraham and his people, "returning" weary "from the slaughter of the kings" (not that he "offered" them in sacrifice to God as His priest, the mention of his priesthood rather advancing the reason why he blessed them, than why he fed them): as both Moses in the words next afore, and the apostle also (Hebr. vii. 1), intimateth or declareth the intent why he "brought them forth." Though, if I should grant that custom, which was common to all idolaters, to have been in force under the law of nature (because we see it
retained and enacted by the law of Moses), not to taste of any thing till some part of it had been dedicated to God in the nature of first-fruits to the sanctifying of the whole, till when it was not to be touched; I say, though I should grant this, for a reason why he may be thought to have "offered bread and wine" to God, not why γυρσί should be translated "protulit"—"he brought forth," no man would have cause to thank me for any advantage from thence. For still the correspondence between Melchisedec and our Lord Christ would lie in this:—that our Lord, by appointing this sacrament, brings forth bread and wine to strengthen the people of Abraham in their warfare against the powers of darkness; as, "in the days of His Flesh," He fed those that attended [Heb. v. 7.] upon His doctrine, "lest they should faint" in their travail. [Matt. xv. 32; Mark viii. 5.]

Now this will first infer, that it is bread and wine which our Lord feeds us with in the eucharist; and again, that it hath the virtue of sustaining us by being made the Body and Blood of Christ, as in a sacrament, by virtue of the consecration passed upon it: which is all that which I say to a hair;—that, by being made a sacrament, it becomes the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, to be feasted upon by Christians.

§ 4. In like manner be it granted, that the words of the [Of the prophet Malachi] (i. 11),—"From the rising of the sun to his going down My name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to My name, and a pure meat-offering; for My name shall be great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts,"—is a prophecy of the institution of this sacrament, because it is contained in those kinds of bread and wine which served for meat and drink

---

---

*"Neque tamen improbabilis sententia factum hoc sacrificio precedente. *'Eπωλεια ηθος, ait Philo. Nam et e simila obtatio Hebrais γυρσί, Græcis ὠρα, dicitur Lev. 2... Et vinum ante mensam Deo libare mos omnium gentium." Grot., in Gen. xiv. 18.—"Proferens panem et vinum—non ad cibum mabilit um vel ad epulum victoriae, ut vult Calvinus et Kemmarius; iam enim ex præda satiati erant milites, ut petat v. 24; sed ad sacrificium pacificum, in gratiarum actionem pro victoria Abraham Deo concessa offerendum... Nota, Melchisedec prius panem et vinum Deo obtulit in sacrificium, acilicet partem panis cremando, partem vini libando, id est, effundendo Deo in gratiarum actionem pro victoria Abraham; deinde reliquam panis et vini partem in milites Abraham libandum, id est, participandam et comedendum distribuit: hoc enim moris erat in sacrificio pacifico." Corn. a Lapide, in Gen. xiv. 18.—See especially Budworth, De Vera Ratione Cena Domini, c. i. § 10. in Mosheim's tranal., vol. ii. p. 841.

BOOK III. Offerings in the law of Moses. But, this being granted, what shall we do with the incense and the meat-offering which the prophet speaks of; unless we say, that they signify that which corresponds to the meat and drink offerings of the Law, and their incense, under the Gospel? And will not that prove to be the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which God under the Gospel is served with by all nations? Though those prayers and praises of God being by the institution of the eucharist limited and determined to be such as the celebration thereof requires, it is no inconvenience, nay, it will be necessary to grant, that the sacrifice thereof is foretold by these words; not signifying nevertheless the nature of it to require any thing more than is expressed by the premisses. Be the same therefore said, if you please, of all the sacrifices of the old law, of all the prophecies, in which the service to be rendered to God in the New Testament is described by the offering of sacrifices.

§ 5. As for the words of our Lord to the woman of Samaria* (John iv. 23[, 24]):—"The hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship Him: God is a Spirit, and those that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and truth:"—though I grant, as afore, that this is fulfilled by the celebration of the eucharist, when once we suppose our Lord to have limited the worship of God under the Gospel to the form of it, yet there can be no consideration of a sacrifice signified by these words, which neither suppose nor express the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, the eucharist no way bearing the nature of a sacrifice but as it is the same with it.

§ 6. But for the same reason, and by the same correspondence between the sacrifices of the Law and that of Christ's 40 cross, it may be evident, that it is not nor can be any disparagement to the sacrifice of our Lord Christ upon the cross, to the full and perfect satisfaction and propitiation for the sins of the world which it hath made, that the eucharist should be counted the sacrifice of Christ crucified, mystically, and as in a sacrament, represented to, and feasted upon by, His people. The apostle saith, that "Christ is gone into no

* Bellarm., ibid., c. 11; pp. 995. D—998. A.
holy place made with hands, figurative of the true, but into heaven itself, to be presented [now] before God for us: nor to offer Himself many times, as the high-priest goes once a year into the holy places with that blood which is not his own; for then must He many times have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of times is He manifested, by the sacrifice of Himself, to the voiding of sin: and as it is appointed for men once to die, and after that judgment; so Christ, once offered to take away the sins of many, shall appear the second time without sin, to those that look for Him to salvation:” Hebr. ix. 24—28. But have I said any thing to cause any man to imagine, that I suppose Christ to be crucified again as often as the eucharist is celebrated? Do I say those that celebrate it are those Jews that crucified Him once? Or do I or can I imagine them to be Jews at all, that would have the sacrifice of our Lord Christ upon the cross repeated again and again, as legal sacrifices are? Certainly, I will speak freely, neither can they that hold transubstantiation be truly said to stand obliged to any such consequence, so long as they acknowledge with all Christians that the covenant of grace is for once settled by the one sacrifice of our Lord upon the cross.

Why? Because, though they believe the natural Flesh and Blood of Christ as crucified to be there, yet not naturally but sacramentally (that is, in their sense, under the accidents of bread and wine, which is indeed and in the sense of the Church

\footnote{Compare even Bellarmine’s words, De Missa, lib. ii. c. 4; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 1061. D, 1062. A.—“Hinc tria sequuntur... Primum est, discrimen esse inter sacrificium missæ et sacrificium Crucis, quatenus a Christo utrumque oblatum est. Nam sacrificium Crucis fuit meritorium, satisfactorium, et imputatorium, et praeterea proprie, quia Christus tunc mortalis erat, et mereri ac satisfacere poterat: sacrificium missæ... proprie solum est imputatorium, quia Christus nunc immortalis nec mereri nec satisfacere potest. Cum autem dicitur propitiatorium vel satisfactorium, id est intelligendum ratione rei quæ imputatur. Dicitur enim propitiatorium, quia imputat remissionem culpa; satisfactorium, quia imputat remissionem pe- næ; meritorium, quia impetrat grâ-}

\footnote{tiam beneficiandi ac merita acquirendi. Quanquam non negaverim, dici etiam satisfactorium, quod ex Christi institutione per sacrificium hoc applicetur Ejusdem Christi passio ad penas tollendas seu viventium seu mortuorum,” &c.—And Estius more plainly: “Quod autem negat apostolus Christum sepius offerre Seipsum, de ea dicit oblatione quæ per se valeat ad propi- tiandum Deum; qualis sola est illa qua Seipsum obtulit in cruce: ab hac enim sicuti sacramenta, sic et missæ sacrificii vim suam omnem recipit.” In Epiat. ad Hebr., c. ix. v. 25; p. 1011. a. Paris. 1640.—And see Forbes, Consid. Pac. et Mod., De Euchar., lib. iii. c. 2. § 2—5. pp. 460, 461: quoting Estius as above, and others of the "saniores Romanenses."}
BOOK III.

under the species or kinds): which difference is so great an
abatement of that common and usual sense, in which all
Christians understand that Christ was sacrificed upon the
cross, that all that know it to be their profession (which all
must know, that will not speak of they know not what), must
acknowledge, that the repeating of the sacrifice of Christ
crucified by the eucharist is not the repeating of that sacrifice
by which mankind was redeemed, otherwise than as a sacra-
ment is said to be that whereof it is a sacrament. What
ground and advantage this gives me, and any man of my
opinion, to argue from those things which themselves ac-
knowledge, that there is no cause why they should insist upon
the abolishing of the substance of the elements in the eucha-
rist; I leave to them, that shall think fit to consider the pre-
misses, to judge. But for me, who demand no more than this,—that, in as much as the Body and Blood of Christ is in
the eucharist, in so much it is the sacrifice of Christ upon the
cross,—I cannot foresee what occasion slander can have to
pick any such consequence out of my sayings. Certainly the
sacrifices of the old law ceased not to be sacrifices, because
they were figures and prophecies of that one sacrifice upon
the cross which mankind was redeemed with. And why
should the commemoration and representation (in that sense
of this word "representation" which I determined afore")
of that one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross which mankind
was redeemed with, be less properly a sacrifice, in dependance
upon and denomination from that one, which the name of
"sacrifice upon the cross" was first used to signify? For all
conceit of legal sacrifice is quite shut out, by supposing that
sacrifice past, which the sacrifice of the eucharist represents
and commemorates; whereas all sacrifices of the old law are
essentially (at least to Christians) figurative of the sacrifice
of Christ to come.

§ 7. Indeed, by that which I have said concerning the
nature of a sacrifice in the eucharist, as it is intended for
Christians to feast upon, it is evident, that this commemo-
rative and representative sacrifice is of the nature and kind
of peace-offerings; which, by the Law, those that offered were
to feast upon. "I will take the cup of salvation, and call

* Above, c. ii. § 20.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

upon the name of the Lord; I will pay my vows now in the presence of all His people; right dear in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints:" saith the Psalm, cxvi. 12, 13. And that, in answer to the question made, "What reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the benefits that He hath done unto me?" At feasting upon the parts or remains of peace-offerings, the master of the sacrifice began the cup of thanksgiving for deliverance received, in consideration whereof he pays his vows; and the sacrifices which he pays are called "σωτηρία," or "sacrifice of thanksgiving for deliverance received." Is not this the same that Christians do in celebrating the eucharist, setting aside the difference between Jews and Christians? Wherefore I have shewed, that it is celebrated, and is to be celebrated, with commemoration of and thanksgiving for the benefits of God, especially that of Christ crucified. Which thanksgiving as it tends to the consecrating thereof, so (inasmuch as the consecration tends to the receiving of it) another thanksgiving, at the receiving of it, becomes also due; as at feasting upon peace-offerings. And hereupon I have shewed, that it is called by the apostle "the sacrifice of praise, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to" God: and that, having shewed that Jews have no right to it as a propitiatory sacrifice (that is, not to it, because not to the propitiatory sacrifice which it representeth); but therefore that Christians have right to feast upon it, as the Jews upon their peace-offerings. But if it be true, as I have shewed, that the celebration of the eucharist is the renewing of the covenant of grace, which supposeth propitiation made for the sins of mankind by that one sacrifice which it commemorateth and representeth; the

* See Grot., ad Levit. iii. 1: Spencer, De Legg. Hebr., lib. iii. c. iii. § 2; tom. ii. pp. 765, 766; Cudworth, De Vera Ratione Cena Domini, c. i.: ad cale. Intell. Syst. a Mosh. Latine redd., tom. ii. pp. 830, sq. with Mosh. 49's notes to his translation. Cudworth's doctrine is, in short, that "Sacr. . . . censum epulum est sacrificiale, seu epulum ex obiatis:" but that, where-as the Jewish sacrifices were typical of the future sacrifice of the cross (which, once made, "repetit et instaurari nequit"), and therefore with their attendant feasts were perpetually repeated, with Christians on the contrary "typicis sacrificiis nullus amplius locus est, verum epula tautum sacrificiales semper symbolice celebratur, ut in memoriam magnum illius et unius sacrificii repetuntur." Cudworth, ibid., § 11. p. 842. See a defence of his doctrine in Waterland's Review of the Doctr. of the Euchar., c. xi.; Works, vol. vii. pp. 325—336.

* Above, c. iv. § 10: and Right of Ch. in Chr. State, c. iii. § 27, 28.

* Right of Ch., &c. c. iii. § 28: and above, c. ii. § 18.

* Above, c. ii. § 13, 14.
celebration thereof being commanded, as a condition to be performed on our part to qualify us for the promise, which it tendereth to those that are qualified as it requireth: shall it be a breach upon Christianity to say also, that it is such a sacrifice whereby we make God propitious to us, and obtain at His hands the blessings of grace, which the covenant of grace tendereth?

§ 8. This indeed requireth yet further consideration, for what reasons the sacrament of the eucharist may be accounted and called a sacrifice; that we may be able to judge, in what sense and for what reason it may be accounted propitiatory and imperative without prejudice to Christianity.

§ 9. First, then, let it be remembered, that by the institution and ordinance of God, those that dedicate themselves to the service of God in the faith of Christ by baptism, are to dedicate their goods to the maintenance of the communion of the Church in the said service; the chief office whereof is the celebration of the eucharist, proper to Christianity, as I shewed a little afore\. Then be it observed, that there were two sorts of oblations commanded by the Law, and practised by God’s ancient people. For first-fruits, tithes, and accursed things (that is, things dedicated to God under a curse upon them that should convert them to any other use, Levit. xxvii.), were not dedicated to be spent upon the altar in sacrifices; but to the maintenance of the temple, or of them that attended upon the service of it. But, seeing we have now shewed that the eucharist is a sacrifice, it followeth, that those oblations, which are dedicated to God to be spent in the celebration of the eucharist (in reference whereunto I have already shewed \(^\text{c}\)), that all oblations of Christians are consecrated to God, because dedicated to maintain the communion of His Church, whereof the eucharist is that office which is peculiar to Christianity, are not barely consecrated to God, but to the service of God by sacrifice. For those things, which under the Law were consecrated to God to be sacrificed upon the altar, were not then first offered to God when they were killed and the parts of them burnt upon the altar, but from the time that they were declared God’s goods for that purpose: as by the Law itself may appear, in

\(^{b}\) Above, c. i. § 2. \(^{c}\) Above, c. ii. § 18.
the precept of the second tithe, which, for two years belonging to the poor, the third year was to be spent in sacrificing at Jerusalem, and so by the law, and by no man's act, consecrate to the altar; Deut. xiv. 22—29. In as much then as I have shewed that the eucharist is a sacrifice, in so much, and for that very reason, that which Christians offer to God for the celebration of the eucharist is no otherwise a sacrifice, than those things which were appropriated to the altar under the Law were sacrifices, from the time that they were dedicated to that purpose; saving always the difference between sacrifices figurative of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross (such as Christianity supposeth all the sacrifices of the old law to be), and the commemoration and representation of the same past, which I have shewed that the eucharist pretendeth. And truly, having shewed that this representative and commemorative sacrifice is of the nature and kind of peace-offerings, inasmuch as it is celebrated on purpose to communicate with the altar in feasting upon it; and knowing, that every beast that was sacrificed for a peace-offering was attended with a meat-offering of flour and a drink-offering of wine, which are the kinds in which the eucharist is appointed to be celebrated: I must needs say, that those species, set apart for the celebration of the eucharist, are as properly to be called sacrifices of that nature which the eucharist is of (to wit, commemorative and representative), as the same are to be counted figurative under the Law, from the time that they were deputed to that use. This is then the first act of oblation by the Church, that is, by any Christian that consecrates his goods, not at large to the service of God, but peculiarly to the service of God by sacrifice; in regard whereof the elements of the eucharist, before they be consecrated, are truly counted oblations or sacrifices.

§ 10. After the consecration is past, having shewed you[d, [2. In the offering of prayer for all estates of men.] [1 Tim. ii. 1.] Epistle to the Hebrews), because, though eucharistical, yet it is of that kind, the blood whereof is offered to God within

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{d}}\text{ Above, c. iv. § 9: and Right of Ch. in Chr. State, cc. iii. 27, iv. 45.}\]
the veil, with prayers for all estates of the world, as Philo\footnote{See Waterland, Distinctions of Sacrifice, § xv.; Works, vol. viii. p. 346, and note a: quoting ample authorities (among others Thornrike himself) to prove, that, "in a lax and less proper acceptation, propitiatory sacrifices are allowed by Protestant divines."} and Josephus\footnote{And compare Bellarmine, De Missa, lib. ii. c. 5; Controv., tom. ii. p. 1064. B, C. "Sacrificium simile est orationi, quod attinet ad efficientiam: oratio enim non solum prodest orandi, sed etiam iis pro quibus oratur: unde manducatio eucharistica quae fit a sacerdote, ut est sacramenti susceptio, soli suis provet; ut autem est sacrificii consummatio, prodest illis omnibus, pro quibus oblatum est sacrificium."} inform us: seeing the same apostle hath so plainly expounded us the accomplishment of that figure in the offering of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross to the Father in the highest heavens to obtain the benefits of His passion for us; and that the eucharist is nothing else but the representation here upon earth of that which is done there: these things I say considered, necessarily it follows, that those who believes the prayers of the Church, made in our Lord’s name, do render God propitious to them for whom they are made, and obtain for them the benefits of Christ’s death (which he that believes not is no Christian), cannot question, that those which are made by St. Paul’s appointment at the celebration of the eucharist, offering up unto God the merits and sufferings of Christ there represented, must be peculiarly and especially effectual to the same purposes. And that the eucharist may very properly be accounted a sacrifice propitiatory and imperative both, in this regard,—because the offering of it up unto God, with and by the said prayers, doth render God propitious, and obtain at His hands the benefits of Christ’s death which it representeth,—there can be no cause to refuse, being no more than the simplicity of plain Christianity enforceth\footnote{§ 11. But whether the eucharist, as in regard of this oblation, so in regard of the consecration, may be called a propitiatory sacrifice; this, I perceive, is yet a question even among those of the Church of Rome\footnote{See below, § 12, note l.}}.
the offering of it already consecrated (according to the order of
the Latin mass) to God for the necessities of the Church, utterly
deny any nature of such a sacrifice in it by virtue of the con-
secration otherwise 1. True it is, these men are looked upon
as bordering upon heretics 1; in regard they acknowledge no
other nature of a sacrifice, but that, which those who ac-
knowledge no transubstantiation may grant without prejudice
to their positions. And if my aim were only to hold a mean
opinion between two extremes, and not freely to declare what
may be affirmed with truth, it might seem very convenient
to take up that position, for which I may allege a party at
present extant in the communion of the Church of Rome.
But, having resolved to set all regard of faction behind the
consideration of truth manifested by the Scriptures, I stick
not to yield, and to maintain, that the consecration of the
eucharist in order to the participation of it is indeed a sacri-
ifice; whereby God is rendered propitious to, and the benefits
of Christ's death obtained for, them that worthily receive it:
but this, perhaps, neither in the sense nor to the interest of
them, who make it their business to maintain the present
abuses of the Church of Rome by disguising the true inten-
tions and expressions of the Catholic Church.

§ 12. That I may be understood without prejudice in this
point, I will lay down the difference of opinion that remains
in the Church of Rome since the council of Trent; as I find
it reported by Jacobus Bayus, De Eucharistia iii. 15—18 k.

1 "Sed quia non desunt qui opinen-
tur in consecutione Corporis et San-
guinis Domini oblationis rationem non
reperiri, sed tantum rem offerendam
consecratione produci, quam, oblatione a
consecratione non solum re et actione,
set etiam loco, tempore, ac positione
disjuncta, Deo verbis presentari eleva-
dione adductiva debet; eorum argu-
menta . . . discutiemus." Jacob. Bayus,
De Euch., lib. iii. c. xvii. pp. 280, 281.
Lov. 1605.—"Dolendum est, non-
nullo in ecclesia eminentes viros ex
professo novam et exoticae loquenti
formam inducere: contenedo per
consecrationem fieri sacrificium, id est,
hostiam, exclusa oblatione (ut conse-
cratio sit velut incarnatio), quodque
hostia consecratione confecta, parata et
habita consequenter postea religiosa
actione distincta loco, positione, et tem-

k "Lutherorum errorem promo-
vent." Bayus, ibid., p. 286. in marg.
—"Sententia opposita" (i.e. the opii-
nion here considered) "catholicam doc-
trinam infirmat, et hereticeorum corro-
borationem." Id., ibid., p. 299. in marg.
k James De Bay, President of the
College of Savoy at Louvain.—In c. xv.
pp. 258, sq. he discusses the question,
"in qua missae parte sacrificium eu-
charistiae consistat;" concluding, that
"sacrificium Novi Testamenti con-
secratione eucharistiae peragitur." c. xvi.
pp. 269, sq., establishes the position,
He complains of an opinion, that the nature of a sacrifice is not seen in consecrating the elements to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but that they are thereby made fit to be offered, and therefore there must be some other act, whereby they are offered in sacrifice; and this they find in the canon of the mass. For, having rehearsed the institution (whereby the parties agree that consecration is done), it follows:—“Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi Tui, sed et plebs Tua sancta, ejusdem Christi, Filii Tui Domini nostri, tam beatae passionis, [necon] et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in caelos gloriosae ascensionis, offerimus praclarae Majestati Tuae de Tuis donis ac datis hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitæ aeternæ, et calicem salutis perpetuae; supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digeris, et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri Tui justi Abel, et sacrificium patriarchæ nostri Abraham, et quod Tibi obtulit summiss sacerdos Tuus Melchisedec, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam”—“Whereupon we also Thy servants, O Lord, and holy people (mindful as well of the blessed passion and resurrection from the dead, as the glorious ascension into heaven, of the same Thy Son Christ our Lord), offer to Thy excellent Majesty of Thy own free gifts a pure sacrifice, a holy sacrifice, a spotless sacrifice, the holy bread of everlasting life and cup of eternal salvation; upon which vouchsafe to look with a gracious and clear countenance, and accept them, as Thou deignest to accept the gifts of Thy just child Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that holy sacrifice, that spotless oblation, which Thy high-priest Melchisedec offered Thee.” Then follows that which I quoted afore;—“Sulplices Terogamus Domine, jube hac perferri,” &c. And this they think to be the offering of the sacrifice, which the consecration exhibiteth only to be offered at the elevation by these

"quod Christus nunc immortalis vere ac proprie in sacrificium offeratur et increuente immoletur," &c. In c. xvii. he argues, "quod elevatio et verbalis oblatio ad sacrificii essentiam non pertinent," and treats in its latter half of the arguments, "quibus nonnulli" (sc. the defenders of the doctrine noticed above in the text) "supradicta impugnent." In c. xviii. pp. 304, sq. he proceeds to refute objections "contra veritatem sacrificii."

1 See above, § 11, note i.
2 See below, note p.
4 Above, c. iv. § 11, note x.
words. But the common opinion is offended at this, for placing the sacrifice in that act of the Church, which says, "We offer to Thee;" in which there is only a general reason of sacrificing, by offering, without changing that which is offered. And therefore, as offering is nothing but dedicating and presenting to the worship of God, so that, if the substance of the thing be changed in offering it, then is it sacrificing: supposing the substance of the elements to cease, and the Body and Blood of Christ to succeed; in this doing, this opinion places the nature of the sacrifice. For the change of the elements, saith mine author, "acknowledgeth God's power," and the dependence upon Him of His creature. And, the Body of Christ being under the dimensions of the bread, His Blood of the wine, Christ is present as sacrificed, His Flesh and Blood being divided. Wherefore that change, whereby the sacrifice is produced, sufficeth to the offering of it, which is produced as sacrificed; the power of God being sufficiently testified by the change, though in sacrificing living creatures it is testified by destroying them for God's service. And this, he thinks, our Lord "signifies, when He


"Illa mutatio quae circa hostiam fit, dum operatione supernaturali producitur, ad sacrificii rationem succurrere potest, cum talis productio satis Dei omnipotentiam ac super omnis dominati testatur. Secus autem accidit in rebus quae a causis naturalibus dependent, quatum productio non tam aperte Divinium principatum testatur, quam eam in Dei honore destru- tio; in quibus prorsus sacrificia instigata, non rei novae productionem, sed potius existentis immutacionem operantur." Bayus, ibid., c. xv. pp. 263, 264. — "Vox sacrificii prorsus dicti, juxta Scripturas sacras, omniumque Latine loquentium usum, significat actionem qua res cum sui immutatione Deo offertur, ita ut in essentia sacrificii oblatio includatur, qua signo externo fiat obligationis internae significatio. Dum enim homo sacrificalem actionem exercet, profetetur quod seipsum omniaque sua Deo, tanquam ser- vus domino, subjiciat, s quo solo pendet omniaque corporis et animae bona expectet. ... Quia enim Deus novum dominium rerum quod prius non habuerit acquirere negatis, eo titulo res dari non possunt; sed hactenus solum Deo a liquida dare vel ofrare dicimus, quia in Eius honorum aliquid facimus, consecratus, immutamus, vel consumimus." Id., ibid. c. xvii. pp. 300—302.

"Quod vero in eucharistico sacrificio non prius hostia consecratione producatur, et alia deinde actione loco et tempore distincta in sacrificium of- feratur, ex Christi prima instituzione manifestissimum est. Nam Dominus proferendo verba, 'Hoc est Corpus Meum, hic est Sanguis Meus;' Deo Patre sacrificium obtulit; ut signifi-
saith, 'This is My Body Which is given for you—This is My Blood Which shall be poured out for you.' For to whom but to God? Seeing He saith not, 'That is given you;' but, 'for you.'" And immediately hereupon there is no doubt but it hath the nature of a sacrifice; the offering whereof must consist in that action which is done in the person of Christ, as the consecration they agree is done by using the words of Christ. And thus, though this sacrifice be typical and representative of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, which the parting of His Body and Blood signifieth, yet is it nevertheless a true sacrifice; as the sacrifices, which figured Christ to come, cease not therefore to be true sacrifices. And from this nature of a sacrifice he deriveth the reason, why the table is an altar, the Church a temple, the minister sacerdos, or one that offereth sacrifice*. I have made choice of this author, because I meet not this difference of opinion among them reported any where else. That which I shall say to him, will shew what we are to think of others.

§ 13. For having maintained, that the elements are really changed: from ordinary bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ mystically present as in a sacrament; and that in virtue of the consecration, not by the faith of him that receives: I am to admit and maintain whatsoever appears duly consequent to this truth:—namely, that the elements so consecrated are truly and properly the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, inasmuch as the Body and Blood of Christ crucified are contained in them, not as in a bare sign, which a man may take up at his pleasure, but as in the means by which God hath promised His Spirit; but not properly the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, because that is a thing that consists in action and motion and succession, and therefore, once done, can never be done again, because it is a contradiction that that which is done should ever be undone. It is therefore enough, that the eucharist is the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, as the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross is represented, renewed, revived, and restored by

cant verba adjecta apud Lucam, 'Quod pro vobis datur, Qui pro vobis effundetur.' Cui enim Corpus Suum offerret nisi Deo? Non enim sit, 'Hoc est Corpus Meum, Quod vobis datur,' sed 'pro vobis.'" Bayus, ibid., c. xv, p. 264.

* Id., ibid., pp. 265, 266.
it, and as every representation is said to be the same thing with that which it representeth; taking "representing" here, not for barely signifying, but for tendering and exhibiting thereby that which signifies.

§ 14. On the other side, I insist, that, if sacrificing signify killing and destroying in the sacrifices of the Old Testament and the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, it is not enough to make the eucharist properly a sacrifice, that the elements are deputed to the worship of God by that change which transubstantiation importeth; and therefore much less, not supposing any change in their bodily substance. For this difference will abate the property of a sacrifice, the truth of it remaining. I grant, that God's power is seen in this change according to the terms already settled. For what power but God's can make good the promise of tendering the Body and Blood of Christ, as a visible mean to convey His Spirit? And he that goes about to make this change by consecrating the eucharist, must needs be understood to acknowledge this power of God's; but this is not that acknowledgment, which sacrificing importeth, but that, which every act of religion implieth. He that sacrificeth, acknowledging that which he sacrificeth, with all that he hath, to [come from or to belong to] God, to testify this acknowledgment, abandoneth that which he sacrificeth to be destroyed in testimony of it. And therefore the power of God is not testified in this change, as the nature of a sacrifice requires that it be testified: for, certainly, he intends not to abandon his interest in Christ, that consecrates the elements into His Body and Blood. And, therefore, the consideration of dedicating the elements to the service of God in this sacrament, makes them properly oblations: but the consideration of their being changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, represented [as] sacrificed upon the cross, makes them properly no sacrifice. In the former consideration, being properly oblations, let them be improperly sacrifices.

§ 15. For in this sense, in the canon of the mass:

---

1 Above, c. ii. § 20. 
2 Added from MS. 
3 Corrected from MS.; "be" in orig. text. 
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Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus ac petimus, uti accepta habeas ac benedicas hae dona, hae munera, hae sancta sacrificia illibata"—"We therefore humbly beseech and desire Thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son, our Lord, to accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy unstained sacrifices." And not only here before the consecration, but just before the Lord's prayer and the communion:—"Per Christum Dominum nostrum; per Quem haec omnia semper, Domine, bona creas, sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis, et praestas nobis"—"Through Christ our Lord; through Whom Thou, O Lord, always createst, sanctifiest, quickenest, and furnishest us with all these good things." The repetition of which consideration shews, that they are presented to God to be consecrated and made the eucharist, as oblations out of believers' goods: according to the form used in divers Greek liturgies, from the words of David, "Τὰ Σα̂ ἐκ τῶν Σῶν"—we give Thee "Thine own of Thine own." But when our Lord says, "This is My Body Which is given for you—This is My Blood Which is poured out for you;" will any man of sense understand, 'That is, now, by that which here I do, offered up to God for you,' and the Blood as poured forth? Or rather, This is that Body and Blood, That is given to be crucified and poured forth for you shortly upon the cross?

§ 16. Let it therefore have the nature of a sacrifice, so soon as the consecration is past. It shall have that nature improperly, so long as it is not the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross; though truly, so long as the sacrament is not empty of that which it signifies. And, according to this truth, true altars they are, true temples, true sacrifices, though improperly, where and by whom it is ministered.

§ 17. But I will not therefore grant, that this sacrificing (that is, this consecrating the elements into the sacrifice) is an action done in the person of Christ: though they are agreed, that it is done by the rehearsing of the words of

---

[1 Chron. xxix. 14.]
[Luke xxii. 19, 20.]

[True altars, temples, sacrifices; but improperly.]

[Yet this sacrifice no action done in the person of Christ.]

---

\[a\] Ibid., p. 227.

\[b\] See on this subject, Albertini, lib. i. cc. 12, 19; pp. 74, 76, 78, 119: and others quoted by Waterland, Appendix to Chr. Sacrific. Explained, c. iii., Works, vol. viii. p. 195, note h.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

Christ. For the rehearsing of Christ's words is not an act done in the person of Christ; nor do I take upon me His person Whose words I recite. And I have shewed, that the consecration is done by the prayers of the Church immediately; though these prayers are made in virtue of Christ's order, commanding to do what He did, and thereby promising, that the elements shall become that, which He saith those which He consecrated are.

§ 18. As for the other opinion (which I am not to be the more in love with, because I am not satisfied with this); it is to be considered, that the elements are offered thrice in the canon of the mass. The first is that offering which I rehearsed last, beginning, "Teigitur," &c.; going before the consecration, as all agreed. The second is that, which this opinion intendeth; agreeing with the other, that the consecration is past by rehearsing the words of institution. But mine opinion allows not this. For I conceive the consecration is yet in doing, till that prayer be past,—"Ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii Tui Corpus et Sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione caelesti et gratia repleamus"—"That as many of us, as shall have received the holy Body and Blood of Thy Son by this communion of the altar, may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace:"—which is the later of the two in which I conceive the consecration to consist; as, in all other liturgies, in something correspondent to it. And, truly, the very words of the second offering do bear, that the elements are by it offered to God, not as consecrated, but as to be consecrated; supposing the 'blessing' of them to be the consecrating of them, as I proved afore. Therefore the offering, and the presenting of them to God as consecrated, is that which is done by the prayer which follows;—"Memento Domine famularum famularumque Tuarum" &c., and, "Nobis quoque peccatoribus

---

" Above, c. iv. § 7—11.
" Above, § 15.—"Prima" (actionis sacrae pars) "est oblatio panis et vini per elevationem cum oratione vocali, quae nuda est ceremonia, ad excitationem ad ecclesia inductam, neque ad sacrificii naturam neque ad integritatem pertinent." Bayus, De Euch., lib. iii. c. xv. p. 258.—"In oblatione panis et vini sacrificium Mis-
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—whereby the several estates of Christ’s Church are recommended to God, in virtue and consideration of Christ’s passion here represented and commemorated. Not that I intend here to justify that prayer for the dead, which this containeth: but because (referring that to consideration in due time) all liturgies have a place, where (according to St. Paul) intercession is made for all states of Christ’s Church, in consideration of the sacrifice of Christ’s cross represented by this sacrament; and because this intercession is properly the offering up of the said sacrifice to God for their necessities. And therefore this opinion saith well, that the consecration exhibiteth only the sacrifice, to be offered up to God by the prayers of the Church: but not by the prayer which desireth the ‘blessing’ of the elements, where-in the consecrating of them is contained (which is that of the elevation in the canon of the mass), but by those prayers, whereby the effects of Christ’s cross are prayed for in behalf of His Church. According to which opinion, the consecrating of the elements will be the sacrificing of Christ no further than as the Body and Blood of Christ are thereby represented as sacrificed. But there will be no further cause of complaint in this, than there is cause to complain, that there is not such ground for division as the parties would have.

§ 19. For though there be only a general reason of offering, no particular consideration of destroying, seen in the act of the Church, offering either the elements to be consecrated, or the consideration of Christ’s cross represented, to render God propitious to His Church; yet are the consecrated elements no less the sacrifice of Christ’s cross, than the presence of Christ’s Body and Blood in them will allow: though in order to that evangelical banquet upon them, at which, and by which, the covenant of grace is renewed. For, the apostles having made the eucharist a sacrifice in this regard, I must not count the making of it one offensive. I say then, that, having proved the consecration of the eucharist to be the production of the Body and Blood of

---

1 Ibid., p. 226.
2 Below, cc. xxviii., xxix.
3 See Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c.
4 x. § 59—69: and Right of Ch. in a Chr. State, c. iii. § 29.
5 See above, § 15. note y.
Christ crucified, or the causing of them to be mystically present in the elements thereof, as in a sacrament representing them separated by the crucifying of Christ; and the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross being necessarily propitiatory and impetratory both; it cannot be denied, that the sacrament of the eucharist, inasmuch as it is the same sacrifice of Christ upon the cross (as that which representeth is truly said to be the thing which it representeth), is also both propitiatory and impetratory by virtue of the consecration of it, whereby it cometh the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. For is it not all the reason in the world, that, if the eucharist be the sacrifice of Christ crucified, the consecrating of the eucharist (that is, the causing of the elements to become this sacrifice) should be, and be accounted and called, the sacrificing of Christ? And if the participation of the eucharist be, as I have shewed it to be, the renewing of the covenant of grace (by virtue whereof the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross becomes propitiatory and impetratory in behalf of Christians); shall not the sacrifice of the eucharist, whereof they participate, be counted propitiatory and impetratory, by virtue of the consecration indeed, though in order to the participation of it? For if the profession of Christianity be the condition that renders God propitious to us, and obtains for us the benefits of Christ’s passion; and that the receiving of the eucharist is the renewing of that profession, by virtue whereof the faults, whereby we have failed of that profession, for that which is past, are blotted out, and we for the future are qualified for the blessings which Christ’s passion tendereth: then is the eucharist a sacrifice propitiatory and impetratory, by virtue of the consecration, though in order to the participation of it.

§ 20. Which, whether those that are so much for the sacrifice in the Church of Rome, rest content with it or not, seemeth to me so natively proper to the simplicity and holiness of Christianity, that nothing can be held forth more pertinent to advance the zeal of frequenting, together with the devotion and reverence of communicating in, this most precious of God’s ordinances to Christians. For what can more oblige a Christian to the frequent and worthy communion of this sacrament, than to consider, that by receiving it he is
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re-estate in his right to those promises which the Gospel tendereth; provided, that he on his part re-establish in his own heart that resolution to Christianity, by professing which he was at the first estated in God’s kingdom?

§ 21. Hereupon arises a fourth reason, why this sacrament is a sacrifice; to wit, of the bodies and souls of them, who, having consecrated their goods to God for the celebration of it, do by receiving it profess to renew that consecration of themselves to the service of God according to the law of Christ, which their baptism originally pretendeth. For inasmuch as we revive and renew the first profession of our Christianity in receiving the eucharist, we do also, by the same means, “offer up our bodies for a living sacrifice, holy and well pleasing to God, which is our reasonable service” of God; as St. Paul commandeth, Rom. xii. 1.

§ 22. And by that which hath been said, it is easy to resolve that which is further questioned in the School: whether the breaking, the pouring forth, the taking and the consuming of the elements by eating and drinking, belong to the nature of the sacrifice or not. For I have already allowed the consecrating of the elements apart to be a necessary ingredient of the sacrifice of the eucharist; as necessary to represent the sacrifice of the cross. And if men did consider, that the eucharist had never been instituted but to be participated, they would find it impertinent to allege any reason, why it should be a sacrifice, that tendeth not to the participation of it. There is then, in the mass, a peculiar ceremony of breaking the host into the chalice, not tending

= “Est... considerandum, sex potissimum actiones fieri nunc in missa, de quibus dubitatam est, in quas, vel in quibus eorum, essentia hujus sacrificii consistat.”—These six are, “Oblatio panis et vini—Consecratio Corporis et Sanguinis—Distributio Sacramenti consecratii”—the “Oblatio in missa post consecrationem in illis verba, ‘Unde et memores Domine,’” &c.—the breaking of the host in the cup (see note 0),—and, lastly, “sumptio utriusque speciei consecratæ.” Suarez, in Tert. Part. D. Thom., tom. iii. Disp. lxxxv. sect. ii. pp. 1112. 1. C—1113. 1. B.—Of the last of these, “quidam etiam Catholici, quamvis non dicant hujusmodi distributionem esse de ne-

cessitate hujus sacrificii, dicunt tamen, quando fit, aliquo modo ad comple-

mentum sacrificii pertinentem: quod indicat Soto, cum dicit, populum fide-

lem sacrificio astantem, dum Sacra-

mentum sumit, per ipsum sumtionem suo gradu et ordine sacrificare, qua

mors Christi non representatur in con-

secratione sed in consumptione. Et

Cano fere eodem modo loquitur,” &c.

Id., ibid., sect. 3. p. 1116. 1. B, C.—

Suarez himself (ibid., et pp. sq.) argues on the contrary, that, “si quotidiana ecclesiae sacrificia integre ac perfecte fiunt sine hujusmodi distributione, ergo

omnino extrinsecus est ad substantiam vel perfectionem sacrificii,” &c.

n Above, § 12, 14, 19.
to the distributing of it, but all the portions to be taken by
the priest¹. Of this I speak not. Otherwise, breaking, pour-
ing forth, distributing, eating, drinking, are all parts of the
sacrifice; as the whole action is that sacrifice, by which
the covenant of grace is renewed, restored, and established
against the interruption of our failures.

§ 23. And now, I confess, that all they, who do not be-
lieve the promises of the Gospel to depend upon any condi-
tion to be performed by our free will, qualifying us with a
right title to them, may very well say, by consequence, that it
is a disparagement to the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross,
to make the eucharist a propitiatory and imperatory sacrifice
in behalf of the Church, in that sense and to that effect as I
have said. But, supposing that condition, I challenge all
the world to say, wherein any such disparagement lies. For
[The sacrifice of the eucharist in this sense no disparage-
ment to the sacrifice of the cross, supposing the Gospel
promises condition-al, as pre-
mised.]

* "Quinto, post consecrationem fran-
gitur nunc in missa hostia consecrata et particula ejus miscetur in sanguine:
que actio dubium propitior mysticam significationem. Quocirca sub
ea ratione constat Christum hujusmodi actionem non exercisse nee per illam
sacrisse: nam in primis de mis-
tione nulla mentio sit in Evangelio," and secondly, "Christus non fregit pa-
nem nisi ut distribueret discipulis." Suárez, ibid., sect. 2. p. 1113. 1. A, B:
proceeding in sect. 3. (p. 1115. 1. D,
2. A —D) to argue against Canus, who
affirmed this act to be "de substantia
hujus sacrificii."¹ "Haec fractio licet
sit valide antiqua, ut patet ex Liturgià
Jacobi et Chrysostomi, tamen in Lit-
turgia Basili nulla sit ejus mentio; quod est signum non fuisse universalem, et consequenter neque ex Christi
institutione. Imo ex iisdem Liturgià
Jacobi et Chrysostomi constat hujus-
modi actionem non fuisse factam eodem
modo apud omnes." Íd., ibid., p. 1115. 2. B.

¹ Cassander admits (Consult., art.
xxiv. De Missa, § De Sacrif. Corp. et
Sang. Christi, Òp., p. 908), that "ob-
latioins et sacrificii nomine veteres
nunquam intellexisse totam hanc
mysticam actionem, quæ constet sym-
bolorum consecratorum oblatione, ob-
latorum consecratio, mortis Domini
commemoratione, gratiarum actione et
pro communi omnium salute suppli-
butione et participatione: hæc certe
omnia Graeci his nominibus λειψουρ-
γίας, ἱερουργίας, θυσίας, ἀσαιμάματης, λο-
γικής, λατρείας significasse videntur."¹
¹ Added from MS.—For the state-
ment itself of the text, see above, § 6,
note t, and below, § 25, note a.
² See S. Prosper., Resp. ad Capit.
Gall., Resp. ad cap. ix. "Quod non
pro totius mundi redemptione Salvator
sit crucifixus;" Òp., tom. i. p. 121. a:
—and Resp. ad Capit. Object. Vincent,
Resp. ad cap. i. (on the same subject);
ibid., p. 130. a.
thereof, and that truly if it be worthy (so that the propitiation wrought by [the] cross, thereby becomes effectually thine): in that regard the eucharist becomes to thee a propitiatory sacrifice, by virtue of the consecration indeed (which makes the elements to become the Body and Blood of Christ mystically, as in a sacrament), but yet in order to the participation of it. And is not this the applying of the propitiation wrought by the sacrifice of Christ's cross, whenas by the sacrament of the eucharist a man becomes entitled to the benefit of it? Nor let any man tell me, that this application is wrought by living faith; as if that were evidence enough, that not by the sacrament of the eucharist. For if, notwithstanding this faith, the sacrament of baptism is necessary to estate us in this right, because there is no living faith without being baptized into God's Church; by the same reason (supposing the frequentation of the eucharist commanded for the daily redressing and maintenance of the same title) of necessity it follows, that the application of that propitiation is to be ascribed to the eucharist, which is not applicable without it. Again: if St. Paul enjoin the Church to offer up their prayers, supplications, and intercessions, for all estates in the world, at the celebration of the eucharist, as recommending them in the name of Christ, there mysteriously present in the commemoration of His death upon the cross; can it seem strange, that the prayers, which are so powerfully presented by alleging an intercession of such esteem, should have a special virtue, and take a special effect, in making God propitious to His Church, and all estates of the same, and obtaining for them those benefits which Christ's passion tenders? And if so, is not the sacrament of the eucharist a propitiatory and impetratory sacrifice, by virtue of the consecration, though in order to the oblation and presentation of it by the prayers of the Church for the obtaining of their necessities? What is there in all this, that the tongue of slander can asperse with the imputation of popery; unless they will have popery to be that Christianity which we have received from our Lord Christ and His apostles? But if from hence any man would infer, that, seeing the sacrament of the eucharist (that is to say, the Body and Blood of Christ crucified there present by virtue of the consecration) is a propitiatory and impetratory sacrifice for the congregation there present, for
their relations, and for the Church, therefore it is so, whether they proceed to receive the eucharist or not; therefore it is so, whether they proceed to offer up the eucharist present by their prayers for the necessities of the Church, or not; therefore it is so, whether they pray with the Church or not. The consequence will straight appear to fail; because those reasons, which make it such a sacrifice, make it so in order to the receiving, or to the offering of it by the prayers of the Church in behalf of the Church.

§ 24. It is well enough known, what opinions and abuses in the use and concerning the virtue of masses had vogue under the dark time of the School, though not authorized by the Catholic Church. For in regard the eucharist can pretend no virtue by the nature of the work (impertinent to any spiritual effect), but merely by the institution of Christ; the efficacy thereof "ex opere operato" (according to the language of those days), and "by virtue of the very work," was so extended, as to take effect without any good motion in them that celebrate it. And the intent of the priest

Suarez's arguments, e. g., as referred to above in § 22, note m, to prove that the distribution of the sacrament is not an essential part of the eucharistic sacrifice, go as far as the positions in the text; and so much indeed all defence of private masses must assert.—See below in c. xxiv.

"Quemadmodum sacramenta quoque ex opere operato prodesse idcirco dixi doctendi causa solet, quia ex lege Divina, recte dispositis, per se sunt salutaria hoc ipso, quod eis legitemi ministri opera conferuntur, non attenta hunc ad effectum privata conferentia conditione." Greg. de Valentina, De Miss. Sacrif., lib. i. c. v.: De Rebus Fidei Controv., p. 537. 1. E. fol. Lugd. 1591.—And, says Forbes, (Consid. Mod. et Pacif., De Euchar., lib. iii. c. 2. § 16. p. 465. Lond. 1658), "Perperam scholastici doctoribus alliaque multis Romanosius affingitur, quasi docuerint et adhuc doceant opus sacerdotis in missa valere coram Deo ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis, sineque opere operantis, hoc est, etiamsi nec sacerdos nec popular suum opus, hoc est, veram fidem adjungat. Ut aut enim crasius iste error in nimis magna indocitorum sacerdotum et vulgi parte altas radices egerit, docent tamen doctiores omnes S. Ca- nam juxta institutionem Christi admissatam per se bonum et salutiferum opus esse omnium qui ea rite utuntur, etiamsi sacerdos omni fide deestitutus sit, propter Christi institutionem," &c. See however below, notes u, x.

"Controversia autem scholastica hic est, utrum etiam effectus hujus sacramenti habitualis, nempe gratia et ejus augmentum, possit per aliquid veniale peccatum in ipso tempore summationis admissam impediri. Caietanus affirmat hic art. 1; nempe per talem mentis evaginationem et distractionem, ut non habeat quia eo tempore actualis devotionem, id est, motum bonum liberorum arbitrii ergo Deum. Quin etiam si talis distractio esset sine ualla culpa, tamen putat Caietanus, hoc ipso, quod desit illi motus erga Deum, impediri sacramenti effectum habituali. Quia sententia est etiam Alexandri Alenses, ... Bonaventuræ, ... Durandi," &c. "Sed contraria est sententia communiter jam defenditur: nempe nullum peccatum veniale, neque ullo adeo defectum actualis devotionis seu motus boni liberih arbitrii, impedire gratie effectum eo tempore quo aliique sacramentum istud est efficax in amente. Ista expresse D. Thomas, ... Adrians, ... Victor," &c. Greg. de Valentina, Com.
(whose act the consecration was taken to be) was thought to extend it to whom and to what he pleased. And this, so far from requiring that any but the priest should communicate, that even at this day it is not thought necessary by the looser sort of that side, that the people should understand what the priest does or says, much less assist him with their devotions; the intent of the priest (which the canon itself always extends to all that are present) serving to give it virtue.

§ 25. On the other side, how hath this been taken and construed? As if every mass pretended to sacrifice Christ anew; Who "by offering Himself once hath perfected for ever those who are sanctified," as saith the apostle, Hebr. x. 14: and, therefore, as if every mass did challenge the virtue of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross. And it is true, the properties and effect of things signified are in some certain sense truly attributed to the signs. But he that enlarges his language beyond that sense, may give, and he that understands not the limitations requisite, may take, offence, when there is no need. Otherwise, the reasons of those limitations are evident enough to save any sober or charitable men either from inflaming or taking up offences. For common sense, which tells all men that what is once done can never be done again, obliges them to understand an abatement in the property of that language,

ment. Theol., tom. iv. Disp. VI. Qu. vii. De Effectibus Euchar., Punct. 3; p. 922. A. — C. Lugd. 1619. — And see below, c. xxiv. both for this subject and for those of notes x, y.

E. g. "Primum, quod in Canone sacerdos precatur, tota ecclesia adeoque circumstantes etiam orant per sacerdotem: deinde, neque apostolus ibi (1 Tim. ii. 1) "neque Christus in cena mandavit, ut sacerdotes preces omnes ab omnibus circumstantium audirentur vel intelligerentur. Ubi hoc est praeciput?" Greg. de Valentia, De Missae Sacrif., lib. ii. c. iv. p. 620. I. F.
which attributes the sacrificing of Christ to a priest; because, once done upon the cross, it can never be done again. Neither can it be in reason supposed, that he, who inflames the impropriety of his language, intends therefore to renounce the common faith concerning the redemption of mankind by the sacrifice of the cross. But when all derive all virtue in the mass from it, to take such language for equaling the mass to it, will require a great lust to maintain partiality in the Church.

§ 26. And make but once the consecrating and offering of [2. Of the opus operatum and opus operantis.]

the eucharist for the necessities of the whole Church by the prayers of those who celebrate it, to be the act of the respective assembly by the ministry of him whom the Church deputes for the purpose; it will easily appear what follows. For the virtue thereof will still be "ex opere operato," in opposition to the sacraments of the old law: the spiritual intent whereof not being discerned by all, because not openly preached at that time, the spiritual effect of them could not be attributed to the common work, but to the particular intent of those, that belonged to the Gospel under the Law; which is a true ground of opposition between "opus operatum," and "opus operantis,"—"the work merely done," and

* * * * *

"Ex his quoque constat manifestam esse calumniam, qua insinulatur praeem ecclesia, quod iteret obligationem Christi semel in cruce factam, et iterum Christum maetet et crucigiat." Cassander, Consult. art. xxiv. De Missa, § De Iteratione; Op., p. 1000.—"Sed ad hoc diceres, Sacramentum altaris quotidie offeretur in ecclesia, ergo, &c. Dicendum, quod non est ibi Sacrificii reiteratio, sed unius Sacrificii in cruce oblati quotidiana commemoratio." Lyranus, In Epist. ad Hebr., c. x. v. 3; quoted by Cassander, ibid.—"Idem omnes Catholici sentiunt et confidunt; quis enim unquam dixit, aut aliquis nobis Redemptorem esse quemendum aut hunc nostrum iterum mori opertere?" Ribera, Comment. in Hebr. c. x., num. 25. p. 471. Col. Agrip. 1600. —"Tertium sacrificium" (scil. propitiatorium) "est veluti medium" (inter sacrificia Legis, which are merely "umbrae et figurae," et sacrificium crucis, which alone is "adeo perfectum ut de se habeat valorem et sufficiantiam ad tollenda pecata"), "sc. quod non offeretur propter acquirendum pretium sed ad applicandum jam acquisitum." Suarez, In Tert. Part. D. Thom., tom. iii. Disp. lxxiv. sect. 1. p. 1096. 1. A.—See also the quotations to the same purpose from Cardinal Hosius, Michael Merspurgenensis, Bp. Watson, Wicelius, and several others, in Field, Of the Church, Append. to Bk. III. Introd., pp. 210, sq.—And also above, § 6, note t.—That unhappily there have been also "Romanenses" non "saniiores," see e. g. Alanus (sc. Cardinal Allen), De Euchar., lib. ii. c. 10. p. 543. Antv. 1576, quoted by Morton, in his Catholic Appeal, lib. ii. c. 7. § 12—paragraph 49; who affirms without qualification, speaking of the sacrifice of the mass, that "Vere et realiter geruntur ista, ut non sit falso dicere Christum mori, occidi, immolari, animam deposnere, frangi:" and lib. i. c. 37. p. 435 (condemned however by Gregor. de Valentia, Comment. Theol., as quoted above, § 24, note u, Qu. iv. De modo quo Christus est in Euch., Punct. 3. p. 872. C. D.): for which see above in c. ii. § 30, note a.

* See the last note; and above, § 6, note t.
“done by such an one.” Besides, seeing the truth of Christ’s Body and Blood is eaten and drunk by living faith without the sacrament, he that believes, that God instituted not the sacrament to no purpose, though he abhor to think that the effect thereof can be had without any good motion, must of necessity allow the devotion, which a living faith is exercised with in assisting the celebration of it, an effect by virtue of that work, which without it it cannot challenge. As for the effect of the prayers which it is offered with, it is not to be ascribed to the quality of the priest; and therefore in that regard also it may be ascribed to the work itself, not to the quality of him that doth it. But seeing the common obligation of all Christians extendeth their prayers to all necessities of Christ’s Church, it will not lie in the intent, either of the priest or of the whole assembly (whose act more properly it is), to make it more beneficial to particular Christians, than it can be thought that God accepteth the charity and devotion of particular Christians more particularly for their particular relations⁹.

§ 27. As for the matter of private masses, and the assistance of the people with their devotion as well as presence,—of an unknown tongue in God’s service,—of the extending of the

---

⁹ “Uno ore omnes hodie ecclesiastici scriptores clamant, falsa ecclesiastic accussari, quod doceat missae actionem ex operae operato, hoc est, ex operae externo, quatenus id a sacerdote fit, mereri allia remissiomi pecatororum, pro quibus applicatur; sed hoc tantummodo docent, Corpus et Sanguinem Christi, quae in hoc sacra actione religiosa commemoratione offeruntur, et fidelibus dispensantur, ex panis et vini substantias consecrari, et virtutem sanctificandi obtinere non ex operae operantis, id est, dignitate et merito celebrantis ministri, sed ex operae operato, hoc est, ex ordinacione et pacto Ipsius Christi, hanc sacram actionem instituenter.” Cassander, Consult., art. xxiv. de Missa; Op., pp. 991, 992.—“Si enim per opus operatum intelligas externam ceremoniam sine fide et bono motu cordis, eam prorsus cuique utilem esse negant” (sc. Romano-Catholici); “tandum abest ut illi tribuant meritum remissionis peccatorum pro vivis et mortuis non participantibus Christi meriti per fidem.” Id., ibid., p. 992: proceeding to quote from Michael Merspurgensis, that “falso nobis imputant, quod missa ejusmodi actum externum sentiamus, quem sacerdos suo arbitratu quibus velit seu vivis seu mortuis accommodare quest, etiamsi nula fide nullaque voluntate preditus sit.”—“Et Scotus in Quodlibetis disputat (Quesst. 200), hanc obligationem eucharistiam non esse acceptam nisi sit oferentis accepti, et ratione bona voluntatis alicujus offerentis: ... patet ergo, inquit, quod eucharistia obiata acceptatur, non ratione voluntatis Christi ut immediate offerentia; ratione ergo voluntatis ecclesiae generalis, quae habet rationem meriti finitam.” Id., ibid., p. 993.—There are several other quotations in Cassander to a similar purpose, the same principally as in Field, as quoted in last note; except that the latter cites them as protesters against a dominant faction in the Church, the former as truly representing her.—For “Romanes non saniiores,” however, see above, § 24, notes u, x, y.
benefit thereof to the dead; thus much being said generally here, I refer the rest to their own places.

§ 28. In fine, what other reason soever can be pretended (by any that shall make it his interest to maintain, not to excuse, the abuses of the Church of Rome), why the eucharist should be counted such a sacrifice; if it be not contained in that which hath been said, will easily be wiped off by that which hath been said: those scriptures, which we ground ourselves upon when we make the eucharist a sacrifice, being the only ground to determine (though not the only means to evidence), for what reason and to what purpose it is to be counted such a sacrifice.

§ 29. For how much regard soever we ought to have to the consent of the Church in this point (as, without doubt, if in any, then in this); without doubt the agreement and correspondence, visible to common sense, between the original practice and sense of the Church, and that which hath been alleged out of the Scriptures, will be evidence enough of the right reason, or reasons, for which the eucharist is not or is to be esteemed a propitiatory sacrifice.

§ 30. There is no man can thrust his nose into the writings of the fathers, even of the first times, but he shall find the oblations of the faithful, that are once deputed to the celebration of the eucharist, called sacrifices in that regard. This consideration, therefore, is not owned by them that strive most to make the eucharist properly a propitiatory sacrifice; because, though it have the stamp of primitive

c Below, cc. xxiv., xxvii., xxviii.

Christianity upon it, yet it makes nothing to that purpose. And yet the mass is never celebrated but they hear the obligations of the faithful called "sacrifices" (in the words quoted afore'); and that, "for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of salvation," for the "discharge of their vows." All which, understanding the renewing of the covenant of grace by the communion, is properly true in order to it.

§ 31. As for the sayings of the fathers, whereby the eucharist is declared to be a sacrifice in regard of the consecration; I do no way doubt, that they are utterly innumerable. For wheresoever the whole action, including the propitiation which the Church intends to procure by it, is called a sacrifice (which is most ordinary in the language of the fathers), there the consecration cannot be excluded; though referring it to the communion, not the communion to it, as some would have. For if it be considered, on the other side, that they were all said at such time as the communion was no less usual than the consecration thereof (that is to say, when it was a strange thing to hear of the eucharist celebrated and none but the priest to receive); it will not be strange, that I demand it to be understood in order to the communion of the same. Especially, when the liturgies themselves, that is, the form of consecration used in the most eminent Churches (from whom the less must necessarily be thought to have received their pattern), do limit the being and presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the elements to the benefit of them that shall communicate; as it appears by the forms of consecration that have been alleged.

§ 32. And though the fathers divers times call the celebrating of the eucharist the death and passion of our Lord, which it commemorates, and the sacrifice of His cross—(St. Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. St. Chrysostom, In Matt. Hom.

[The fathers call the eucharist the sacrifice of the cross with an abatement.] troversiam est: non enim res terrane esse possunt illud unicum sacrificium, quod in ecclesia vigere pro omnibus veteribus sacrificiis patres affirmant." Bellarm., as in last note, p. 1043. D.—And so also Suarez, In Tert. Part. D. Thom., Disp. lxv. sect. 3; tom. iii. p. 1114. l. C, D; in answer to Sotus and others, who hold, "hanc obligationem panis et vini pertinere aliquo modo ad substantiam hujus sacrificii."

1 Above, § 15; and below, § 32, note b.
2 See e.g. Suicer, sub voce θυσία, II. 2. a. 8, γ.
3 See the Appendix to Field, Of the Church, Bk. III.; as quoted below, § 36, note y; and Bingham, XV. iv. 4.
4 Above, c. iv. § 10, 11.
lxxxiii.1, In Acta Hom. xxi.2, In Epist. ad Hebr. Hom. xviii.; Chap. V.

See above, c. iv. § 43, note a.


See above, c. iv. § 39, note a.

“Se Ipsum (Christus) obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris, et ejus sacrificii similitudinem celebrandum in Suse passionem memoriam commendavit.” S. Aug., Lib. de Diversi Quest. Octoginta-Tribus, Qu. lxi. § 2; Op., tom. vi. p. 34. C.

“Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinem promittebatur, in passioni Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebat, post adscensum Christi per sacramentum memoria celebratur.” Id., Cont. Faust., lib. xx. c. 21; Op., tom. viii. p. 348, C, D.

In c. 6. of De Civ. Dei, lib. x. (Op., tom. vii. p. 243, F), S. Augustin says—“Quod etiam sacramento altaris fidelibus noto frequentat ecclesia, ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re” (previous editions have “oblatione”), “quam offert, ipsa offeratur.” In c. 5 there is no allusion to the subject of the eucharist.—“Per hoc et sacerdos est (Christus), Ipse offerens, Ipse et oblatum. Cujus rei sacramentum quotidiam esse voluit ecclesiam sacrificium.” Id., ibid., c. 20, p. 256, B.

“Ubique offertur sub sacerdote
BOOK III.
cap. iii.: and even the canon of mass, calling it "a sacrifice of praise for the redemption of souls, that pay their vows\(^b\)).

And therefore St. Ambrose, De iis qui initiantur mysteriis cap. viii., says, that Christians then, seeing the altar prepared, cried out, "Thou hast prepared a table before Me."

And in the fathers, which is sometimes called an altar, is otherwise called a table; especially with the additions of "mystical—holy—spiritual—Divine," and others. All abating the property of a sacrifice, or rather the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, when speech is of the eucharist.

§ 33. The words of St. Augustin, Epist. xxxiii., are express: "Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in Scipso? et tamen in sacramento, non solum per omnes Paschae solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur; nec utique mentituri, qui interrogatus Eum respondet immolari"—"Was not Christ in Person sacrificed once? and yet in mystery, not only all the 50 Easter holidays, but every day, is He sacrificed for the people; nor shall he lie, who being asked answers, that He is sacrificed." That truth of a sacrifice, which serves but to save a "lie," makes not a proper sacrifice.

§ 34. And the words of St. Chrysostom, In Epist. ad Hebr. Hom. xvii., are not to be omitted.—"\(T\)i \(\omega\nu\); \(\eta\)\(\mu\)\(e\)\(s\) \(k\)\(a\)\(\theta\) \(\epsilon\)\(k\)\(a\)\(s\)\(t\)\(h\) \(\eta\)\(m\)\(e\)\(r\)\(a\)\(n\) \(o\)\(u\) \(p\)\(r\)\(o\)\(s\)\(f\)\(e\)\(r\)\(o\)\(m\)\(e\)\(n\) \(m\)\(e\)\(n\), \(\alpha\)\(l\)\(l\)\(l\) \(\alpha\)\(n\)\(\alpha\)\(m\)\(n\)\(h\)\(s\)\(i\)\(n\) \(p\)\(o\)\(i\)\(o\)\(m\)\(e\)\(n\)\(o\)\(i\) \(t\)\(o\)\(u\)\(s\) \(\theta\)\(a\)\(n\)\(a\)\(t\)\(o\)\(s\) \(\alpha\)\(u\)\(t\)\(o\)\(u\)\(s\) \(\kappa\)\(a\)\(l\) \(o\)\(u\) \(p\)\(o\)\(l\)\(l\)\(a\)\(i\). \(\pi\)\(o\)\(s\) \(m\)\(a\) \(k\)\(a\) \(o\)\(u\) \(p\)\(o\)\(l\)\(l\)\(a\)\(i\); \(\epsilon\)\(p\)\(e\)\(l\) \(\acute{\alpha}\)\(p\)\(a\)\(x\) \(p\)\(r\)\(o\)\(s\)\(h\)\(e\)\(\theta\)\(h\)\(a\), \(o\)\(u\)\(h\) \(\omega\)\(s\)\(t\)\(e\)r \(\epsilon\)\(k\)\(e\)\(l\)\(h\)\(i\) \(\eta\)\(i\)\(s\) \(t\)\(a\) \(\alpha\)\(n\)\(i\) \(t\)\(o\)\(n\) \(\acute{\alpha}\)\(g\)\(o\)\(n\)\(o\)\(i\) \(t\)\(o\)\(u\)\(t\)o \(\epsilon\)\(k\)\(e\)\(l\)\(h\)\(i\)\(s\)."

Christo, quo prodest Melchisedec quando benedixit Abraham." Id., ibid., lib. xvii. c. 17: ibid., p. 480. C. These are the only words relating to the subject in the place cited. In lib. xix. c. 24. § 5. (ibid., p. 569. F.) we have—

"Cujus rei mysterium celebrabam oblationibus nostris:" and in lib. xxi. c. 25. § 2. (ibid., p. 646. A) "Qui est in ejus corporis unitate, . . . cujus corporis sacramentum fideles communicantes de altari sumere consueverunt, ipse ver dicendis est manducare Corpus Christi et bibere Sanguinem Christi."

\(^a\) See above, c. iv. § 43, note e.

\(^b\) "Qui Tibi offerunt sacrificium laudis pro se suisque omnibus, pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis et incolimitatis suae; Tibique reddunt vota sua, aeterno Deo, vivo et vero." Missal. Rom., p. 281. ed. Antv. 1631.


\(^f\) S. Chrys., In Epist. ad Hebr. c. x. Hom. xvii. § 3; Op., tom. xii. pp. 168. D—169. A.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

§ 35. Now that, in the sense of the Catholic Church, the sacrament of the eucharist is a sacrifice propitiatory for the Church, and imperative of the necessities thereof, in regard of those prayers wherewith it is offered and presented to God in virtue of the sacrifice of the cross, which it is mystically (that is, representeth and commemorateth) : a few words will serve to persuade him, that knows the practice and custom of the Church in all ages, at the solemn and regular times and occasions of celebrating the eucharist, to make mention of all
states and qualities belonging to the Church⁵; and not only so, but upon occasions incident, of going to God for the necessities either of the Church or of particular Christians, to celebrate the eucharist with an intent of presenting and offering the cross of Christ there present for their necessities⁶. You had afore out of Tertullian (De Cor. cap. v.¹): "Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus"—"We make oblations for the dead, for the birth of martyrs, on the anniversary day." And further (De Exhor. Castit. xi.), speaking of him that had married a second wife:—"Necque enim pristinam poteris odisse, cui etiam religiosiorem reservas affectionem, ut jam receptae apud Dominum, pro cujus spiritu postulas, pro qua oblationes annuas reddis: stabis ergo ad Dominum cum tot uxoribus quot in oratione commemoras? et offeres pro duabus? et commendabis illas duas per sacerdotem de monogamia ordinatum, aut etiam de virginitate sanctum? circumdatum virginitus ac univiris? et ascendet sacrificium tuum libera fronte? et inter caeteras voluntates bone mentis postulabis tibi et uxori tuae castitatem?"—"For the former thou canst not hate, for whom thou reservest a more religious affection, as received already with the Lord, for whose spirit thou makest request, for whom thou renderest yearly oblations: wilt thou then stand before the Lord with as many wives as in thy prayers thou mentionest? and wilt thou offer for two? and commend those two by a priest ordained after one wife, or confirmed of a virgin? compassed with virgins and once-married people? and shall thy sacrifice freely ascend? and, among other affections of a good mind, wilt thou desire chastity for thee and thy wife?" I dispute not here, how lawful it is to pray for the dead; which Tertullian touches again De Monogamia x.¹, De Anima liviii.⁵ This Tertullian supposes, that, if a Christian have two wives, 51

⁵ See Service of God at Rel. Ass., c. x. § 27—37: and Bingham, XIII. x. 4, 5; XV. i. 2, iii. 13—24.

¹ See Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x. § 59—70.

¹ Tertull., De Corona Militis, c. iii. (v. in the text is a mistake); Op., p. 102. A. See above, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. v.ii. § 29, 30.


¹ "Enim vero et pro anima ejus orat, et refrigetum interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium, et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus." Id., De Monog., c. x.: Op., p. 531. A.

⁵ Praying for the dead is not expressly mentioned in the De Anima, c. liii.; Op. Tertull., pp. 306. D—307. B. How the passage is connected with the subject, will be seen below, c. xxviii. § 51.
he must offer, that the eucharist may be celebrated, and that at the celebrating of it the priest may pray for those whom he mentions as the occasion of celebrating it. The birthdays of martyrs, that is, the anniversaries of their sufferings, was another occasion of celebrating the eucharist: as in Tertullian o, so in St. Cyprian o (Epist. xxxiv.); "Sacrificium pro eis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies annua commemoratone celebramus"—"We always offer sacrifice for them, as you remember, when we celebrate the yearly commemoration of the martyrs' suffering days." Therefore, where the same St. Cyprian forbids "offering the names" of those that had fallen away in persecution, and "offering for them" (Epist. ix. p. xi. q), he forbids the receiving of their offerings, and by consequence praying for them at the eucharist. Epiphanius (Her. xxx. 7), speaking of the patriarch of the Jews baptized in private:—"Χρυσίων ὅλην τινα ἱκανοτάτην ἔχων παρὰ χειρὰ ὁ αὐτὸς Πατριάρχης, ἐκείνης τῆς χειρᾶ ἐπέδωκε τῷ ἐπίσκοπῷ, φῶςκων, δι', πρόσφερε ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ”—"The said patriarch, having in his hand a very considerable sum of gold, stretched out his hand, and gave it to the bishop, saying, Offer for me." St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. Mystag. v. 1)—"Εἰτα, μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν τὴν ἀναμακτὸν λατρείαν ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱεροῦ, παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησίων εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου εὐσταθείας, ὑπὲρ βα-

a Above, note i.

d "Ante actam penitentiam," &c., "offerre pro ilii et eucharistiam dare," &c. Id., Epist. xv. (x. ed. Pamel.), Martyribus et Confessoribus; Epist. p. 34.—These and equivalent phrases occur several times in S. Cyprian.
tom. i. p. 130. A.
f S. Cyril. Hieros., Catech. xxiii. (Mystag. v.) § 8; Op., pp. 327. C—328. A. The comma is at latreian, and not at ἵλασμοι, in the Benedictine edition. And the passage continues (ibid., § 8, 9),—"ὑπὲρ τῶν καταπονυμένων, καὶ ἀνατελεῖται, ὑπὲρ τῶν βοηθειῶν δομίνων, δεδομεθα διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γιὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τῆς θυσίας εἰστα μεμονωμένος καὶ τῶν προκεκομισμένων, πρῶτον πατριαρχῶν," κ. τ. λ. "μεγαλουχία δικαίων πιστεύετε δεδομένα ταῖς ψυχαῖς, ὑπὲρ δὲ ἡ δικαιοδοξία διαφέρει τῆς ἀγίας καὶ φρονέστητης προκεκομισμένης θυσίας." And to the same effect in the next section, ibid., § 10. p. 328 C, "Χριστὸν ἐνθραυσμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμιτέλων ἀμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν, ἐξελευθεροῦμεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν" (sc. the dead) "τε καὶ ἤμων τῶν φιλαθρωτών Θεοῦ."
BOOK III. σιλέων, ύπερ στρατιωτῶν, καὶ συμμάχων, ύπερ τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείας"—"Then, that spiritual sacrifice, that unbloody service, being done" (consecrated) "over that propitiatory sacrifice, we beseech God for the common peace of the Churches, for the state of the world, for the kings, their armies and allies, for the sick," &c.; adding, that, "praying for the departed, we offer to God Christ crucified for our sins, to render Him propitious to them and to us." Of which effect in due place the intent hereby appears. For here, as he calls it a sacrifice upon the consecration, so he plainly sets down, wherein the propitiation which it effecteth consists, according to the Catholic Church. For, to say truth, to the purpose in hand, I can produce nothing like that which I have said already in my Book of the Service of God at the Assemblies of the Church (to which I remit you for the rest, pp. 370—382):—that in all the liturgies there is a place, where mention is to be made of all states of the Church; for whom the oblations, out of which the eucharist is consecrated, are offered: and likewise a place, where, the eucharist being consecrated, prayer is made in behalf of all states in the Church; that is to say, the sacrifice of Christ His cross there present is offered up, to move God to grant them all that is desired by the regular and continual prayers of the Church: and among them there is a special place for those that offer at present.

§ 36. If any man be moved to imagine, that any part hereof is prejudicial to that reformation which the Church of England professeth (for I profess from the beginning, not to be scrupulous of offending those that offend it); I remit him to that learned Appendix of Dr. Field to his third Book of the Church: the purpose whereof (in answer to the question, where the reformed Church was before Luther) is, to shew, that in this point, as in others there handled, the sense of the whole Church of Christ, even to the time of Luther and to the council of Trent, was no other than that which the Church of England embraceth and cherisheth; thereby to shew, that the reformation thereof never pretended to found a new Church, but to preserve that which was, by taking

* Edit. of 1649.—c. x. § 59—70; in vol. i. pp. 351, sq., of the present edition. § 1—11.
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away those corruptions, which time, and the enemies of Chris-
tianity, had sown in the laws and customs of it*. Which he
doeth so evidently perform in this point?, that I must needs
challenge any man, that hath a mind to blast any thing here
said with the stale calumny of popery, to consider first,
whether he can prove those things, which the authors past
exception there quoted declare to be the sense of the Catho-
lic Church at that time, to contain any thing prejudicial to
the Gospel of Christ, and that purity thereof which the refor-
mation pretendeth. And because I know he cannot do it, I
rest secure of all blasphemies or slanders, that can be forged
upon this occasion: openly professing, that those who will
not acknowledge that condition of the Gospel, and the pro-
mises thereof, which I have demonstrated* to be essential to
52 Christianity—it is for their interest to defame the sense of
the Catholic Church with the slanderous aspersions of popery;
that so they might seduce miserable creatures to believe, that
there is a faith which entitles them to the promises of the
Gospel, not supposing them converted to the Christianity
which it tendereth. For seeing that propitiation, which the
sacrifice of the eucharist pretendeth, is grounded upon this
condition of the covenant of grace (as I have shewed); it is
no marvel if they, who pretend to reconcile the promises of
the Gospel to the lusts of the flesh, by which this world is
enjoyed, endeavour to slander the purity of Christianity with
those aspersions, which they have seduced wretched people to
count odious.

§ 37. In fine, it is not that consideration of a sacrifice in
the sacrament of the eucharist, which the sense and practice
of the Catholic Church enforceth, but the violent interpre-

* "An Appendix, wherein it is
clearly proved that the Latine or West
Church, in which the Pope tyrannized,
was, and continued, a true orthodoxe
and Protestant Church; and that the
devisers and maintainers of Romish
errors and superstitious abuses were
only a faction in the same, at the time
when Luther, not without the applause
of all good men, published his propo-
sitions against the prophane abuse of
Papall indulgences." Title of Appen-
dix to Bk. III. of Field, Of the
Church, pp. 183, sq. 2nd edition, Oxf.
1628.

* Prefixed to the Appendix of Field,
Book III., is "An Answer to M.
Brekeley's objection concerning the
Masse, publique used in all Churches
at Luther's appearing:" pp. 185—
224: wherein the points of Private
Masses, Half-Communion, and the
Roman doctrine of the Propitiatory
Sacrifice in the Eucharist, are handled
at length, for the purpose of shewing
the general proposition maintained in
the Appendix to hold good in these
instances in particular.

* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc.
ii—ix.
tations of it which are made on both sides, to both extremities, that can give the least pretence for division in the Church. For while, on the one side, the sacrificing of Christ anew is so construed, as if to doubt of the virtue of it in behalf of all that assist in it (whether they communicate in it or not, whether their devotions concur to it or not) were to doubt of the virtue of Christ's cross; it is no marvel, if this create so great offence, that the receiving of the eucharist, nay, the assisting of it with the devotions of Christian people, comes to be a matter of indifference. On the other side, while the renewing of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross by that representation thereof which the eucharist tendereth, for the redressing* of the covenant of grace between God and those which receive, is construed as prejudicial to that one sacrifice, whereby our Lord "for ever hath perfected those whom He sanctifieth;" no marvel, if the very celebrating of it come to be a matter of indifference, the effect whereof, by believing that a man is predestinate or justified, is had before and without it. The matter of the sacrifice then being so great a subject for the division, upon so little cause, it is time for good Christians to awake and look about them, and see, that the less cause there is, the greater goodwill the parties have to continue at distance. In the mean time, it is the common interest of Christianity, even the means of their salvation by the worthy frequenting of this holy sacrament, that suffers.

§ 38. As for the Church of England, I refer myself to the very form of those laws, according to which as many as have received orders in it, have promised to exercise the ministry to which they were appointed by the same; and that before God and His Church, at so solemn an occasion, that nothing can be thought obligatory to him that would transgress it. For the offertory which the Church of England prescribeth, if it signify any thing, signifieth the dedication of that which is offered, as at large to the necessities of the Church, so in particular to the celebration of the eucharist then and there. At the consecration the Church prayeth, "that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed

* Corrected in MS. into "renewing," but the correction scorched through.
Body and Blood:"—and after the communion;—"We Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His death and passion:"—all this, having premised prayer for all states of Christ’s Church. Which whether it make not the sacrament of the eucharist, by virtue of the consecration, the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, propitiatory and impetratory for them who communicate in it by receiving the elements; whether or no, by virtue of this oblation, propitiatory and impetratory for the necessities of the rest of the Church, as well as the congregation present: I leave to men of reason, but not to puritans, to judge. This I am sure, the condition of the Gospel (which is the fourth reason, for which I have shewed, that the eucharist is counted a sacrifice in the sense of the Church) is exactly expressed in the words that follow; to the confusion of all puritans, that would have us expect the blessings promised from such a kind of faith, which supposes it not, neither implies it:—"And here we offer and present to Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching Thee, that all we, which be partakers of this holy communion, may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction." For the reason, which obliges us to profess this at receiving the eucharist (which is "the New Testament in the [Luke xii. 20.]

covenanteth for, depend upon it, as the condition which renders them due. And upon these premisses I may well conclude, that all the reasons, for which I have shewed that the eucharist is a sacrifice in the sense of the Church, are recapitulated and comprised in [that] which followeth:—"And though we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences."
CHAPTER VI.

THE REASON OF THE ORDER BY WHICH I PROCEED, BRINGS ME TO THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS IN THE NEXT PLACE. THE POWER OF THE KEYS SEEN IN GRANTING BAPTISM, AS WELL AS IN COMMUNICATING THE EUCHARIST. WHY SOCINIANISTS MAKE BAPTISM INDIFFERENT. WHY ANTINOMIANS MAKE IT A MISTAKE TO BAPTIZE. THE GROUNDS UPON WHICH I SHAKE OFF BOTH. WITH ANSWER TO SOME OBJECTIONS.

When I proposed to write of the laws of the Church (that is to say, of those controversies concerning the same, which are the subject of division in matter of Christianity to the English at this time), I proposed my subject in equivocal terms; till it be further distinguished, that the laws of the Church may be understood to be those, which God hath given the Church to conduct the body of the Church in the exercise of their Christianity; and they may be understood to be those, which God hath enabled the Church to give themselves: according to that which I shewed from the beginning; that God's giving such laws to Christians as are to be kept and exercised by the community of Christians at their respective assemblies, is a demonstration, that God hath founded a society or corporation under the name of the Church; and that supposing the Church to be such a society or corporation of necessity inferreth, that it is enabled by God's law to give laws unto itself in such matters, as, not being determined by God's law, become necessary to be determined for preservation of the body in unity, and communion in the offices of God's service. The laws, therefore, that God gives His Church, are so far the subject of this inquiry, as may make it to appear, what is left to the power and duty of the Church to determine. And to this purpose it seemed requisite in the first place to determine, what the rule of faith containeth to be believed of the sacrament of the eucharist, which is the ground of whatsoever can be pretended that He hath enjoined His Church as concerning the frequentation of it; having determined the like afore, not only concerning the sacrament of baptism, but also concerning penance, inasmuch as they contain qualifications requisite by the Gospel.

\[c\] Corrected from MS.; "Christian amity," in orig. text.

\[d\] See above, c. i. § 2.
to render the promises thereof due to particular Christians. Whereas the sacrament of the eucharist, being (as I said afore* the most eminent of those offices which God hath enjoined to be celebrated by the assemblies of His Church (having first founded His Church upon the duty and the command, or upon the charter [and †] privilege, of holding those assemblies, even when the powers of the world allow it not), required a treaty express, to determine the true intent why it was instituted; that it might the better appear in due time, how those circumstances in the celebration of it, which are a great part of the subject of that division which prevails among us in point of Christianity, may best be determined to the intent of God's law: and also, that the true intent of other powers given the Church (evidently tending to the maintenance of Christianity, and the purity thereof, but always with a respect to the unity of the Church in the communion of those offices whereof this is the chief) might the better be estimated by a right understanding of the end which they seek. You have then the first, that is, the original and primitive, and also (if you demand that) the prime and chief power of God's Church, consisting in celebrating the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist. Not in washing away "the filth of the body," as St. Peter saith (that is, not in ministering the outward ceremony of washing the body with water, or any part of it), but in admitting and allowing that profession of a "good conscience," which qualifies a man to be a member of the Church. For this allowance is no less than a declaration on the part of the Church, that he, who upon these terms is admitted to baptism, is likewise invested with a right and due title to the promises of the Gospel, remission of sins, and everlasting life: as it may appear to all, that have contracted with the Church of England in God's name, that, continuing in that which they professed and undertook on their part at their baptism, they are assured of no less by the Church.

§ 2. And therefore this is, and ought to be, accounted that power of the keys, by which men are admitted to the house of God, which is His Church, as St. Paul saith: at least that part of it, that is seen and exercised in this first office that

* Above, c. i. § 2.  
† Corrected from MS. "or," in orig. text.
the Church can minister to a Christian. And seeing no man can challenge the privilege of that communion, to which he is admitted upon condition of that profession which baptism supposeth, unless he proceed to live according to it; it cannot seem strange, that the same should be thought to be exercised in the celebration of the eucharist, as it is done with a purpose to communicate the sacrament thereof to those that receive. I shall desire any man, that counts this strange, to consider that which I quoted even now out of Epiphanius:—that the patriarch of the Jews at Tiberias, being baptized by the bishop, put a considerable sum of gold into his hand, saying, "Offer for me; for it is written, Whatsoever ye bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven:" for so it follows in Epiphanius. And when St. Cyprian blames or forbids "offering up the names," or "offering up" the eucharist in the names, of those that had fallen away from the Church in time of persecution, till they were reconciled to the Church by penance; doth he not exercise the power of the keys in his hands, by denying the benefit of those prayers which the eucharist is celebrated with, to them, who had forfeited their right to it by failing of that which by their baptism they undertook? As, on the other side, whatsoever the eucharist is offered for (that is, whosoever hath a part in those prayers which it is celebrated with), is thereby declared loose by the Church, upon supposition that he is indeed what he professes. And whatsoever canons of the Church there are (of which there are not a few), which take order, that the offerings of such or such shall or shall not be received; they all proceed upon this supposition, that by the power of the keys they are to be allowed or refused their part of benefit in the communion of the eucharist, and the effects of it. For (not to speak of what is by the corruption of men, but what ought to be by the appointment of God) it is manifest, that the admission of a man to the communion of the eucharist is an allowance of his Christianity as conformable
to that which baptism professeth: though in no state of the Church it is a sufficient and reasonable presumption, that a man is indeed and before God entitled to the promises of the Gospel, that he is admitted to the communion of the eucharist by the Church; because whatsoever profession the Church can receive, may be counterfeit. But so, that it is to be endeavoured by all means possible for the Church to use, that the right of communicating with the Church in the sacrament of the eucharist be not allowed any man by the Church, but upon such terms, and according to such laws, that a man, being qualified according to them, may be really and indeed qualified for those promises which the Gospel tendereth. Which being supposed, every Christian must of necessity acknowledge, how great and eminent a power the Lord hath trusted His Church with, in celebrating and giving of the eucharist; when he is convinced to believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ is thereby rendered him, though mystically and as in a sacrament, yet so truly, that the Spirit of Christ is no less really present with it, to enable the souls of all them that receive it with sincere Christianity, than the sacrament is to their bodies; or than the same Spirit is present in the Flesh and Blood of Christ, naturally being in the heavens. For suppose, that by faith alone, without receiving this sacrament, a man is assured of the Spirit of Christ (as by faith alone, understanding faith alone as St. Paul meant itm, I shall shew that he may be assured of it): yet, if He have determined a visible act to be done, to the due performance whereof He hath annexed a promise of the participation of the Spirit of Christ by our spirit, no less than of the Body and Blood of Christ sacramentally present by our bodies; and if He hath made the doing of this a part of the Christianity, which under the title of faith alone entitleth to [thea] promises of the Gospel (for who can be said to profess Christianity, that owneth not such an ordinance upon such a promise?); then hath He determined and limited the truth of that faith, which only justifieth us, at the beginning of every man's Christianity to the sacrament of baptism, but in the proceeding of the same to that of the eucharist; these being the first powers of the Church.

1 Misprinted 45 in folio edition.  
2 See below, § 11.  
3 Added from MS.
§ 3. And having resolved from the beginning, that the power of the Church extends to the determining or limiting of any thing requisite to the communion of the Church, the determination or limitation whereof (by such an act as ought to have the force of law to them that are of the Church) becomes requisite to the communion of Christians in the offices of God’s service in unity; I cannot see any of the controversies, whereby we stand now divided, that can deserve a place in our consideration before that of the baptism of infants. For as it is a dispute belonging to the first and original power of the Church, to consider whether it extend so far, as (when it is acknowledged that there is no written law of God to that purpose) that it may, and justly hath, provided, that all the children of Christian parents be baptized infants; so it will appear to concern their salvation more immediately, than other laws, limiting the exercise of the Church’s power, or the circumstances of exercising those offices of God’s service which it tendeth to determine, can be thought to do.

§ 4. But before I come to dispute this point, I will here take notice once more of the book, called the Doctrine of Baptisms⁹, one of the fruits of this blessed reformation, commonly attributed to the master of a college in Cambridge: proving by a studied dispute, that it was never intended by our Lord Christ and His apostles, that Christians should be baptized at all; that John indeed was sent to baptize with water, but that the baptism of Christ is baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire; and, so long as the ceremonies of the Law were not abolished in point of fact (though become void in point of right), so long also baptism by water was practised by the apostles, as by John the Baptist and his disciples; but that, since then, the continuance of baptism by water in the Church, is nothing else but an argument, that it hath been destitute of baptism by fire, which is the Holy Ghost, which this reformation, or forsooth this dogmatist, pretends to⁷.

⁷. Above, c. i. § 2: and Right of Ch. in Chr. State, c. i. § 1—6. ⁸. See above in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 24, note n: and in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. v. § 6. ⁹. See an account of the book in Right of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 17. note p. ⁴⁰. "So John's water Baptisme was to
§ 5. Which opinion obliges to mention again that of Socinus*: who allows no further of baptism, than of an indifferent ceremony, which the Church may use still at pleasure to solemnize the profession of Christianity, when a man is converted from infidelity to it (as it was prescribed by our Lord to signify the washing away of sin from those, who, having been Jews and Gentiles, were converted to be Christians); but that the obligation thereof is utterly ceased in respect of those, who, being born of Christians and bred up in the Church, have, by the exercise of that Christianity which their years entitles them to, made continual profession of it.

§ 6. These two opinions, like Samson's foxes, though tied together by the tails to set the Church on fire, yet may proceed upon several grounds. For we know, that Socinus, denying original sin, hath reason enough to reject the baptism of men, as well as of infants; as not acknowledging any thing but the will of man requisite to make him a good Christian, and consequently suspending the promises of the Gospel only upon that act thereof, which resolveth a man to become a good Christian†. Which how well it agrees with Socinus his acknowledgment of the gift of the Holy Ghost, promised to them that have made this resolution to enable them to

last but till Christ's fire Baptisme should come in, and then the fire should lick up the water: and as Spirit Baptisme should increase, water Baptisme should decrease. So that John's Baptisme or water Baptisme (which is all one) belongs not to Christ's Kingdom. Doctr. of Baptisms, p. 11. "The last and that which seems the strongest objection is, that the Apostles practised water Baptisme, not onely before Christ's Baptisme came in, but after. I answer, true indeed, the Apostles did practise water Baptisme, but not from Christ, but from John, whose Baptisme they took up, and an outward ceremony of honour and account is not easily and suddenly laid downe: hence some of the Apostles used circumcision." Ibid., p. 16. "And this is the onely Baptisme wherein all the Church of the New Testament are to partake with Christ, I say not the Baptisme of water, but the Spirit." Ibid., p. 19. "Now the outward instrument of Christ's, or Spirit Baptisme, is not materiall water, but the Word." Ibid. —"So that this place (Matt. xxviii. 19.) cannot be understood of water, but instead of baptizing in materiall water, as John, He tells them they should 'baptize into the Name of God,' that they that were before sinfulfull, corrupt and evil men, should now be taken up into the glory of the Name of God; neither can this place be understood of a forme of words which the Apostles and their successors should use in baptizing, seeing no place of Scripture can be named wherein the Apostles in baptizing used this forme." Ibid., p. 15. "And thus in all these particulars you see the infinite excellency and glory of Spirit Baptisme above water Baptisme, and this onely is sufficient in the daies of the Gospel, as being the true and proper Baptisme of the New Testament." Ibid., p. 25.

* See above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. i. § 7. note r, c. v. § 6. note c, and § 10. note g: and in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 24. note m.

† Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. i. § 5. c. vii. § 2.
perform it, is clear to them who shall have perused the premisses, to give sentence.

§ 7. As for the other opinion last mentioned, I must profess, that I do not take upon me that it is his work who is said to be the author of it: though I name him upon common fame, as an instance to evidence, that there is no Church of God in England by the present laws, when there is no means to bring to light the authors of such pestilent doctrines; and when those, who pretend to be an University, do acknowledge such a man master of a college (partly of divines), as, if they were an University, they ought not to acknowledge as a Christian; to wit, belonging to the communion of the Church. For though I mean not to charge him with this book, yet, so long as he owns all that he is charged with by Rutherford, the Scots Presbyterian, I do charge him with the heresy of the Antinomians; which here I mention, because it seems reasonable to conceive this opinion to be a branch of it.

§ 8. Wherein, how well he is refuted by his adversary, how clear his adversary is of the same blame, is to be judged by that which I have determined concerning the condition of the covenant of grace. For, the heresy of the Antinomians consisting in voiding the condition of the covenant of grace, it is free for them to make the justification of Christians to go before justifying faith, being nothing else but the revelation of God's mercy which He hath from everlasting for the elect, whom He, determining to save, sent Christ to redeem them alone. It seems therefore very consequent in reason to this position (if that operation of the Spirit, which they pre-

* See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. x. § 1, 3, 4, notes e—k.

* See in the "Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist, opening the secrets of Familisme and Antinomianisme in the Anti-Christian Doctrine of John Saltmarsh and Will. Del, the present preachers of the Army now in England, and of Robert Town, Tob. Crisp, H. Denne, Eaton, and others: in which is revealed the rise and spring of Antinomians, Familists, Libertines, Swenckfeldians, Enthysiasits" (sic). "&c, in two parts: by Samuel Rutherford, Professor of Divinity in the University of St. Andrews in Scotland, 4to. Lond. 1648."—In Part ii. c. 84. is proved, that "Del, Saltmarsh, and Familists deny an outward Reformation, Scripture, seals, and ordinances: Del denies any worke of the Spirit or conversion to God in the Old Testament:—Del a Familist;—Del a Libertine:—he denies all laws:—. . . Believers as spiritual as Angells, saith Del, what need then of preaching to them?—Outward reforming no more our duty then to redeem the world:—Del maketh God's absolute decrees to destroy all the working of second causes:—Del and Familists deny the Scripture and contend for an internall enthysiasical call."

* Above, in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. vii., xxx., xxxi.
tend, admit any dispute of reason about their positions), to say, that, the gift of the Holy Ghost being due to the elect by virtue of Christ's merits and sufferings, provided for them alone, and imputed to them alone from everlasting to the re-
mission of sins, there can be no reason why baptism should be requisite: those, that are not elect, not standing in any capacity either of admitting the Gospel or attaining the promises of it; those that are, being from everlasting estated in the right of them.

§ 9. Now if that Presbyterian make justifying faith to consist in the knowledge of man's predestination to life, in consideration of Christ sent for him, revealed to him by God's Spirit, but limited to take effect upon the said revelation of it (as I have said that some of them do); then I refer myself to that which I have said already*, to shew this opinion to be no less destructive to Christianity than the former, but not so agreeable to itself, nor to reason, to make remission of sins and salvation (appointed them merely in consideration of Christ) to depend upon the revelation of Christ to them, altogether impertinent to any act required of them to procure it. But if he make justifying faith to consist in a confidence in God (such as men may have, that are assured of remission of sins and of life everlasting, not supposing on their part any condition of turning from the world to God, as requisite by the Gospel); I refer myself still to that which I have said, to shew how this is destructive to Christianity.

§ 10. But why those, that have these opinions, should nevertheless maintain the necessity of baptism, whereof they have no reason to give according to the Scriptures, I confess I am to learn. For if we believe Christianity to come from God (and therefore all the laws of it), how shall we believe, that for one of these laws He hath provided, that all that will be saved be baptized, having given assurance of remission of sins and salvation without consideration of it or dependance upon it? He that comes to be baptized, either hath saving faith, or not: if he have it, he hath it never the more for being baptized, being such an assurance as no man may

---

* Ibid., c. i. § 8.
* Ibid., c. vii. § 7: and c. xxx. § 27.
* Ibid., c. xxx. § 16.
doubt in without failing of all God's promises; if he have it not, can baptism bring it? Unless we say with the Church, that the promise of the Holy Ghost depends upon it: which he that saith (if he will give a reason of what he saith), must have recourse to the condition of the undertaking and professing of Christianity, in consideration whereof God hath promised the gift of the Holy Ghost to enable Christians to perform that which they undertake.

§ 11. This is then to say, that, though I take notice of these heresies in this place, where I purpose to speak of the power of the Church in baptizing, yet I hold not myself obliged to say any more for the rooting of them out or preventing them, than I have said in demonstrating the nature of the covenant of grace. For I have shewed, on the one side, that the condition required on our parts to undertake, if we would be entitled to the promises which it tendereth, consisteth in an act of our free choice, whereby the course of our lives is dedicated to the service of God, as the end for which we were made; and that this course is determined by the law of Christianity; and, consequently, the act whereby we undertake to profess Christianity (called faith by St. Paul), that which entitles us to remission of sins and everlasting life. And I have shewed, on the other side, that the nature of man, being corrupted by the fall of our first parents, could not be repaired but by the coming of the second Adam; and those helps of grace, which by His obedience in the flesh He purchased, to enable us to embrace and undertake the condition proposed, and to proceed in the performance of it to that which God accepteth. In fine, I have shewed, that the sacrament of baptism is that visible act, which legally determineth and limiteth that profession of Christianity which entitleth to the kingdom of God; as confining the profession of a Christian unto the hands of the Church, by the means whereof Christianity is conveyed to us. Therefore, having shewed these things, I have no reason to think myself obliged to untie these cobwebs thread by thread, which I can sweep away at once with this besom.

* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Grace, c. v.
* Ibid., cc. vii., viii.
* Ibid., cc. x., xi., xviii.—xx.
* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. ii.—iv.
§ 12. Only I will stand here so long, as to admire, whether the boldness or ignorance of these new dogmatists of new religions be the greater; when I see the baptism of John counted among the ceremonies of the old law\(^{h}\), for a foundation of this new doctrine of baptisms, never heard of by any Christian till this blessed reformation was on foot: which must be said, a fortiori, of that baptism by water, which our Lord Christ instituted, by them that esteem it not the same.

Is it possible, that any man, that believes Christianity to be the religion now in force to salvation by God’s appointment, in opposition to Judaism, should imagine, that John the Baptist (sent to declare our Lord to be the Christ, That was sent of God to introduce it, to the avoiding of Moses’ law) should set on foot that baptism, whereby he prepared his disciples for Christ or brought them to Christ, by virtue of that law which he intended to void? Is it not essential to all the observations of the old law, that they be thought to be figurative of Christ to come, at least supposing Christianity? Can that baptism figure Christ to come, the intent whereof supposed Him to be already come, pretending to prepare his disciples to receive Him that was come? But whether we say, the baptism of Christ was the same with John’s baptism, or another; to say, the apostles of Christ, when they baptize with water, intended to figure that the Messias was coming, from Whom they had their commission to baptize, would be no less than a spice of madness.

§ 13. I will also stay so long for Socinus\(^{1}\), as to answer

---

\(^{h}\) "In so much as he" (John the Baptist) "preached Christ in the Spirit, he belonged to that kingdom of Christ, which is spiritual, as also Abraham," &c.; "but so farre forth as he preached the Doctrine and administered the Baptism of repentance, and both these not really and spiritually, but only in the letter and signe, so farre he belonged to the Old Testament rather then to the New, and here was John in his proper office. I say, so farre as John preached Christ spiritually, he did not that as John the Baptist, but as John a Believer; and so the same John, in regard of his Baptist’s office, belonged to the Old Testament, but according to the Revelation which he had from the Father touching Christ and his faith in Him and confession of Him, he belonged to the New: and except we learne thus to distinguish of John’s doctrine, to wit, what he preached as Baptist and in his proper office, and what as a Believer, who had the revelation of the Father, we shall never understand his Baptisme aright; for John’s Baptisme was the scale of his Old Testament doctrine, and not of his New, or of his owne immediate Ministerie, and not of Christ’s." Doctr. of Bapt., p. 6.

---

\(^{1}\) "Secundum testimonium, idque meo judicio apertissimum, erunt verba illa Pauli 1 Cor. I. 17. Non enim misit me," &c. "Nam si praeceptum Christi esset, ut ipsius discipuli baptizarent, idque manus, ut quidem ne-
that suspicion which he draws from the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. i. 13—17, to his purpose;—"Is Christ divided; was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized into the name of Paul? I thank God that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius; that no man say, that I baptize in my own name: yet I baptized also the house of Stephanas: further, whether I baptized any, I know not: for Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." If there were any thing in these words to intimate, that the precept of baptizing is not of peremptory and perpetual necessity, then must they signify more, than that it was not necessary that it should be done by St. Paul’s own hands; which is all they contain. For he that would say, that which was not necessary to be done by St. Paul, was not necessary to be done; would deserve to be laughed at for his pains. The question is then, was any of them, whom St. Paul baptized not, left unbaptized, or not? If not; how is it inferred, that a man need not be baptized now, because then they were not baptized by St. Paul? If so; how comes Socinus to grant, that those, who were first converted to Christianity, were to be baptized1? And therefore, before Socinus or any man go about to teach a new religion, it was fit for him to learn from the custom and practice of the Church, that there is a difference between authority in ordering, and ministry in executing; and from the cesse esset, Apostolis mandasset, falsa omnino its loquutus esset Apostolus." Socin., De Bapt. Aquæ Disp., c. xvi.; Op., tom. i. p. 734. b. His purpose in this chapter is to collect intimations from Scripture, that "non fuisset omnibus, qui Christi discipuli esse velint, pereæque et in perpetuum aquæ baptismi essent, præceptum datum, et ob eam rem posse quempiam et nominari et revera esse Christianum, licet aquæ baptismum, vel nuncuam, vel non rite, cum tamen posset, acceptum." § 14. But to both these heresies, I say at once, in the last

1 See above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. i. § 7. note r.
place, that they belie the very ground [upon²] which they profess to be Christians. The reason why the motives of faith cannot be doubted for truth, is, because all that are Christians, have taken upon them their Christianity for a law, and entered into a communion and body of the Church, to live and communicate in the faith and service of God according to certain laws, upon evidence that they come indeed from God. Therefore, that which all this body hath taken upon it to observe for law from the beginning, and constantly observed till Socinus his or the Antinomians' time, that belonged to the matter of Christianity as evidently, as it is evident, that the motives of Christianity recorded in the Scriptures are true: which are therefore evidently true, because it is evident, that they have moved the world to receive Christianity; which could not have been done, had they been false. For if all Christians could be deceived to believe, that their Christianity requireth them to be baptized, if they will be saved; why might they not be deceived to believe, that those things were truly done, which the Scripture allegeth to evidence the Gospel to come from God, wheras indeed they were not? Which is to say, that whoso pretends to void that which the whole Church observeth for a law, must not think that he can do it by shewing that it is not commanded in the Scriptures; until he can shew, that it is come into the Church not according to right, having been from the beginning otherwise. He must therefore first refuse all that I have said in the first Book¹, to demonstrate, that the Church always was from the beginning one body, governed by certain laws, originally proceeding from the apostles: by whom power was left it to determine and limit further all that the future estate thereof should require to be further determined, for the maintaining of unity in the communion of the Church. For, granting this, it will be impossible to shew, how so great a body should agree to receive that for a law, and that necessary to salvation, as baptism hath always been esteemed; which they received not for such at the beginning from our Lord and His apostles.

² Added from MS. ¹ Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vi., vii., &c.
CHAPTER VII.

THE GROUND OF BAPTIZING INFANTS ORIGINAL SIN; THOUGH NOT INSTITUTED TILL CHRIST ROSE AGAIN. NO OTHER CURE FOR IT. INFANTS OF CHRISTIANS MAY BE DISCIPLES; ARE HOLY. THE EFFECT OF CIRCUMCISION UNDER THE LAW INFERRETH THE EFFECT OF BAPTISM UNDER THE GOSPEL.

And these same are the reasons that I must have recourse to, now that I come to conclude against the Anabaptists. Our Lord saith to Nicodemus, John iii. 3; "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And what this new birth is, He setteth forth in answering that impertinent question, which Nicodemus not understanding Him makes—how a man should come out of his mother's belly the second time:—"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

§ 2. Here I will grant the Anabaptists, that the sacrament of baptism is not instituted by these words, but by the act of our Lord after His resurrection, when He gives His apostles their commission: "Go, make disciples all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you" (Matt. xxviii. [19, 20]): but for reasons, which perhaps they will not thank me for, though they be not able to refute.

§ 3. As yet, when this discourse was held, it was not declared to all that took our Lord for a prophet, that He was the Son of God. Nicodemus himself, that comes to Him as a prophet, saying, "Master, we know Thou art a prophet come from God; for no man could do the works that Thou dost, unless God were with him;" if he go away instructed, that the same which obliges him to take our Lord Christ for a prophet, concludes Him to be the Christ the Son of God, he is beholden to the freedom of our Lord in declaring to him
the pretense of his coming by this discourse. But, for the
purpose of sending the Holy Ghost, it cannot be imagined,

that it was declared from the beginning of our Lord's preach-
ing; Who reveals not the intent of His death to His apostles, [Matt. xx.

till He grew towards the time of it: the privilege of sending
the Holy Ghost being part of that state, to which He was to
be exalted, rising from death. How then can it be imagined,
that our Lord should, from the beginning of His preaching,
appoint all to be baptized in the Name of the Father, Son,
and Holy Ghost, which is the sacrament of baptism that
makes us Christians?

§ 4. Certainly, it is not the same thing for John to baptize

"in the name of Him that should come," as for the apostles,
in the Name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: unless we
think, that all the people of God, who expected a Messias,
expected Him to be the Son of God; which Christians wor-
ship our Lord Christ for, and they crucified Him for pre-
tending to be. There is therefore no cause, why we should
offer that violence to the Scripture, Acts xix. 4, 5—"John
indeed baptized the baptism of repentance, saying to the
people, that they were to believe in Him that came after him,
that is, in Christ Jesus; and, hearing this, they were bap-
tized in the name of the Lord Jesus;"—which I shewed
youn is offered by those, that would have it to signify, that
those who were baptized by John Baptist, were baptized in
the Name of the Lord Jesus. For other answersn that are

n = Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Grace, c. ii. § 7. note r.

gives three interpretations of the pas-
sage. "Unum est, ut propter particu-
las μηδ & δε; verba illa διαβασσεσ δε
Pauli esse dicantur; Luciæ autem
verba incipiant versu sq. ubi particula
καὶ respondunt versu tertio et quarto:" and its defenders explain thus,—that
"primum generatim dici de toto Jo-
nannis ministerio, quod baptismaverit bap-
tismo pœnitentiae," &c.; "deinde vero
specialium addi, quo ordine et modo
baptismum administrat, nempe quod
prius sit hortatus ut crederent in Chris-
tum, deinde eos in Christi nomine bap-
tizaret; denique adjungi, postquam
Paulus et doctrinam Joannis ut evan-
gelicam, et baptismum ejus ut Chris-
tianum approbasset, baptizatis a Joanne
non quidem iterasse baptismum, sed
tandummodo imposuisse manus ut ac-
cipere Spiritum Sanctum. . . . Altera
ejus loci interpretatio est, ut sermo sit
ἀπαντάδωτος, nec δε sit relativa sed
transitiva particula: aliter si esset,
Lucam, inquinunt, non fuisse dicu-
tum, διαβασσεσ δε; sed si διαβασσε-
τες οἰκιου, vel potius, of δι θεομον
οἰκιου, hoc est, 'Qui audierunt il-
illum.' Movet etiam eos, quod cum dis-
cipuli illi dixissent se baptizatos fuisse
eis ιωάννου διηνισμα, Paulus docent
eos qualis fuerit Joannis doctrina. Unde
colligunt, ab aliquo Joannis discipulo,
cum baptismus ejus locum amplius non
haberet, aqua tintos esse; vel cum
rite possit usurparsi, male in Joannis
nomen, non Christi, fuisse baptizatos:
aique ideo, postquam de doctrina Jo-
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Devised to avoid so clear a Scripture, I count them not worth the refuting, so evidently they force the express sense of the words. And among them none more unreasonable, than that which saith, that these men were not indeed baptized with the baptism of John, though they thought they were; and that St. Paul, when he says, "John indeed baptized" with water, "saying to the people, that they should believe in Him That was to come, even in Christ Jesus," argues and persuades them, that they were not indeed baptized with the baptism of John, though they thought they were. For, of all things in the world, could men be deceived to think, that they professed that which the baptism of John must oblige them to profess, and did not? Nor can it be said with any appearance of truth, that John, baptizing "unto repentance" those, whom he sends for the means of salvation for the future to "Him That was to come," did baptize in the Name of the Lord Jesus; inasmuch as it is necessary to be said, that the apostles, when they baptized...
in the Name of the Lord Jesus (Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, x. 48), did sufficiently intimate the Name of the Father, Whose Son they preached our Lord to be, and also of the Holy Ghost, Whom our Lord had promised to those that are baptized: as Irenæus', so long since, hath exquisitely cleared the difficulty, how they observed their commission of baptizing in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; baptizing, as St. Luke reports, in the Name of the Lord Jesus. But of John the Baptist it is said, Joh. i. 29—34, that, the morrow after he baptized our Lord, he declared Him to be the "Man" That was to "come after" him, in Whose Name he had baptized; that he "knew Him not," but came to declare Him; and that by the coming down of the dove upon Him it was revealed to him, that he should know our Lord to be the Man that came to "baptize with the Holy Ghost." Whereby it appeareth, that he cannot be thought to have baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus, as that importeth as much as baptizing in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For though it is evident, that John knew our Lord when He came to be baptized, that he knew Him to be in the world from the time that he began to preach, and that He should baptize with the Holy Ghost; yet, not knowing the Man from the time that he began to baptize, how he could baptize in His Name, and as the Son of God That was to give the Holy Ghost, before our Lord Himself had preached and declared, upon what terms it was to come? I suppose it is easy enough to distinguish between baptizing in the Name of Christ, and baptizing with an intent of sending them whom he baptized to Christ, to be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Neither is this to say, that John's baptism availed not to remission of sins, for the time that it was on foot by God's appointment: whereas we acknowledge that dispensation of grace, which was intimated and conveyed by the Law, to have been the means to bring some to the righteousness of faith; how much more the twilight of the

---

5 "In Christi enim Nomine suban-
ditur Qui unxit, et Ipse Qui unctus
est, et Ipse Unctio in qua unctus est.
Et unxit quidem Pater, unctus est vero
Filius, in Spiritu Qui est unctio:
quemadmodum per Esaian ait sermo,
'Spiritus Dei super Me, propter quod
unxit Me;' significans et ungentem
Patrem, et unctum Filium, et un-
tionem, Qui est Spiritus." S. Iren.,
Book III

Gospel under John the Baptist? But that, before the covenant of grace was published by the preaching of our Lord, and enacted on God’s part by His death upon the cross (or rather by raising Him from death), it was not time to determine that act, by which God intended that profession, which He requires for the condition of it, should be solemnized and celebrated.

§ 5. Therefore there came water and blood out of our Lord’s side upon the cross, to intimate the ground upon which this sacrament should be in force for the future.

§ 6. And if this be the condition, upon which the Holy Ghost, Which Christ promiseth upon His ascension, is granted, as I have shewed, then can it not be thought to have been in force from any other date, than that of the promise.

§ 7. This is the reason, why I am to expect no thanks from the Anabaptists, for granting that the sacrament of baptism was not in force when these words were said. For the regeneration here required in them, that shall come to the kingdom of heaven, being expressed here to be that which the Holy Ghost worketh; and the sending of the Holy Ghost depending upon the profession of Christianity solemnly made by baptism, from the time that Christianity came in force: whatsoever Nicodemus understood by being "born again of water and the Holy Ghost," after the institution they cannot be understood to take effect without it. There were then divers customs of baptizing in force among the Jews by virtue of the Law. There was a custom to admit proselytes into the synagogue, by circumcision, by a sacrifice, and by baptism. And they that look upon this

---

* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. ii. § 7; &c.
* See Wall, Hist. of Inf. Baptism, Introd.; and the various authorities quoted by him, p. 4; of whom Selden (De Jure Nat. et Gent. ap. Hebr., lib. ii. c. 2; Op., tom. i. pp. 172. sq.; and De Synedriis Vet. Hebr., lib. i. c. 3; ibid., pp. 776. sq.; and De Successionibus ad Leges Hebr., c. xxvi. ibid.; tom. ii. pp. 68. sq.) is the one to whom Thorndike usually refers on such subjects as those here noticed.
* Corrected from MS.; "synagogues," in orig. text.
* So Maimonides, אַלְפָּיוֹר, or Issuri Bia, i. e. De Prohibito Congressu, c. xiii. § 4.—cc. xiii. and xiv. of this tract were translated by Prideaux into Latin, and published under the title of Tractatus de Proselytis, in fin. tract. R. Mos. Maimon. De Jure Pauperis et Peregrini, 4to. Oxon. 1679. The passage (which is quoted by Wall, p. 11, and by Selden, De Synedr., &c., lib. i. c. 3. Op., tom. i. pp. 787, 788.) runs thus in Prideaux, pp. 113, 114—"Et sic in perpetuum, quoquecumque aliquis Gentilis voleatur in fœdus intrare," &c., "opus est ex circumciscione, baptismo, et conciliazione 'per spasione sanguinis' sacrificiis: sed si semina
custom with judgment, cannot doubt, that our Saviour, intending to prescribe a course for the bringing of true proselytes, which are Christians, into the true Israel of God, which is the Church, made choice of the ceremony of baptism, because of the correspondence between the Law and the Gospel. In fine, John had taken it up for the fittest expression of that repentance and conversion from those evil ways, which he charged those that bore themselves high upon the privilege of God's people with, which those whom he baptized were to profess. This was enough to make Nicodemus understand by these words the declaration of a purpose to institute some such ceremony, as those which he knew to be in use. But when He addeth the Holy Ghost, as a promise annexed to it, He sends us [to His'] Gospel, to learn further what this promise requires.

§ 8. And, therefore, I must resume here that which I observed afore, that our Lord, intending to institute the sacrament of the eucharist for the eating of His Body and Blood mystically as in a sacrament, prepared His disciples for it by discoursing to them of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood, by considering His doctrine, and turning it to the nourishment of their souls, by taking up His cross and professing Christianity: Joh. vi. For one egg is not liker another, than the course He takes here, to intimate what He intended to ordain for the qualifying of His disciples to be capable of the Holy Ghost (whereby He declar eth a promise), is to His proceeding in bringing in the other sacrament.

§ 9. If then our Anabaptists can shew us a new Gospel, to assure us of the gift of the Holy Ghost without baptism, then may they take upon them to assure us of the kingdom of heaven without it. But if the kingdom of heaven depend upon the new birth of the Holy Ghost, and there be no possible means to assure any man of this new birth without the sacrament of baptism; either infants must be baptized before they go out of the world, or go out of the world without that assurance.

sit, opus ei tantum baptismo et sacrificio."

John's Gospel," in orig. text.

1 Corrected from MS.; "sends us
§ 10. Here, I profess, it is all one to me as to this dispute, whether those whom I dispute with, believe original sin or not. For if they believe it not, I remit them to that which I have said in the second Book to maintain it. If they believe it, I remit them to all that I have said there, to shew that it is not cured by predestination alone, but by that condition which the covenant of grace requireth. To this condition he that is predestinate, is cured of it by his predestination, which appointeth him the cure: but, not being predestinate to the cure, cannot be presumed to be predestinate to the kingdom, which supposeth the cure.

§ 11. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;” saith our Lord. How shall that which is born flesh, be born again spirit? Did our Lord promise it any man, that should not first profess Christianity and be baptized? He that stands upon that, let him dispute with that which I have said in the second Book. Let him shew me, how the Gospel, how Christianity can stand, if the promises of it be assigned to God’s grace and purpose immediately, without supposing any condition qualifying for the same. It is plain what will be said: infants are not capable of making this profession, of knowing what it means, of judging that it ought to be made; therefore not capable of baptism, or the promises depending upon it, if, in that consideration, they depend upon it. And, truly, set aside that consideration, and I do not marvel, that man cannot believe God should make the spiritual and everlasting promises of His Gospel to depend upon a little water, and so many words as it is used with. Besides that St. Peter, finding it inconvenient to attribute such effects to laying down “the filth of the flesh,” establisheth instead of it “the profession of a good conscience to God,” as that to which he would have them ascribed.

§ 12. They then, that believe, that God provided and procured the fall of Adam; or, foreseeing the means by which it would come to pass, permitted it on purpose, that, all his posterity being liable to original sin, He might choose whom
He would save, and whom He would damn for it, without respect of any compliance with those terms of salvation which He should hold forth; do not stand to their own opinion, if they refer not the salvation of infants to the mere appointment of God, without respect of any thing that the Church may do in it. But they, that will not part with their Christianity for so gross a presumption as that is, will take heed how they become murderers, of [their] children's souls first, denying them that help to God's kingdom which is in their power to give, and [then] of their own, by breaking the unity of the Church rather than do that which the Church always did do.

§ 18. Indeed, if there were any thing in the precept of baptism to signify, that it is not to be given them who do not actually make profession of Christianity, reason would that it should be obeyed; referring ourselves to God for the issue of those inconveniences, which His commands breed, though never so visible. But what saith the apostles' commission? "Go, make disciples all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you." For I do except against the translation of it, Go teach all nations; being in the Greek, "μαθητεύσατε," and in the Syriac, ΤΑΛΜΕΔ, which can signify nothing but "make disciples." Now those that "were first called Christians at Antioch" (Acts xi. 26), were called "disciples" afore; and afterwards also, almost throughout the Scripture, which useth the name of Christians but seldom. And is there not reason to take them for disciples, who, being engaged to Christianity by being baptized infants, stand obliged to inform themselves in it, when they come to age? Indeed, all that hath been said of the covenant of grace and the terms of it witnesseth, that they are first to be proposed to them that understand, then choice is to be made, baptism following to solemnize the profession of that choice: but this text is so far from signifying, that infants should not be baptized till

---

* Corrected from MS.; "the," in orig. text.
* See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. ii. § 8.
* Corrected from MS.; "that," in orig. text.
* Scil. thrice: Acts xi. 26, xxvi. 28; 1 Pet. iv. 16.
all this is done, that it rather serves to intimate an exception to the generality of the proposition in behalf of them: seeing those who shall be taught the obligation they have to be Christians, whether they will or not, are very regularly and legally called "disciples," and therefore comprehended in the precept of "making disciples."

§ 14. This intimation appears clearer in the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 14: where he persuadeth Christians, that were married to infidels, not to forsake them, in these words; "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now they are holy." For the meaning whereof I will have recourse to the Book of Wisdom, iii. 11—16: where, describing the miseries of the idolatrous heathen under the title of those that "neglect wisdom," among other things, he saith; "Their ways are foolish, their hearts wicked, and their generation accursed"; for," saith he, "blessed is the barren that is clean, and hath not known the bed of sin." And again: "The fruits of good labours" (that is, of those that labour in the Law) "are glorious, and the root of wisdom never fadeth; but the sons of adulterers shall decay, and the generation that is born of evil bed shall be destroyed." For the excesses of the Gentiles, that knew not God, in the lusts of carnal uncleanness, were so great, that it always was to be presumed, that children so bred could have no means of instruction to preserve them from the same. And the difference between the people of God and idolatrous nations was visible, even in this point, from the first separation of them upon that account. As appeareth by the zeal of Simeon and Levi for their sister so dishonoured. "Should they deal with our sister as an harlot?" say they, Gen. xxxiv. 31. Which zeal Judith (ix. 4.) understandeth to have proceeded upon this reason, that they, being abandoned to the service of strange gods, had done that uncleanness which God had forbidden, and which His servants abhorred, as "the pollution of their blood." For there is no man that knows what belonged to heathenism, that can doubt, that all

1 This is misquoted, in part seemingly by a misprint. The original runs thus—"Whose despiseth wisdom and nurture, he is miserable, and their hope is vain, their labours unfruitful, and their works unprofitable; their wives are foolish, and their children wicked." Wisd. iii. 11, 12.
uncleanness of this nature was always reckoned among them for a thing indifferent, and no account had of it but in civil regards, as it dis Naomi the house or tainted the issue. But the people of God, being bred to the knowledge of the true God and the abomination in which He hath it, stood upon it chiefly in that regard, because, should they do as idolaters, they could not be taken for God's people. Wherefore, when St. Paul adviseth them that were married to infidels, not to part from them, "in case they were content to continue with them"—"εἰ συνενδόκει ὁικεῖν μετ' αὐτῶν," this content is to be understood to be such, as might stand with Christianity; that is, that the Christian party should have interest to teach the issue Christianity, and to guide them according to the law. For by this interest they are, in St. Paul's esteem, legally holy as to the Church; because of a legal presumption of their Christianity by the means of their education under that parent that was Christian, and, by the consent of that party which was not Christian, had all freedom to propose unto their posterity the obligation of Christianity. If this be the case of those that are born of one side Christian, what shall we say of them that are born of Christian parents? For, being sure (as human things can be sure) that they shall come to the knowledge of Christ and then be under the obligation of Christianity, they are already, as to God, and to all Christians (not to them that do not believe Christianity), under the obligation of living and of behaving themselves as Christians.

§ 15. But we are not therefore to imagine, that the guilt of original sin ceaseth in them; any more than in those that are not Christians: or that this guilt can be taken away otherwise than by Christianity. And hath an infant any

\[1 \text{Cor. vii. 12.}\]
thing but baptism to entitle it to Christianity? And shall they not cry out to God upon those parents, that suffer them to go out of this world not Christians?

§ 16. Surely, if we look upon the provision of the Law with a single eye (that is, always observing the difference formerly settled between the Law and the Gospel), we shall have great cause to conclude. The Law, that is, the covenant made with Abraham, having entitled his posterity to the land of promise, provideth, that every male child of his, that shall not be circumcised the eighth day, shall be cut off from his people (Gen. xvii. 14): that is to say, the life thereof shall be forfeit in God’s hands, not to give him any share in the right of that people, who by being circumcised became God’s people. So you have here the condition of circumcision, requisite to entitle even those that are born of Abraham, to the promise made to him and his seed. The consequence hereof is that, which the correspondence between the Law and the Gospel, between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, infers. If, by entering into the covenant made with Abraham and with his seed, they become heirs of the land of promise; then, by entering into the covenant made with Christ and Abraham’s (that is, Christ’s) spiritual seed, we become heirs of the world to come. If by circumcision they entered into the covenant made with Abraham and with his seed, then by baptism we enter into the covenant made with Christ and with Abraham’s spiritual seed. If by the neglect of circumcision the temporal life of Abraham’s seed were forfeit by the term of this covenant in God’s hands, then by the neglect of baptism is the spiritual life of those that are born of Christ’s spiritual seed, forfeit in God’s hands. For if the land of promise and the inheritance thereof, estated upon Abraham and his seed according to the
flesh, required nevertheless the execution of that condition, by which they were admitted into the covenant; how much more shall the inheritance of the world to come, promised to the children of Christians, as the parties agree, require the execution of that condition, by which the covenant of grace is enacted? Indeed, if the covenant of grace were enacted between God and man by the publishing of the Gospel, as most men seem to imagine, there were some colour for such a consequence. But if the covenant of Abraham was to be enacted upon the flesh of them that were circumcised, even after that the whole people of Israel had entered into covenant for themselves and their posterity; and that, till this were done, no child was entitled to the benefit of it: how can it be imagined, that the covenant of grace, which is (as all covenants necessarily are) the act of two parties, should be enacted by the act of God alone in publishing the Gospel? Indeed by that declaration, God, of His infinite goodness, hath obliged Himself before to stand to all the promises of the Gospel with any man; that shall profess and stand to His Christianity. But till this profession be made as God’s law hath appointed, that is, by baptism; the covenant is not enacted. And, therefore, I allow that which St. Paul saith, Rom. iv. 11; that “Abraham received the sign of circumcision for a seal of [the] righteousness of that faith which he had being uncircumcised:” but I do not allow, that his circumcision was a bare sign of that right, which he and his posterity had to the promise without it and before it, speaking of the time after it was once enacted for a law of that covenant (for afore indeed that it was so required, his faith

* The following may serve to indicate the Calvinistic argument on this point.—“Quemadmodum nec Dominus, quem Abrahamum Sibi cooptat, a circumciscione subit exordium, interim quid illo signo Sibi velit dissimulans: verum quod ferire cum ipso foedus instituat, primum denunciat; tum deinde post fidem promissiohabitam, sacramenti facit participem. Cur in Abrahamo fidei sacramentum sequitur, in Issaco filio intelligentiam omnem precedit? Quoniam eum qui adulta demum etate in foederis societatatem recipitur a quo fuerat hac tenus aliquen, ejus conditionis antea

* Corrected from MS.; “his,” in orig. text.

* Added from MS.
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entitled him to the same promise without it). For if the law require, that writings be drawn and sealed, though these writings of themselves are mere evidences, and signs to record the consent of the parties, by which every contract subsists; yet, inasmuch as the law requires them, the consent of parties avails not to bring the contract to effect without them: even so, if the law of God appoint the first covenant to be signed by circumcision, the second by baptism; though it may be said to be in force, conditionally, towards them that have not yet signed it upon themselves, yet are they not absolutely within it till that be done. If the Roman emperors' law require, that their soldiers, when they were listed and imprest, should also be marked with the mark of a hot iron, recording upon their flesh that from thenceforth they were soldiers; it is reasonable to think, that thenceforth, and not afore, they were entitled to the privileges of soldiers, and liable to the penalties of leaving their colours. This is that character of baptism, which St. Augustin hath so much of; and St. Chrysostom compares circumcision to the same: which, therefore, not only signifies, but brings with it, the burdens and privileges of Abraham's seed, or Christ's offspring. If therefore circumcision, bringing with it the obligation of living according to the faith which "Abraham had being uncircumcised," and when the Law was afterwards given, of living according to the Law, do also bring with it a title to the promise made to Abraham and his seed; is it strange, that baptism, visibly and necessarily bringing with it the obligation of Christianity upon them, who are dedicated to God by the Church in giving that sacrament, should be entitled thereby to the regeneration of God's Spirit, the earnest of our future inheritance? In the children of the Israelites, as there was nothing to entitle them to the promise made to Abraham's seed, setting aside circumcision and the covenant that required it; so was there nothing to

---

p So in orig. text.
q Veget., De Re Milit., lib. i. c. 8: et Impp. Arcad. et Honor., lib. xi. Cod. tit. 9. leg. 3; et Imp. Zeno, ibid., tit. 42. leg. 10.
r See above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iv. § 11. note k.
1 So in orig. text. We should read apparently, "should entitle us," or, "we should be entitled thereby;"
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hinder them, or render them incapable of a temporal pro-
mise. In the children of Christians, either we believe
original sin to be no bar to God's kingdom, and fall into the
heresy of Pelagius: or that the new covenant, which is an
act of two parties, is enacted by the appointment of one, in
regard of the elect, who never knew of it; but signifies
nothing in regard of those that are not elect, though never
so much convict of it, and yet have force to damn them,
whom only God's appointment could make it concern. But
if these extremes be equally destructive to Christianity, it
beoveth us to embrace that, which the correspondence be-
tween the old and new covenant necessarily infereth, upon
that proportion; which must be the same between circum-
cision and baptism, and the promises to which they entitle
us. Neither is this argument to be avoided, but by avoiding
the ground of all mystical sense in the Scripture; which is,
indeed, the avoiding of all Christianity, by acknowledging,
that there is no ground for it in the Scriptures of the
Old Testament, which all acknowledge. For if the children
of Christians are no less entitled to the promises of the New
Testament, than the children of Abraham under the Law
were to the land of promise: granting original sin to be a
bar to the effect of them, neither is it removed but by
bringing them under the covenant of grace, nor are they
brought under it but by the act of the Church baptizing
them, and so obliging them to it.

§ 17. And here comes in the saying of St. Peter, exhorting
them that were pricked in heart with the remorse of our
Lord's death, Acts ii. 38, 39:—"Repent and be baptized,
every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, unto re-
mission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy
Ghost; for to you is the promise made, and to your chil-
dren, and to all that are far off, whom the Lord our God
shall call to you." Indeed it seemeth, that, when the[Apostle saith the promise is made to their children, he
meant to prevent a mistake;—that the promise which he
speaks of, concerns not only the present generation, but all
succeeding ages of God's people:—for when he addeth "all"

* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii. § 26, sq.: and Bk. II. Of the Cov.
of Gr., cc. v. § 10, xvi. § 2, &c.

THORNDIKE.
those "whom God shall call to you;" it seemeth, that he intends not for the present to determine, whether those that were to be called to the same promises, were to be ingrafted into the commonwealth of Israel by circumcision, or not. But all this being admitted; seeing no age can succeed whereof infants are not one part, and seeing that the apostle declares the promises of the Gospel by Christ to belong to them, no otherwise than they understood the promises of the Law to do; of necessity it must follow, that upon correspondent terms they obtain interest in correspondent promises: which correspondence wherein it consists, hath been oft enough said.

§ 18. And this argument is much enforced by the act of our Saviour, commanding little children of the state of infants to be brought to Him, reproving them that would not have Him troubled with them, laying hands on them, and blessing them; Matt. xix. 15; Mark x. 15, 16; Luke xviii. 16, 17. For by this means it is effectually declared past all contradiction, that the blessing which Christ came to give belonged to infants. For though this were all done upon another occasion (to wit, that our Lord had made them the pattern of that humility, which He preacheth to Christians); yet the very doing of it is evidence enough, that He meant not to leave that estate unprovided of His blessing. What His blessing is, the apostle expresseth, Acts iii. 26: "To you first, God, having raised up His Son Jesus, hath sent Him to bless you by turning every man from his sins." If, therefore, that which barreth infants of this blessing, be nothing but original sin; and that neither God's appointment alone, nor the publishing of His Gospel, nor the faith of their predecessors, can make any appearance of freeing them from it: what madness will it be, not to expect it from, not to impute it to, that condition, which succeedeth the condition, by which the children of God's ancient people stood entitled to the land of promise?
CHAPTER VIII.

WHAT IS ALLEGED TO IMPEACH TRADITION FOR BAPTIZING INFANTS, PROVES NOT THAT ANY COULD BE SAVED REGULARLY WHO DIED UNBAPTIZED; BUT THAT BAPTIZING AT YEARS WAS A STRONG MEANS TO MAKE GOOD CHRISTIANS. WHY THE CHURCH NOW BAPTIZES INFANTS. WHAT BECOMES OF INFANTS DYING UNBAPTIZED, UNANSWERABLE. WHAT THOSE INFANTS GET WHO DIE BAPTIZED.

And thus from the Scriptures alone I have proved, that infants are capable of baptism, and that the Church is bound to provide them of it; unless we will say, that the Church is not bound to provide them of that means of salvation, which the Church alone dispenseth. And upon these terms I conceive I may safely acknowledge, that there is no precept for baptizing of the infants of Christians written in the Scripture; presuming, that it is written in the Scripture, that infants are to be provided of the necessary means of salvation by the Church. For though it be not necessary, that all infants be baptized, because they are infants; yet will it be necessary, that they be baptized before they go out of the world: and, therefore, while they are infants, rather than they should go out of the world unbaptized.

§ 2. But the practice of the whole Church, and that from the beginning, challenges the effect of St. Augustin's rule;—that what is received of the whole Church, and not by any express act of the Church from which the beginning of it may be demonstrable, must of necessity be imputed to the tradition of the apostles. For, the judgments of men being so diverse as they are, how can it be imagined, that so great a body, and so far dispersed, as the Church, should agree to impose such a burden upon themselves, had they not understood the obligation of it by the means of them from whom they received their Christianity?


§ 3. The testimonies of Tertullian (De Bapt. cap. xviii. 4), of St. Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. x1. in Sanctum Baptisma 5), and of Walafridus Strabus (De Reb. Eccles. cap. xxvi. b), that dehort from baptizing infants, or declare that the Church in the first ages did not baptize during infancy, are so far from making any exception to this evidence, that they contain sufficient evidence for the same truth; if we be so considerate as to understand this tradition, not to require, that all be baptized during infancy, but that no infant go out of the world unbaptized. For he that will employ a little common sense may see, that there may be reasons to make men think it better, that baptism be ministered to those that can understand what it imports and what they undertake; provided that they go not out of the world unbaptized, but that there be an effectual course taken for the baptizing of them in danger of death. For that it is not my sense, but the sense of the Church, that makes the baptism of infants necessary, not because infants, but lest they die unbaptized; I appeal to St. Augustin, Enchirid. cap. xliii. c:—

"A parvulo enim recens nato usque ad decrepitum senem, sicut nullus prohibendus est a baptismo, ita nullus est qui non pecato moriatur in baptismo; sed parvuli tantum originali," &c.

"For from the little one new born to the decrepit old man, as none is to be hindered of baptism, so is there none that does not die to sin in baptism; but little ones only to original," &c. He saith not, that from young to old are to be baptized; but none is to be refused baptism, supposing the necessity of his case and the rule of the Church.

---


b See the passages from St. Gregory below, § 7. text to notes q, r, and § 22. text to note d. See also Wall, Pt. i. c. 11. vol. i. pp. 169, sq.

c See below, § 9. note x.

d Op., tom. vi. p. 213. C.
to require it. The same is to be said of the canon of Neo-Cæsarea\(^d\); that allows the baptism of a woman with child, because it extends not to the baptizing of the infant in her womb, before confession of faith: and of the custom of the Greeks to this day, testified by Balsamon\(^e\) and Zonaras\(^e\) upon that canon. For what need more words? I acknowledge, that Vives upon St. Augustin (De Civit. Dei, lib. i. c. 27\(f\)) gives very great reasons, why it were better, that the baptism of infants were deferred till they come to the discretion of understanding\(^g\) to what they engage themselves. But shall I therefore believe, that Vives was an Anabaptist? that he did not believe original sin? that he acknowledged any cure for it without baptism? that he thought it not necessary to salvation, that all should be baptized before death? A ridiculous thing once to imagine. Thus much for certain: so sure and evident as it is, that, when he write this, the custom of the Church was to baptize infants; so certain it is, that, when all that I have alleged was written and done that men should not be baptized in infancy, there was a constant custom and practice in force in the Church, whereby care was taken, that no infant should die unbaptized. And though they express reasons, for which they had rather Christians should be baptized at years; yet never any Christian ex-


\(^e\) Balsamon (in can. vi. Conc. Neo-Cæsar., ap. Bevereg., Pandect. Canon., tom. i. p. 407. A), after saying that the infant, as well as the mother, must be baptized, when born, adds, "τὰ δὲ νήπια διὰ τῶν διαθήκων αὐτὰ κατατίθενται, καὶ πραγματικῶς φωτὶζομενα θεῖας καταρχῶνται ἐλλάνηψις."—Zonaras (ibid.) simply says, that, "ἐν τῇ ἐμβρυών ὁστὲται προϊστρευσις, οὐδὲ βαπτὶζεσθαι δοκεῖ." (sc. in the womb of the baptized mother), "ὅτεν αὐτὸ χρῆσθαι αὐτὸς βαπτίσματος, ὅτε προαιρέως δυνηται."—See Wall's comment on this canon, and on the two scholiasts here quoted, and his answer to Grotius's and Jeremy Taylor's argument drawn from them, Pt. i. c. 8; vol. i. pp. 150, sq.


\(^g\) Altered in MS. into "intending."
pressed any opinion, or any reason, why infants should not be baptized, rather than die unbaptized. Never was there any opinion heard of, and allowed in the Church, that God's predestination alone, without baptism, or any thing else beside it, can be taken for a cure of original sin.

[IRENAEUS.] § 4. Irenæus is one of the next to the Apostles that we have. He, when he saith (ii. 39\(^h\)), "Christus venit per Septuagintam omnes salutem, omnes, inquam, qui per Eum renascentur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et parvos et juvenes et seniores"—"Christ came to save by Himself all, who by Him are born anew unto God, infants and little ones and children and young men and old ones;"—if any man think fit to question, whether, in his language, "[renasci] in Deum" can be understood without baptism, when he speaks of infants, must suppose, that one that is not an infant, may be regenerated without it. Such a one must know, that, though he dare understand that which St. Paul never said, when he calls baptism "the laver of regeneration" (Titus iii. 5), yet Irenæus, with the whole Church of God, never understood any regeneration without it. Thus much for certain, as to these words of Irenæus; if he understand the regeneration of men to be by baptism, he cannot understand the regeneration of infants to come otherwise.

[ST. CYPRIAN.] § 5. St. Cyprian\(^k\), whatsoever his reasons be when he contendeth for the baptizing of all infants, as he evidences the practice of the Church, so he maintains the same grounds, upon which I have shewed that it did proceed.

[TERTULLIAN.] § 6. Tertullian (De Anima, cap. xxxix.\(^1\)), St. Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. xliii.\(^m\)), abundantly prove mine intent. The words of Tertullian:—"Hinc enim et apostolus ex sanctificatio alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait, tam ex seminis


\(^k\) "In hoc enim, quod tu putabas esse faciendum" (sc. the delaying baptism of a child until the eighth day from its birth), "nemo consensit: sed universi potius judicavimus nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandum." S. Cyprian, et Ceteri Collegae qui in concilio affuerunt, numero lxvi. Fido fratri; ap. Epist. S. Cypr., Ep. lxiv. p. 160: and see the epistle at length; and Wall, Pt. i. c. 6. vol. i. pp. 126, sq.

\(^1\) Op., p. 294. B.

\(^m\) See below, § 7, text to notes q, r: and § 22, text to note d.—xliii. is a mistake for xl.
prærogativa, quam ex institutionis disciplina; cæterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur; quasi designatos tamen sanctitati, ac per hoc etiam saluti, intelligi volens fidelium filios; ut hujus spei pignore matrimoniis, qua retinenda censuerat, patrocina-retur: aliquin meminerat Dominice definitionis, ‘Nisi quis nascetur ex aqua et spiritu, non ibit in regnum Dei,’ id est, non erit sanctus: ita omnis anima eo usque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur’—‘For hereupon the apostle also saith, that men are born holy of either sex sanctified, as by prerogative of seed, so by breeding and discipline; otherwise, saith he, they should be born unclean: giving to understand, that the children of Christians are, as it were, designed to holiness, and thereby to salvation, that he might patronize those marriages, which he thought fit to be maintained, by the pledge of this hope: otherwise, he remembered the determination of our Lord, ‘Unless a man be born of water and the Spirit, he shall not go into God’s kingdom,’ that is, he shall not be holy: so, every soul is so long listed in Adam, till it be listed again in Christ” which, you see, is not done but by baptism, according to Tertullian. Therefore, in the end of the next chapter—Proinde, cum ad fidem pervenit, reformata per secundam nativitatem ex aqua et suprema virtute, detracto corruptionis pristinae auleo, totam lucem suam conspicit’—‘Therefore, when it comes to the faith, being reformed by a second birth of water and the power above, and the curtain of former corruptions drawn, she sees her whole light.’ And De Bapt., cap. xvii. p, shewing in what case a layman might baptize:—‘Sufficit scilicet in necessitatis utaris, sicubi aut loci aut temporis aut persone conditio compellit; tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia periclitantis’—‘Let it suffice thee to use it’ (the right of baptizing) “in cases of necessity, if at any time the condition of place or time or person constrain; for then is the resolution of him that helpeth accepted, when the case of him that runneth hazard presseth.” There is no such thing as any case of such necessity in the opinion of our Anabaptists; therefore it is not Tertullian’s. He shews, that the Church alloweth a lay-

* As above in note 1.
* Next but one; sc. c. xli.: Op., p. 
* Ibid., p. 231. A.
man to baptize, because it believed, that the children of Christians could not enter into the kingdom of God otherwise. § 7. The words of Gregory Nazianzen: "Εστι ταύτα, φησι, περὶ τῶν ἐπιζητοῦντων τὸ βάπτισμα: τί δ' ἄντε περὶ τῶν ἔτι υπηνόων, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαισθανομένων, μήτε τῆς χάριτος ἢ καὶ ταύτα βαπτίσομεν; πάνυν, εἴσπερ τις ἐπείγοι κινδύνους' κρείσσον γὰρ ἀναισθήτους ἀγιασθῆναι ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα καὶ τούτῳ λόγος ἡμῖν ἢ ὁκαθήμερος περιτομή, [τυπικὴ τις οὔσα σφραγίς,] καὶ ἀλογίστως ἢδη προσαγομένη τὸς ἰππό καὶ ἢ καὶ τῶν φλιῶν χρίσει, διὰ τῶν ἀναισθήτων φυλάττουσα τὰ πρωτότοκα' περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι γνώμην, τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμείναντα, ἢ μικρόν ἐντός τούτου, ἢ ὑπὲρ τούτοι ἡμῖν καὶ ἀκούσαι τί μυστικὸν καὶ ἀποκρίνασθαι δυνάτον, εἰ καὶ μὴ συνεῖναι τελεῖως, ἀλλ' οὖν τυπούμενα, οὕτως ἀγάλξειν τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τῆς τελειώτευσος'—"Be all this, saith he" (that delays baptism), "in those that demand baptism: but what would you say of infants, that are neither sensible of the loss nor of the grace? shall we baptize also these? by all means, if any danger should press; for it is better they should be sanctified insensible, than depart unsealed and not perfisit: and of this, circumcision, that is applied on the eighth day to those who cannot reason, is a reason to us; the daubing of the door-post also, preserving the first-born by things unsensible: for the rest, I give mine opinion, staying three years, or something over or under that (at which age they may hear and answer something of religion, though not perfisit but grossly understanding it), then to sanctify their souls and bodies with the great sacrament that perfecteth us." By and by: "τετειχίσατε τε τῷ λουτρῷ, παντὶ λόγῳ λυσιτελεστερον, διὰ τὰς ἔξαλφης συμπιπτούσας ἡμῶν προσβολὰς τῶν κινδύνων, καὶ βοηθείας ἵσχυροτέρας"—"And it is in all reason of more advantage to be fortified by the laver, for the sudden accidents of danger that encounter us, [and more valid and powerful relief*]." He proceeds dis-

---

* Id., ibid., p. 714. B.—The translation of the last words in the Bened. edition, is, "propter inopinatos et repentinos periculorum impetus, quique nulla ope alque auxilio propulsari queat."  
* Corrected from MS.; "not being capable of help," in orig. text.
puting against those, that would not be baptized afore thirty, because of our Lord's example. All this is so plain, that I will add nothing to point out the effect and consequence of his words.

§ 8. Nor doth the sixth canon of Neo-Cæsarea signify any more than this: providing, that women be baptized while they are with child; and that it be not thought, that the baptism of the mother concerns the child, "διὰ τὸ ὅιναν ἐκθεντο τὴν προασφαλισθήτων τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι": because every one's proper purpose upon profession is declared.

§ 9. Nor Walafridus Strabo (De Rebus Ecclesiasticis, cap. xxvi.*); saying plainly, that "in the primitive times the grace of baptism was wont to be granted only to them that were sound in body and mind, to understand what they expected and what they undertook by being baptized." For though the solemn profession of baptism be a powerful means to make it effectual; yet what is that to the necessity of baptizing before death? And that the custom here testified was not general; the infant that received the eucharist in St. Cyprian (De Lapsis†), besides the opinion of Nazianzen*, which you had even now, will witness.

§ 10. Neither do the examples of St. Chrysostom (who, being bred under Meletius, bishop of Antiochia, was not

† S. Cyprian (De Lapsis, Op., p. 132.) speaks of an infant, who had been "carried by her nurse, unknown to her parents, to the magistrates, to partake of the idol-sacrifice: who, when she was brought by her mother afterwards to receive the eucharist," "sequitur singularis et ipse in corpore atque ore violato eucharistia permanseram non potuit; sanctificatus in Domino sanguine potus de pollutis visceribus erupit."—See Bingham, XV. iv. 7.

* § 7.
baptized till one and twenty), or of the same Nazianzen (who, having a bishop to his father; was not baptized till he came to man's age) *, prove any more than the then custom of the Church allows;—that it was by particular men thought fit to be deferred, supposing that in case of necessity it were secured.

§ 11. But a great many witnesses speak not so much, as the law, the rule, the custom, of giving baptism by any man that was a Christian, in that case of necessity b. For, out of that case of necessity, the office of baptizing belonged to the very highest in the Church; to wit, so as might stand with the more weighty employments of their office. For, otherwise, a little common sense would serve to inform them, that those offices, which required more of their personal knowledge, skill, wisdom, and goodness, were to be preferred before the office of baptizing; which, though it concerns salvation, yet requires no such qualities. Can any man then imagine any reason, why all Christians are licensed, or rather commanded, to baptize in that case; but the necessity of the office, and that no infant should go out of the world unbaptized?

§ 12. And this chokes all the exception, that is made from the custom of giving infants the eucharist in the ancient Church c. For as I have shewed before d, that it was not held necessary to salvation, as baptism was: so here I must allege, that it cannot be said, that the eucharist was celebrated, and that all Christians might celebrate the eucharist, in this case of necessity; to the intent that infants might

---

* See, for these instances, Wall, Pt. ii. c. 3. § 6, and 8; vol. ii. pp. 87, sq., 91, sq.

b The authorities proving the invariable recognition of lay-baptism, as both valid and lawful, in case of absolute necessity, may be found in Bingham, Lay-Baptism, c. i. § 8—15.—And see above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xix. § 12. note c.

c "'From this custom of the ancients giving the eucharist to infants, the Antipædobaptists do draw an argument (and it is the most considerable that they have for that purpose), that there is no great stress to be laid on the practice of antiquity in baptizing infants."—Wall, Pt. ii. c. 9. § 17; vol. ii. pp. 490, 491: proceeding to answer the objection.—And see Tombes, Anti-


d Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xxi. § 36—44.—See Waterland, Doctrine of Eucharist, c. vi. and Advertisement prefixed; Works, vol. vii. p. 136. note k, and in begin. of the volume.—And Thorndike himself also, in his treatise De Ratione et Jure Finiendi Controversias, c. xv. pp. 284, sq.—And Wall, Pt. ii. c. 9. § 15, 16: vol. ii. pp. 478—490.
not go out of the world, either unbaptized, or without the eucharist.

§ 13. As for Origen (upon the Romans†), and St. Augustin (De Gen. x. 43†), who affirmed the baptism of infants to come from the tradition of the apostles: suppose we for the present, that it is not Origen that speaks them, but Ruffinus that translates him; and that this is said four hundred years after the birth of Christ, three hundred and more after the death of the apostles: was it not visible to them, what came from the apostles, what from the determination or practice of the Church? For that it should come from abuse, he that would tell me, must first persuade me, that antichrist was in being, and ruled the whole Church, and might as easily make his corruptions general as Christ Christianity.

§ 14. But if it were merely their saying, to make it a tradition of the apostles; what shall we say of Pelagius? For they must pardon me, who think, that the hatred of his heresy brought the baptism of infants into force. More general it might deservedly make it. For by the condemning of his heresy the danger of infants going out of the world was contested. But it was the baptism of infants, being in force afore, that made his opinion a heresy; as

* "Pro hoc et ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare." Origen, In Epist. ad Rom., lib. v. c. 9; Op., tom. iv. p. 565. 2. A: in Ruffinus's translation, the original being lost.


‡ "It is said" (sc. by Antipedo-baptists—Tombes is quoting an objection), "that the translation" (of Origen in Rom. vi. &c.) "is censured by Erasmus and Perkins, as in something contracting, adding, or altering. What is added, is ingeniously confessed by Ruffinus the translator himself," &c. "Ans. The exception is good notwithstanding this answer. For I. Perkins doth not onely censure Ruffinus his translation as 'in something contracting, adding, or altering,' but also puts 'Origen's Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, not faithfully translated by Ruffinus,' among 'his counterfeit works.' And Erasmus in his censure on the Homilies on Leviticus, saith, that 'a man cannot be certain whether he reads Ruffinus or Origen.' Tombes, Antipedo'baptism, or Third Part, &c., sect. cxxxix. pp. 762, 763, proceeding to argue at length that the passage probably is Ruffinus's and not Origen's.

§ Tombes (ibid., sect. xcviii. pp. 895, 896) holds, "that the baptism of infants was introduced, and grew to such an excess, upon that error" of S. Augustin, in holding "the damning of the infant if dying unbaptized."
making the necessity of baptism visible, as supposed by all Christians, and therefore the truth of original sin. Pelagius was not so very a fool as they imagine. If all the knowledge, that a man of his time could get by seeing all parts of the Church, would have served for an exception to the authority of the baptism of infants; he might have wrangled with his adverse party about the exposition of those scriptures, which are alleged in the point, till this day, and his opinion have found footing in the Church. But because he could not stop men's eyes, so as not to see what they saw; we may, for wantonness, betray the cause of God, by letting the interpretation of the Scriptures loose to every man's fancy, which God hath appointed to be confined within the tradition of His apostles, but they could not choose but condemn that position, which the visible practice of the Church proclaimed to be heresy.

§ 15. Thus far, then, I proceed upon the tradition of the apostles, to make the baptism of infants necessary in case of necessity, that is, of danger of death. But I, that condemn not the ancients for disputing, that it ought not to be general, nor the Greek Church for reserving it till years of discretion, supposing the means of it reasonably secured in that case, am not like to attribute the necessity of baptizing all infants, which the present laws of the Church do introduce, to the tradition of the apostles; but to the original power of the Church, founded upon the constitution thereof, in determining the circumstances of those offices, which, being incumbent upon the Church, are not determined by any law [either of His own or of] His apostles. For though I take not upon me to say, that there can no reason be given, why this particular should not now be so determined as we see it is; who do acknowledge great reasons to have been alleged by the ancients to the contrary, for their time; yet I see so many ways for the misunderstanding and the neglect of Christianity to creep upon the Church, that I cannot see sufficient reason, why the Church

---

1 See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xix. § 11—13.
2 Corrected from MS.; "had," in orig. text.
3 Above, § 3.
4 Ibid., § 7, 8.
5 Corrected from MS.; "law of either of His apostles," in orig. text.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

should trust the conscience of particular Christians, whom it concerned to see to the baptism of all infants that might come into that case; now that the world was come into the Church, and that, therefore, the Church could not have the like presumption of the conscience of all that professed Christianity, in the discharge of an office of that concernment, to that which it might reasonably have, while it was under persecution, and men could not be thought to embrace Christianity but for conscience' sake. And therefore, as I do maintain it always to have been within the lawful power of the Church to make a general law, as now it is; so I must aver, that there was just reason and ground for the exercise of that power in determining this point: whether, as in the East, with some toleration of those whom they had confidence in, for seeing to the baptizing of their infants in danger of death; or generally, as in the West, to see the occasion of mischief and scandal prevented by doing it presently after birth.

§ 16. And therefore those, that forsake the unity of the Church, rather than be subject to a law, which it may lawfully make, as I have shewed, if that which hath been resolved of the difference between heresy and schism be true, cannot avoid being schismatics. As for the ground of that opinion, which moves them to break up the seal of God, marked upon those that are baptized unto the hope of salvation upon the obligation of Christianity, by baptizing

* "Mr. Thorndyke also, in the third Book of his 'Epilogue' (which is of the 'Laws of the Church'), yields, that the eastern Church (though they held infant baptism necessary in case of the danger of death) yet did sometimes defer it when there was no such danger. But that the western Church enjoined it, as the present Church does, to be given presently. He, as well as Grotius, Taylor, &c. seems to be moved to this concession by the instances of Nazianzen, Nectarius, &c., baptized at man's age: of which I shall speak in the next chapter, and shew most of them to be mistaken." Wall, Pt. ii. c. 2. § 11; vol. ii. pp. 37, 38: and see ibid., c. 3. pp. 48, sq.—"Cæterum illa sententia, infantes non baptizatos certo suppliciis æternis, quanquam levioribus, addici, tam rigide defensa ab Augustino, ne ipsi quidem Augustino placuerat antequam cum Pelagio collide-retur. Videtur autem mihi antiquitus baptismus infantium multo magis in Africa quam in Asia aliusque mundi partibusuisse frequentatus, et cum majori quadam necessitatis opinione. Nam in conciliis vetustiorum ejus moris mentionem non invenias concilio Carthaginensi," &c. &c. Grotius, In S. Matth. xix. 13: proceeding to quote Tertullian, S. Greg. Naz., the council of Neo-Cesarea, the instances of S. Chrysostom's baptism at the age of 21, &c. &c.—And see Jeremy Taylor, Liberty of Prophecying, sect. xviii. § 25; Works, vol. v. pp. 551, 552. ed. Eden. P Rt. of Ch. in Chr. State, c. iv. § 7, sq., and Review, c. iv. § 7; and above in Bk. I. of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xviii. § 20, &c.
them anew, to the hope of salvation without the obligation of Christianity; whether they are to be counted heretics therefore or not, let who will dispute. This I may justly infer; they take as sure a course to murder the souls of those, whom they baptize again, as of those, whom they let go out of the world unbaptized.

§ 17. There remain two questions, which seem to make this resolution hard to believe. If there be no salvation without baptism, no, not for the infants of Christians; it is demanded, what becomes of their souls, and whither they go. I must needs allow, that those ancient and later divines, alleged by Cassander and our Hooker after him, had reason to entertain a charitable hope of the happiness of those, who, being prevented (by the inevitable casualties of man’s life) of attaining the sacrament of baptism, are accompanied out of the world by the prayers of Christian parents, commending them to God with the same affections, where-with they always vowed them to God by bringing them to Christianity, so soon as they should become capable to be instructed in it. But if I will stand to the bounds of God’s revealed will, I must also say, that this hope is presumed without book; that is, without any law of God, to warrant the effect of it. For if God promise the kingdom of heaven to infants that depart after baptism (as the reasons premised, and the practice of the Church, make evidence); nothing hindereth the mercy of God to extend to those that depart without it, where nothing hindereth the power of His grace to regenerate without the sacrament those, whom He hath


not expressed that He will not regenerate. But this shall
not proceed from any obligation of His covenant of grace,
nor tend to make good the evidence thereof which the prac-
tice of the Church createth; and, therefore, shall make only
a presumption of what may be, and not of what is. 

§ 18. I find, that Arminius had further a doubtful con-
ceit;—that all infants, departing without baptism, are to be
saved by the virtue of God’s second covenant, and the death
of Christ upon which it is grounded; God having extended
both as far as sin by the first Adam extendeth. But, the
publication of the second covenant, and the intent of Christ’s
death upon which it is grounded, being conditional (as hath
been shewed), I suppose it is not enough to entitle infants
to the benefit thereof, that they never did any thing to refuse
it. Otherwise, what cause is there, why all the Gentiles,
that go out of the world without hearing of Christianity,
should not be saved by virtue of it, notwithstanding all that
they sin against the law of nature: because the new cova-
nant is to take effect, where it is not refused; and sins
against the law of nature cannot be construed as a refusal of
the covenant of grace. And supposing that, excluding them-
selves from God’s mercy by sinning against the law of nature
(as I said in the second Book), they are thereby necessarily
excluded from all benefit of the second covenant; it is not
because they were born under the benefit of it (entitled
thereunto by the same birth which makes them need it), but
because, as by their birth they need it, so by their birth
(supposing the coming of our Lord Christ) they are only

* See above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xx. § 42, 43: and Wall, Pt. ii.
c. 6; vol. ii. pp. 180, sq.; and espe-

# In the Apologia D. Jac. Arminii
adv. Artic. xxxi. Theologios, &c.,
“quibus tum ille tum Adrianus Bor-
reus... novitatis et frepodoéfar in reli-
gione, erroria et hæreses, suspecti red-
duntur,” the 13th and 14th articles
are, “Pecatum originale neminem con-
demnaturum,” and, “Omnem om-
nium gentium infantes morientes sine
peccatis actualibus salvis esse” (Op.
Armin., p. 153. b. 4to. Lug. Bat. 1629): in
defence of which Arminius alleges,
as an allowable private opinion, that
“Deus universum genus humanum in
reconciliationis gratiam assumserit, et
cum Adamo omnibusque ejus posteris
in eo fœdus gratiam inverit, in quo re-
missionem peccatorum omnium polli-
cetur quotquot in illo fœdere perac-
bunt et adversus hoc non prævarica-
buntur: ceterum id non modo cum
Adamo inivit, sed et postea cum Noa-
cho redintegravit, et postremum per
Christum Jesum confirmavit et con-
summavit: quomque infantes fœdus
illud transgressi non sint, non videntur
condemnationi obnoxii.” (Ibid., p. 154.
a.)—See above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of
Gr., c. xxv. § 19. note k.

* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc.
i—v.

* Ibid., c. xxxii. § 10—12.
capable of it. Therefore it remains firm, that, though God by Christ's death stand obliged to receive those that turn to Christianity, yet the covenant is not enacted till the party become obliged to it.

§ 19. And so it remains, that I answer negatively—that, whatsoever hope charity may be allowed, there is no legal assurance or presumption of salvation for infants that depart afore baptism. If this will not serve, unless I affirm where they are and in what estate, I will affirm that I know not; but I will affirm further, that it is an effect of the tree of knowledge, to demand a further answer, being well resolved that God hath given none 7. They, that will not believe the mystery of the Trinity, till I demonstrate to them, how Three Persons can subsist in One Nature, One in Two Natures, must be Arians or Socinians for any thing that I have here said. They, that will not believe the covenant of grace, till they have a reason, why God hath taken such a course as will not save those whom He might have taken a course to save; must for me be Pelagians, or Stoical Predestinatians. They, that will not submit to the baptism of infants, till I can tell them, where those are and in what estate that depart unbaptized, must for me be Anabaptists. But when that is done, how will they be Christians, unless Christianity pretend to resolve these questions before a man is obliged to be a Christian; which no Christian can imagine? I can easily say, that they are not to be in the estate of them, that are condemned to punishment answerable to their works; seeing original sin, howsoever foul, is not the work of him that hath it. And he, that undertakes to press me by the Scriptures, will as soon be dumb, as he finds the torments of hell no where assigned by the Scriptures but to the works of those that actually transgress God's laws.

§ 20. As for that condemnation of all mankind by the first Adam, out of which it is recovered by the second Adam, according to St. Paul, Rom. v.: I suppose all the world will allow, that I acknowledge it, when I allow not those infants the kingdom of God that depart unbaptized.

7 "Curiosity of knowing things not revealed, especially tending to dissatisfaction in the faith or unity of the Church, an effect of the forbidden fruit." Added in margin in MS.
§ 21. If it be said, that Fulgentius, in the Book *De Fide ad Petrum*\textsuperscript{a}, reckons it for a part of the Catholic faith, that infants departing without baptism are in hell torments; it will be as easy for me to say, that Gennadius (in his Book *De Dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis*) acknowledges it not. For though Gennadius was one of those, whose opinion concerning grace was prohibited by the Council of Orange\textsuperscript{b}; and that there is appearance enough,\textsuperscript{c} that Fulgentius writ expressly to contradict him in the list of positions received by the Church; yet, seeing this point is not defined by the Council\textsuperscript{c} (much less by any act of the Church against Pelagius, still much less by any tradition of the whole Church before and after Pelagius), though it may pass for "*dogma ecclesiasticum*"—such a position as the Church alloweth to be held and professed, yet it cannot be pressed for any part of the rule of faith, which cannot but be acknowledged by all the Church.

§ 22. I will add the words of Gregory Nazianzen, in the same Oration\textsuperscript{d} a little afore.—"*Ἀναβάλλοντας δὲ οἱ μὲν διὰ παθημα, οἱ δὲ διὰ ἀπληροτιαν, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ εἰσιν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δέξασθαι, ἂ διὰ νηπιότητα τυχόν, ἂ τινα τελέως ἀκούοντι περι-*

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{a}} *Abseque sacramento baptismatis, preter eos qui in Ecclesia Catholica sine baptismate pro Christo sanguinem fundunt, nec regnum caelorum potest quisquam accipere nec vitam aternam.* Fulgentius, *De Fide ad Petrum*, c. 43; in Append. ad Op. S. Aug., tom. vi. p. 27. E.—"Firmissime tene, et nullatenus dubites, non solum homines jam ratione utentes, verum etiam parvulos, qui sive in uteri materum vivere incipient et ibi moriuntur, sive jam de natribus nati sine sacramento sancti baptismae... de hoc seculo transult, ignis aeterni supplicio sempiterno puniendo." Id., ibid., c. 70. p. 31. A.—This tract was at one time supposed to be S. Augustin's, until Erasmus detected its spuriousness: and it is now known to be the work of Fulgentius.—See Wall, Pt. ii. c. 6. § 5; vol. ii. p. 204.

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{b}} All that Gennadius says on the subject, is, that "*Baptizatis tantum iter esse salutis credimus; nullum catenotechnum, quamvis in bonis operibus defunctum, vitam aeternam habere credamus, excepto martyrio, ubi tota baptismi sacramenta complentur.*" (De Eccl. Dogm., c. xii.; in Append. ad Op. S. Aug., tom. viii. p. 79. D, E.)

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{c}} So say the Louvain editors of S. Augustin: see the Monitum prefixed to the tract *De Eccl. Dogm.* in the Bened. edition. And see above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xix. § 23. note f.

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{d}} The Council of Orange (A.D. 529) mentions baptism only to condemn those, who hold, that "*initium fidei,* &c., "*quo... ad generationem sacri baptismatis pervenimus, non per gratum donum... sed naturaliter nobis inesse*" (Conc. Araucis, can. v.; ap. Lebb., Conc., tom. ix. pp. 1667. E, 1668. A); and that "*alia misericordia, alios vero per librum arbitrium... ad gratiam baptismi posse venire*" (ibid., can. viii. p. 1668. D, E); and to affirm, that "*accepta per baptismum gratia omnem baptizati, Christo auxiliante, quae ad salutem animae pertinent, possint et debeat... adimplere.*" (ibid., can. xxv. p. 1672. A.)

OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

BOOK III. πέτειαν, εἴτε ὁδὲ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς ὑπάρχει τυχεῖν τοῦ χαρά-
σματος· διστέρ οὖν ἐν ἑκείνοις πλείστην διαφορὰν εὑρομεν, οὕτω
κἂν τούτους χείρους μὲν οἱ παντάπασι καταφρονηταί τῶν ἀ-
pληστοτέρων ἡ βαθυμιστέρων· χείρους δὲ οὕτω, τῶν εἴτε ἄργους ἡ
τυραννίδος ἀποπεπτόντων τῆς δωρεάς· τυραννίς γὰρ οὐκ ἄλλοτι
ἡ ἀκούσιος διαμαρτία· καὶ ἤγονμαι, τοὺς μὲν καὶ δίκαια ὑφέξειν,
διστερ καὶ τῆς ἄλλης πονηρίας, οὕτω καὶ τῆς τοῦ λοντροῦ περι-
φρονησεῖν· τοὺς δὲ ὑφέξειν μὲν, ἢπτον δὲ, ὅτι μὴ κακὰ μᾶλλον
ἡ ἀνοία τῆς ἀποτυχίας εἰργάζατο· τοὺς δὲ μήτε δοξασθήσεσθαι
μήτε κολασθήσεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δικαίου Κριτοῦ, ὡς ἀσφαλεῖστοις
μὲν, ἀπονήρους δὲ, ἄλλα παθόντας μᾶλλον τὴν ξημίαν ἡ δρά-
σατας. Οὐ γὰρ, δεῖτοι τοῦ κολάσθαι εἴξοις, ἢδη καὶ τιμῆς ὑστερ
οὐδὲ στίς ὀυ τιμῆς, ἢδη καὶ κολάσεως. Σκοπῶ δὲ κακεῖνο εἰ
cρίνεις τοῦ φόνου τῶν φονικῶν ἐκ μίνου τοῦ βούλευσθαι, καὶ δίχα
tοῦ φόνου, βεβαπτίσθω σοι καὶ ὁ ποθήσας τὸ βάπτισμα, δίχα
tοῦ βαπτίσματος”—“Some delay for negligence, others for
covetousness; others are in no capacity to receive it, for in-
fancy perhaps, or some accident utterly involuntary; where-
by, though they would, they could not attain the grace: as
therefore we found much difference among those, so these;
they, that wholly scorn it in deed, are worse than the more
covetous or negligent; but these are worse than those who
fail of the gift for ignorance or constraint; for constraint is
no other thing than to fail against a man’s will: and I truly
think, that those shall be punished, as for their other wicked-
ness, so for neglecting baptism: these* also, though less, be-
cause guilty of failing rather for folly than malice; but that
the last shall neither be punished nor glorified by the just
Judge, as without malice, though unsanctified, and suffering
rather than doing harm: for he who is not worthy of
punishment, is not therefore of honour, as he that is not
worthy of honour, is not therefore of punishment: and I
consider also this;—if thou condemnest him for murder that
would have murdered, only because he would, without mur-
dering; let him, that desired baptism without being baptized,
be counted baptized.” In this last case, supposing a man’s
resolution to be a Christian so complete, that only oppor-
tunity of being baptized is wanting, I conclude with the
Church since Gregory’s time, that there is no doubt in the

* Corrected from MS.; “those,” in orig. text.
salvation of such a one: and that by virtue of his own words, that baptism is "the covenant of a new life"; which if a man's heart fully resolve upon between God and himself, to doubt of his salvation because his baptism is prevented, is (contrary to St. Peter) to ascribe his salvation to the cleans- [1 Pet. iv. ing of the flesh, not to the profession of a good conscience. 21.]

In the mean time, he who acknowledges, that such a one is not punished for not being baptized, though not glorified, can neither allow the kingdom of heaven to an infant that dies unbaptized, nor condemn him for original sin, which is, for not being baptized.

§ 23. As for the opinion of Pelagius, who, because our Lord said,—"Except ye be born of water and of the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God,"—granteth infants, that die unbaptized, not to come to God's kingdom, but would have them come to everlasting life nevertheless; the Anabaptists may learn modesty of him, in handling the Scriptures with reverence, and not allowing regeneration by water and the Holy Ghost, where the Church never allowed the kingdom of God. But, on the other side, when he maketh life everlasting, which himself cannot distinguish from the kingdom of God, due to nature and birth, he voideth the grace of Christ, and the intent of His coming; seeing nothing but their own choice can hinder men to attain that without Christ, which is due to infants by their birth.

§ 24. And if any man think to blast this with the reputa-
tion of popery (as the conscience of this time is, to make that popery which they understand not, and may justly give reasonable and conscionable men a good opinion of popery, the imputation whereof is so brutishly abused); what will he think of himself, when he finds himself in the company of so many doctors of the Church of Rome, as at this day and always have maintained that, which (you see) I dare not affirm, but he dares; namely, that all infants, who die un-
baptized, go into everlasting fire?

1 See below, § 27. note o.
2 See above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xix. § 13. note e; and Wall, Pt. i. c. 19. § 7; vol. i. pp. 259—362.
§ 25. It is demanded, in the second place, what is that regeneration by the Holy Ghost, and wherein it consists, whereof infants that are baptized can be thought capable. For the wild conceits of those, that imagine them to have faith in Christ (which, without actual motion of the mind, is not), require miracles to be wrought of course by baptizing, that the effect thereof may come to pass. And if the state of grace (which the habitual grace of God’s Spirit either supposeth or inferreth) is not to be attained but by the resolution of embracing the covenant of grace (as, by all the premisses, it is not otherwise attained); it will be every whit as hard to say, what is that habitual grace, that is said to be poured into the souls of infants that are baptized, being nothing else but a facility in doing what the covenant of grace requireth. But if we conceive the regeneration of infants that are baptized, to consist in the habitual assistance of God’s Spirit; the effects whereof are to appear in making them able to perform that, which their Christianity requires at their hands, so soon as they shall understand themselves to be obliged by it: we give reason enough of the effect of their baptism, whether they die or live, and yet become not liable to any inconvenience. For supposing the assistance of God’s Spirit, assigned them by the promise of baptism, to take effect, when their bodily instruments enable the soul to act as Christianity requireth; if the soul by death come to be discharged of them, can any thing be said, why original concupiscence, which is the law of the members, should remain any more, to impeach the subjection of all faculties to the law of God’s Spirit? Or will it be any thing strange, that, when they come to be taught Christianity, the same Spirit of God should be thought to sway them, to embrace it of their own choice, and not only in compliance with the will of their parents? Yet is this no more, than the regeneration

of infants by water and the Holy Ghost importeth;—that the Spirit of God should be habitually present, to make those reasons, which God hath given to convince the world that they ought to be Christians, both discernable to the understanding, and weighing down the choice:—whereas those, that are converted from being enemies to God (that is to say, at those years, when no man can be converted to God, that is not His enemy before), though the Spirit of God knock at their hearts without, striving to cast out the strong man that is within doors and to make a dwelling for Itself in the heart, are possessed by a contrary principle, till they yield God’s Spirit that entertainment which God requireth. If this habitual assistance of God’s Spirit (by the moral effect of God’s promise, not by any natural change in the disposition of that mind, which never used reason to make choice of it) can be called habitual grace (as, for certain, it is a grace of God in consideration of our Lord Christ, and no less habitual than any quality, which the soul of man or the faculties thereof can be endowed with); I shall not need to quarrel the decree of the Council of Vienna\(^k\), which hath determined the gift of habitual grace to be the effect of baptism in infants. Only I express more distinctly, and to the preventing of the inconveniences mentioned, wherein it consisteth.

§ 26. But I shall infer, as a consequence of this resolution, that we are not to look upon Christians that are baptized in their infancy, as those, who are all of them necessarily enemies to God, before they be converted again to become true Christians. For though that very age, when they come first to years of discretion, obliging them to act as Christians, be liable to so many and so great temptations, that few can pass through it without falling away from the profession of Christians; yet, because it is not incredible, that there are many cases, in which the ministry of education, blessed by God’s providence, as acted by His grace, brings it to pass, it is by no means to be supposed, that all those, who are baptized infants, are necessarily to pass through the state of God’s enemies: and, therefore, that as many as come into that state, do fall from the state of God’s grace into which they are baptized. Which is none of the least demonstrations of

\(^k\) See above, in note h.
that, which hath been maintained in due place;—that the
state of God’s grace is as well lost and forfeited, as it is to be
recovered again by Christians.

§ 27. And upon this ground and to this purpose it was,
that the ancient Church (at such time as the solemnity of
baptizing became tied to Easter and Whitsuntide, and the
young were baptized with the old, not absolutely infants, but,
according to the opinion of Gregory Nazianzen related afore,
at three or four years of age mn) used to give them also the
eucharist, as soon as they were baptized. For, the eucharist
being nothing but the confirming and seconding of the cove-
nant of baptism, the reason why they were baptized inferred
the giving of them the eucharist: which reason being ren-
dered by the supposed Dionysius in the end of his book De
Ecclesiastica Hierarchia n (where he tells us, that little ones
received the eucharist as soon as they were baptized,—as I
do here,—that they might be always, from thenceforwards,
in the state of grace), the eucharist, being the Body and Blood
of Christ, because the means to convey His Spirit, may well
be judged the means to secure and confirm that promise
thereof, which baptism importeth. Yet doth not this infer,
that, since it is become necessary for the Church to baptize
all in the state of mere infants, it is not for the best to defer
the communion of the eucharist till little ones may know what
they do (though, in my opinion, it is deferred far longer than
it ought to be, nothing but a disposition positively opposite to
Christianity defeating the effect of it, which may prevent the
said disposition in innocents): much less, that this can be
any just ground for division in the Church; so that the divi-
sion, which shall be raised upon this ground, necessarily ren-
ders those who are the cause of it schismatics. In fine, seeing
it is excellently said by St. Gregory Nazianzen (In Sanctum
Bapt., Orat. xliii.): "Συνθέκασ πρὸς Θεόν δευτέρου βίου, καὶ
πολιτείας καθαρωτέρας, ἱποληπτεύω τὴν τοῦ βαπτισμάτος
dύναμιν"—"that we are to think the force of baptizing to

1 Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxi.
2 § 7, text to note q.
3 "Μεταξύισι δὲ τῷ παιδί τῶν ἱερῶν

symbolōν ἢ ἱεράχης, ὡς εἰν αὐτῶι

ἀνατραφείς, καὶ μῆν χειρὶ ζωῆς ἐκεῖνος,

εἰ μὴ τὴν τὰ θεῖα θεωροῦσαν ἰδί, καὶ κοι-

νωμον αὐτῶν ἐν προκοπάσι ἱεραὶς γιγα-

νομίσης, εἰσὶν τε ἱερὰ ἐν ταύτοις ἱεροῖς,

ἀναγομένη τε ἱεροπρατίς ἐγὼ τοῦ θεοε-

διόνοις ἀναδόξοι." Pseudo-Dion. Areop.,

4 Orat. xl. § 8; Op., tom. i. pp. 695.
F., 696. A.—xlii. in the text is a mistake.
consist in the covenant of a second life and purer conversation with God;” and that the eucharist is nothing else but the seconding of this covenant: where baptism in that regard is necessary to salvation, there the eucharist, though not necessary (as the ancient church never held it), cannot be unlawful; whether expedient or not. He, that contents himself with the practice of the Church for unity’s sake, will prove the best Christian. I do not therefore condemn this custom for a profanation of the sacrament, when it was in use. Infants cannot “examine themselves,” neither can they “presume,” in “eating that bread, and drinking of that cup.” But neither can they be taught to do all things which Christ commandeth, so soon as they are made His disciples by being baptized. If the Church duly presume, that with remission of sins they attain the gift of God’s Spirit by being baptized; did it unduly presume, that, remission of sins remaining uninterrupted, the gift of the Holy Ghost may be strengthened by receiving the eucharist? Let us rather watch over our own customs than condemn the customs of the Church. The grace of the Holy Ghost may be fortified by the sacrament of the eucharist against those occasions of re-entry, which the evil spirit espieth in those, that begin to perceive the difference between good and bad, though unable to reflect upon themselves and to judge whether in the state of grace or not. If the eucharist be profaned where they take it too young, what pretence of Christianity or of a Church remains, where neither young nor old take it?

* Exhortation in Communion Service.
CHAPTER IX.

I HAVE shewed from the beginning, that the power of the keys, which is the foundation of the Church, is seen much more towards them that are already of the Church, than them that are not of it. For in those there is but one thing for the Church to judge,—whether their persuasion and resolution be such as qualifies them to be baptized disciples of Christ, that is, Christians:—but in these, so many particulars as the profession of a Christian is employed about, so many are there for this power to judge, whether the profession of a Christian be discharged in them or not. And this ground must needs be much strengthened by that, which hath been resolved concerning the covenant of grace and the terms of it. For if the profession of Christianity be that which qualifies a Christian for remission of sins and life everlasting; then he, that fails of this profession by any such sin as cannot stand with it, as he attained the communion of the Church upon presumption that he stood qualified for the promises of the Gospel, so he fails of it upon evidence that he is not so qualified. Therefore, though the power of the keys is seen in free admitting to the communion of the Church, yet is it more visible in excluding from the same, as well as in readmitting to it. And this is the next act, or the next object, which the power of the Church is employed about, that comes here to be considered.

§ 2. The difficulty whereof seems to stand in that, which the Church of Rome, by the law of confessing once a year all sins that come to remembrance, seems to teach;—that no
sin, or at least none of those which a man is bound to confess (which in what sense they may and are to be allowed mortal sins, I have shewed in due place'), can be remitted him that falls into them after baptism, unless the keys of the Church pass upon them'. The opposite whereof, in the other extreme, seems to be the opinion of those that pretend [this\textsuperscript{4}] for a point of reformation, and of that freedom to which the Gospel calls Christians;—that, though it be necessary to give satisfaction to the Church, which shall have been scandalized by the evil example of a notorious offence; yet that no office of the Church, and of the keys which it is trusted with by our Lord, concurs to the loosing of that sin, which the Church hath first tied a man with by excluding him from the communion of the Church; but that it is wholly to be imputed to the preaching of the Gospel ministered by the Church, when it is received by faith\textsuperscript{5}. Though, for the present, I enquire not what they would have this faith to be, having distinguished the consequences of the several conceits which may be had about it afores. For, this difficulty being here proposed in the beginning, I do not foresee any thing of moment in question, concerning this power of the Church, the effect and intent of it, that

\textsuperscript{4} Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxii. § 5.

\textsuperscript{5} Bellarmine summarily states the Roman doctrine thus—"Qui mortali peccato se obstrinxerunt, tenentur jure Divino penitentiam agere, et reconciliatimum post Baptismum, est confessio peccatorum omnium sacerdoti facta: ergo tenentur jure Divino, qui post baptismum mortali peccato se obstrinxerunt, sacerdoti peccata omnia confitent." (De Pienit., lib. iii. c. 2; Contr. Lib., tom. ii. p. 1347. C).—And the Council of Trent (Sess. xiv. cap. 5; ap. Labb., Concil., tom. xiv. p. 818. A., B.) declares, that "ex institutione sacra- menti penitentiae jam explicata universalis ecclesia semper intellectit institutam etiam a Domino integrum pec- catorum confessionem, et omnibus post baptismum lapsis jure Divino necessariam existere: quia Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, et terris ascensusus ad colos, sacerdotes Sui Ipsius vicarios re-

\textsuperscript{4} See the quotations from Calvin, and from Cartwright, in the Serv. of God at Relig. Ass., c. x. § 77. note x.: and compare also that from Selden, Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 13. note m.

\textsuperscript{5} Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. vii., viii.
will not come to be determined by virtue of the resolution thereof, and in consequence to it.

§ 3. Which resolution shall briefly be this:—that inward repentance (with [that²] confession to God alone, that is sincere and effectual to the reforming of that which a man repents of for the future) is a disposition qualifying a man for pardon of sin by virtue of the covenant of grace, without any act of the Church passing upon it: but that God hath charged His Church (and therefore given it power and right) to call all those, that notoriously transgress that Christianity which once they have professed, to those demonstrations of inward repentance and amendment of mind by visible actions, that may satisfy the Church that God's wrath in regard of that sin is appeased through Christ, and upon these demonstrations to readmit them to communion with the Church: and, further, that God, having provided this means of procuring and assuring the pardon of sin by the Church, hath also obliged all Christians to make use of the same by bringing their secret sins to the knowledge of the Church, so far, and in as much, as they ought to stand convict, that the ministry of the Church is requisite to procure in them that disposition, which by the Gospel entitles them to forgiveness.

§ 4. This resolution hath several parts, which I have thought fit to be thus wound up in one, not only for brevity's sake (which I seek so far as it will let me be understood), but for the dependance they have one upon another in point of reason and truth.

§ 5. And, first, to clear the foundation in the first place: I suppose what our Saviour preached Himself, in publishing His Gospel, according as it stands declared and settled by the premisses:—to wit, that, mankind being lost in sin, and neither the law of nature nor that of Moses being able to reduce it to righteousness and so to happiness, God, by our Lord Christ, requires all them that find themselves surprised in this estate, to believe Him to be sent for remission of sins and life everlasting, to all, that, turning from that conversation in which they are overtaken, do make the glory of God the end, and His will the rule, of their actions for the

* Added from MS
future, by undertaking to live like Christians, in hope of being enabled by God’s Spirit to perform the same, for Christ His merits, and of being accepted for His suffering. This being the sum of Christ His Gospel, according to the premisses; and the reason, why this profession is limited by the Gospel to be solemnized by the sacrament of baptism, being so clearly rendered, that it is impossible to render any other reason, how the spiritual and everlasting promises of the Gospel should depend upon a material and bodily act of washing away the filth of the flesh: I suppose the way is plain to infer, that, supposing God allows pardon to all that fall after baptism, so often as they return by true repentance, it cannot be refused those that return by true repentance, whether it be obtained by the ministry of the Church or without it.

§ 6. It is not necessary for me here to repeat all those sayings of the New Testament, wherein the motion from the state of damnation, in which the Gospel finds us, to the state of salvation by the Gospel, [is7] expressed under the term of repentance. John Baptist’s, and our Lord’s, first sermon is upon this text, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;” Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17: in Mark, “Repent and believe the Gospel;” i. 15: and both a thing. For he that is moved to repent, either by the preaching of John Baptist or of our Lord Christ, must needs take the rule and measure of that which he turns to by repentance, from him whose doctrine he followeth; whether John, or our Lord Christ, Whom John declareth. The same is the theme that the apostles preach upon, Mark vi. 12. And the same is the case, whether the apostle say, “Repent and be baptized” (Acts ii. 38); or, “Repent and turn” (as Acts iii. 19): seeing he must needs be understood to mean, that they turn to Christianity by repentance. And still the same, when St. Paul, publishing the Gospel, declares, that God by it calls all men to repentance (Acts xvii. 30); that it consists in preaching repentance and faith in our Lord Christ Jesus (Acts xx. 21); or in calling men to “repent and turn to God, doing works worthy of repentance” (Acts xxvi. 20). Therefore all our Lord’s sermons of repentance in the Gospels (Matt. xi. 20, 21; xii. 41: 7 Added from MS.
Luke x. 13, xi. 32, xiii. 2—9, xv.) do imply and presuppose the same limitations, to determine the repentance which His Gospel requires. Which he that receives not, is called the “impenitent heart” (Rom. ii. 5). And St. Paul directs Timothy to “instruct the adversaries with meekness, if perhaps God may give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth” (2 Tim. ii. 25). And St. Peter, when he commends God as “long suffering towards us,” because He “would have none perish, but all come to repentance” (2 Pet. iii. 9), speaks of those that mock at Christianity, “saying, Where is the promise of His coming, for since the fathers fell asleep, all things remain as they were from the beginning.”

§ 7. Since, then, conversion to Christianity is that which qualifies for remission of sins, those whom it overtaketh in sin; can any reason be given, why it should not be effectual to the loosing of any sin, whereby a Christian, transgressing his Christianity, forfeiteth the privileges of it? For the profession which he sealed by being baptized, as to the Church, fails not by a sin that the Church sees not: and as to God, revives by that new resolution which repentance introduceth.

§ 8. There is not, indeed, much mention of private repentance in those which are already Christians, in the writings of the apostles: but there is frequent mention of sins without mention of any cure by the Church, without any appearance or signification of any cure applied to them by the Church. As the eating of things offered to idols, when it might be the occasion to make another Christian commit idolatry, 1 Cor. viii. 12: which, if public, and yet cannot be thought to come under the keys of the Church; how much more those that are not public? I have proved in another place*, that St. Paul instructs Timothy not to ordain sinful persons, lest he “communicate in their sins;” because, saith he, “some men’s sins are manifest aforehand, going before them to judgment” (1 Tim. v. 22, 24): but those, that stood for ordination, could not pretend to be cured of their sins by the Church, because, coming into that rank, they could not aspire to be preferred in the Church. But the words of St. John are unavoidable, for he writ to Christians: 1 John i. 7—10:—

“If we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have com-

* Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii.
munition with one another, and the Blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin: if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness; if we say we have no sin, we make Him a liar, and His word is not in us.”

And immediately: “My little children, I write these things [1 John ii. 1, 2.] to you, that ye sin not; and if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins; but not for ours alone, but for the sins of the whole world.” The precept of God to John, and by John to the seven Churches, to repent (Apoc. ii. 5, 16, 21; iii. 3, 19), is to Christians and to Churches. For though it be directed to the angels of those Churches, yet in behalf of the Churches themselves*. Now can the Church be cured by the Church? If not, then are some sins of Christians cured without the keys of the Church. If so, why not the sin of a man by that man, as well as the sin of a Church by that Church; the cure of the sin of a Church being nothing else but the repentance of that Church, or perhaps the greatest part of that Church: for otherwise no man’s sin of that Church could be cured, till every man of that Church should return by repentance. What say you to St. Paul’s [inveyingb] against wronging Christians, and against uncleanness; 1 Cor. vi. 6—10, 15—20. Shall we think, that they who sued Christians before infidels came to confession for this sin? that those*, whose sin St. Paul aggravates above this (for it is worse to wrong a Christian, than to seek right of a Christian by an infidel’s means), acknowledged any way the Church had to constrain them to do right? Nay, that those, whom he reduceth there from fornication, did acknowledge the cure of it by the Church? What then needed St. Paul to persuade them, that they could not be saved without turning to God from it? For 76 had they been persuaded, that it could not be cured without confession to the Church, they must have supposed, that it could not be cured without confession to God. And what

* See Right of Ch. in Chr. St., cc. ii. § 6, note r; iii. § 8, notes b, c: and Epil., Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxi. § 11.

* Corrected from MS.; “inveings,” in orig. text.

* Corrected from MS.; “these,” in orig. text.
say you to St. Paul’s instruction,—“Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup;” 1 Cor. xi. 28. For though this may be subject to some limitation (as by that which follows, it will or may appear, that it is to be limited); yet must not this limitation be such, as shall abate any thing of the promise of the Gospel, which the sacraments bring with them to those, who by a competent resolution for their Christianity are qualified for it.

§ 9. Turn we to the Law and the prophets: and observe, according to the premisses, that there was no expiation prescribed by the Law for the inward guilt of sin; but for outward uncleannesses, or incapacities of conversing among the people of God (and, by consequence, of enjoying the benefit of the land of promise), together with some sins, which the Law specifies but condemns not to any bodily or pecuniary punishment*. Wherefore, seeing we read in the Law and the prophets so many exhortations to repentance, which if we suppose to come from God, we cannot suppose to be void of a promise implied, tendering pardon and favour at God’s hands upon repentance, it is necessary to acknowledge, that inward repentance under the Law qualified for remission of sins. Read the seven penitential Psalms; and tell me, how men came then to be cleansed of their sins (David affirming, Psal. li. 16, “Thou desirest no sacrifice, else would I give it Thee, but Thou delightest not in burnt-offerings”), but by that faith, which moved them to seek reconciliation with God by repentance, and by that conversion to righteousness, which their faith supposed acceptable to God. So the prophets, Ezek. xviii. 32, xxxiii. 9—20, Essay i. 18, 1 Kings viii. 33, 2 Chron. vi. 24; besides infinite more.

§ 10. For if we say, that men were then bound to confess their sins, that they might be cleansed by the synagogue:

---

* See below, § 15, sq.; and c. xi.
† See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxvii. § 5; and Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xiii.
he that confessed a capital crime, must incur a capital pun-
ishment; and without death there was no way to cleanse
him of it. If we say, he might be cleansed by sacrifice, by
the synagogue, without confessing the sin; why not under
the Gospel by means answerable, that is, by the eucharist,
and the oblations out of which it is celebrated, without con-
fessing in particular to the Church? I do not therefore
here dispute, what sins might be, and what might not be,
purged by sacrifices; not doubting, by many passages of
the prophets and Ecclesiasticus, that the righteous and
spiritual men of that people, under the Law, did offer
sacrifices for the expiation of those sins, which there was
no particular promise in the Law that God would pardon
upon those sacrifices. But, first, I suppose, that, though
God allowed their conformity to His present law, in offer-
ing sacrifices that were not expressly required by it but
customed by God's people upon it, yet He accepted them
not for those sacrifices, but for that repentance and conver-
sion of heart from whence they came. Thereupon then I
argue, in the second place, that, if without declaring the
kind of sin under the Law, under the Gospel much more.
For, seeing that there is no expiation for capital crimes with-
out death by the Law, he that should offer sacrifice for such
a sin, declaring it, must become liable to death. And the
same is the case in the second rank of offences against the
Law, which it punisheth with scourging; those also belonging
to that rank, which the Law threatens with death by the
hand of God, which renders their life forfeit into God's
hands: because of the rule which they have, that, if they
come to be known to the synagogue, they are to be punished
with scourging. For who can imagine, that these can be
purged by the Law without undergoing the penalty of the
Law? And therefore, if sacrifices were offered for them, they
were not confessed; seeing that all estates in the synagogue,
which was bound to punish them, were also bound to bring
them to punishment.

§ 11. As for the Church, it hath been already declared,
that the constitution thereof presupposeth in order of nature
and reason the covenant of grace; that is to say, the condi-
tion upon which the Gospel tendereth remission of sins: so

The condition of [remission of sins under the Gospel],
that, as we have all the reason in the world to think, that God hath founded the corporation of His Church to be the means of effecting or procuring that disposition which qualifies for the promises of the Gospel, so, if the same disposition can be procured without the ministry of the Church, which supposeth the knowledge of particular sins, there can be no cause, why God should enjoin that, the effect whereof is to be had without it. Now I suppose from the premisses, that those, who live within the Church, have sufficient helps of God's grace to enable them to return from their sins by repentance. As for those helps which they may have by the ministry of the Church, making known their sins to it; though they may be of such virtue as to make that more easy which is possible without them, yet, when all is done that man can do, it exceedeth not the same kind of helps, which man outwardly may render to God's inward grace: which as it is more probable that God's good providence should make effectual, than where the same outward means are not employed, or where they are employed in a less measure; so is it possible, that, being once sufficient, they may become effectual by God's grace, though in a less measure.

§ 12. But, I confess, there is nothing prevails more with me to conclude this, than that which the Scripture affords us, to evidence, that God hath instituted and appointed the ministry of His Church for the reconciling of those sins, which must, or which may, come to the knowledge of His Church.

§ 13. For when God giveth first to St. Peter "the keys" of His Church (Matt. xvi. 19), and afterwards to all His disciples the power of "binding" and "loosing" sins ([Matt. xviii. 18;] John xx. 23); it is evident, that by this power they are able to do nothing to unbelievers, but persuade them, by preaching the Gospel, to embrace that course by which it tendereth remission of sin; until, having persuaded them to it, they oblige them to enter into the Church by baptism, as that to which God hath limited that profession of Christianity which He requires to remission of sin. Thus is the power of the keys, or of binding and loosing sin, first seen and exercised in baptizing; understanding thereby, not only

* Corrected from MS.; "affecting," in orig. text.
the ministering of the sacrament, but the bringing of a man to that disposition to which baptism is due.

§ 14. The same is still exercised towards those that are come into the Church, by laying forth to them the doctrine of Moses and the prophets, of our Lord and His apostles, obliging them to return from sin by repentance: so that it cannot justly be said, that preaching, as we call it (that is, further instructing in the doctrine of Christianity those, that by the preaching of the Gospel have been moved to embrace it), is a thing impertinent to the power of the keys, not concerning the office of it; unless we think ministering the helps of sufficient grace impertinent to effectual grace, which always supposeth them; having already shewed, that before conversion to Christianity the power of the keys is seen in ministering the same.

§ 15. But he that thinketh, that within the Church the power of the keys goes no further than preaching, and clearing the scandal of notorious offences, can give no reason, why those, that are converted to believe Christianity by preaching the Gospel, should be bound by their own profession to oblige themselves to it, and by that means to enter the society of the Church. For they are as well certified before baptism as after, that without repentance and conversion from sin there is no remission of sin, or hope of everlasting life; which, if a man be left to his own choice, whether he will embrace or not, after that he is come into the Church, why not afore? Why came he into the Church? Or why was there provision made, that the Church should be a corporation, the communion whereof all Christians should be bound to hold and embrace? Therefore our Lord,—when He declares the depositing of the same keys (or power of loosing

---

*So e.g. Calvin, Whitaker, Cartwright. See Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. x. § 77. note x.*


---
and binding) with His Church, which He gave elsewhere to St. Peter and the rest of His disciples (Matt. xviii. 15—20), commanding, that he who will not hear the Church, be to the Church as publicans and sinners were then to the Jews, —inferreth, that "whatsoever they should bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever they should loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven:" and again, that "where two of you" (that is, of the Church) "shall agree upon any thing to ask it, it shall be done for you by My Father in heaven." Where reducing him, that heareth not the Church, into a state of a publican or a sinner to the Jews, being the binding of sin as to the Church, upon supposition that he is bound by it already as to God (in order to the loosing of the same as to the Church, upon supposition that it is first loosed as to God), is something else besides preaching, or clearing the scandal of notorious sin. And if our Lord, by inferring immediately a general promise of hearing the prayers of Christians, intend to intimate, that He would accept of the prayers of the Church for the reconciling of those whose sins were bound, as I observed afores; then, of necessity, something more than shewing the guilt of sin by preaching is referred to the Church, in procuring the loosing of him that is bound, from the debt of sin, not from the scandal of it.

§ 16. And what is this, but that which we see done by St. Paul, and by the Church of Corinth in obedience to St. Paul's commands, concerning him that had married his father's widow; 1 Cor. v. 2—[13]; 2 Cor. ii. 5—11, vii. 8—11. For when St. Paul blames them, that they did not all "mourn, that he who had done the act, might be removed from among" them; certainly he means, that "he who had done the act," was to "mourn" so much more, that he might be restored unto them again. For so it came to pass, and upon such terms he is restored:—"If any man hath grieved, it is not me that he hath grieved, but in part, that I may not charge you all; enough to such a one is this rebuke of many; so that, contrariwise, ye ought rather to pardon and comfort such a one, lest he be swallowed up with abundance of sorrow." The reason follows:—"For I see, that that letter of mine grieved you, though but for a
time: now I am glad, not that I grieved you, but that you were grieved to repentance; for ye were grieved according to God, that ye might in nothing be punished, as from us: for the sorrow, that is according to God, worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death." I demand, whether the repentance, which St. Paul's censure brought forth, were the repentance of that Church, or the repentance of both the person guilty and the Church. For without question, if this were the crime, and that he was borne out in it by a faction in the Church (the act whereof, prevailing, redounds to the account of the whole), then St. Paul justly blames the Church; because they had not cleared their hands of it by putting from them the guilty person, with demonstration of that sorrow, which might evidence their adherence to the Christianity which they had once professed. And accordingly, if the Church were grieved to repentance, such as procureth salvation, being according to God; and that, having so done, they are enjoined to restore the guilty person; [it followeth], that the guilty person had been reduced to so much more sorrow, as the crime concerned him more; and that this sorrow also was repentance to salvation according to God, wrought by the censure inflicted upon him by St. Paul's epistle. Whether then St. Paul require them to re-admit him, "lest Satan should get advantage" upon the Church by this breach (whose "conceits we are not ignorant of," saith St. Paul), and "lest" the party "should be swallowed up with excessive sorrow:" or lest the party, by despair of reconciliation with the Church, should be reduced to renounce Christianity; or a division be made in the Church from under the authority of St. Paul: this he plainly declares, that he pardons the man whom they pardon, in the person of Christ, that no such thing come to pass; that is, acting by apostolical commission, according to which, that which any man's apostle or commissary did, was as if himself did it: so that either we suppose the repentance wrought by the censure to be sufficiently evidenced, or that St. Paul's commission is not trustily discharged. This is more,

\[\text{CHAP. IX.}
\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{b} Corrected from MS.; "and of the," in orig. text.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1} Corrected from MS.; "Therefore," in orig. text.}\]
then, than preaching the Gospel, or removing offence from before the Church. It is removing the sin by procuring repentance, and thereupon assuring of pardon; which seems not well assured, when there is not competent means used, much less the effect of the means visible in procuring repentance. But if a physician, only prescribing and applying the means of curing a disease, is said to cure it; much more the Church, not only prescribing and applying the means of curing sin (by the exercise of repentance, in prayer, with fasting and alms-deeds), but also, constraining the sick person effectually to use the cure prescribed, by excluding him the communion of the Church so long as he refuses to use it.

§ 17. Now when St. Paul commandeth "to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 5); proving the power of excommunication necessary to the constitution and being of the Church, and that whoso is excommunicate falls under the power of Satan, as excluded God's Church: I alleged, that those miraculous operations, which God gave the Church under the apostles to witness the truth of Christianity by the evidence of His presence in the same, were seen upon those which were cast out of it; and that in that regard this man is commanded to be "delivered to Satan." "The destruction of the flesh" then, for which he is so delivered, may signify the incursions of Satan upon such persons, then visible; and so I understood it afore. But I must not, therefore, omit that sense of these words, which the ancient Church frequenteth; understanding this destruction to be the mortification of the flesh by works of penance. For this is that sense, which Tertullian, then a Montanist, labours to confute; but Origen (In
Lev., Hom. xxiv. 9), Pacianus (Parænesi ad Pœnitentiam’), St. Basil (Ad Amphilochoium, c. vii. 4), St. Ambrose (De Pœniténtia, i. 12’), St. Augustin (De Fide et Operibus, cap. xxvi. 4), suppose and use. Neither is it in any way inconsequent, that the excommunicate, believing themselves to come thereby under the power of Satan, should betake themselves to those demonstrations of humiliation and mortification, whereby the Church might be moved to admit them to the means of their reconcilement. And in this there is more than preaching the Gospel, or taking away offence: there is authority obliging to use the cure, and granting reconciliation upon the same.

§ 18. Again, when St. Paul saith to them again (2 Cor. xii. 20, 21) — “I am afraid, lest, when I come, I find you not such as I would, and be found of you such as you would not; lest there be strifes, envies, animosities, contentions, back-bitings, whisperings, inflations, commotions; lest, when I come to you again, [my] God humble me in regard of you, and I mourn for many that have sinned afore, and have not repented of the uncleanness and whoredom and wantonness which they have done:” — how should St. Paul be “humbled” in regard of, or “mourn for many” of them, but in regard of the necessity which he feareth to find of putting them out of the Church, or to penance in case they adhere to the Church? And if, by appearance and demonstration

conflictationem carnis consequaturum.”
Tertull., De Pudic., c. xiii. Op., p. 665. A: written when he was a Montanist.

\* “Quod dicit, Tradidi in interitum carnis, hoc est, in afflictionem corporis quae solet a pœnitentibus expendi.”


of their repentance, St. Paul was to be moved not to do this; 
is it not evident, that this is the means which he employs 
to procure repentance, and assure pardon, by discharging 
them of it?

§ 19. I do here repeat that which I said afore, to shew, 
that it is the apostle's intent, Heb. vi. 4—6, x. 26, 27, xii. 15 
—17, to deter them from falling away from Christianity to 
Judaism for fear of persecution from the Jews, by putting 
them out of hope of being readmitted to the communion of 
the Church: not as pronouncing sentence of damnation 
against them; but as demonstrating it so difficult to be pre 
sumed upon, in behalf of him that had once violated the pro 
fession of Christianity, that the Church was not to become 
the warrant for it. If this be the case of those, whose in 
terest in the promises of the Gospel the Church warrants 
not; then the warrant of the Church (either in pronouncing 
sentence of absolution formally, or in admitting really unto 
the communion of the eucharist) proceeds, or ought to pro 
ceed, upon supposition of that disposition which qualifies 
for pardon, wrought in the penitent by the censure of the 
Church.

§ 20. And that this is the case, I have further inferred 
from the words of the Apostle; 1 John v. 16, 17: "If a 
man see his brother sin a sin not to death, he shall pray, and 
life shall be given to them that sin not to death: there is a 
sin to death, I say not that ye pray for it; all unrighteous 
ness is sin, but there is a sin not to death." For seeing it is 
manifest, that the Church is to pray for all sinners, be they 
ever so great enemies to the Church: it cannot be under 
stood, that absolutely the Church is not to pray for the sin to 
death; but that, as he forbiddeth not, so he obligeth not, 
the Church to pray for the sin unto death those prayers, 
which tend to reconcile the sinner to the Church, upon sup 
position and for a warrant of the reconcilement thereof 
with God.

§ 21. If this seem not to agree with the words, because 
St. John seems to speak to particular persons, and not to the 

x Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 23.  y Ibid., § 21.

z See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. 24.  ² § 22.
body of the Church, when he says, "If any man see, let him ask;" let him consider the words of another apostle, James v. 14—16. For when he promiseth forgiveness of sins to him that shall "call for the priests of the Church," and they "pray over him;" adding immediately, "Confess your sins to one another, and pray for one another, that ye may be healed:" it is necessary, that we make good a reason, why this admonition follows upon that which went before; why the apostle, having taken order for the cure of their sins, who are here ordered to send for the priests of the Church, proceeds to say, "Confess your sins to one another;" namely, because the way of curing sin is the same, when a man confesses his sin to a brother (that is, a private Christian), and when he submits it to the authority of the Church. For as here the apostle maketh the means of obtaining pardon to consist in the prayers of the priests, in whom the authority of the Church resteth; so there, in the prayers of one Christian for another, that confesses his sin to him. And hereupon it is necessarily to be presumed, both that the apostle means, that the priests of the Church impose upon him that course of cure, which his sin requireth in case he survive; and also that a private Christian, by his advice, reduce his brother to use the same means. Otherwise, to what purpose should the one or the other declare his sin, seeing he might be prayed for at large, without declaring the same? It is therefore no marvel, that the words of St. John, manifestly concerning particular Christians, should extend to the keys of the Church, and the public office thereof. For though in the beginning,—when he saith, "If a man see his brother sin a sin not to death,"—he addresseth only to particular Christians; yet the end—"There is a sin unto death, I say not that ye pray for it,"—manifestly addresseth to the body of the Church; implying, that it is to be acquainted therewith by him that sees this, if the case require it.

§ 22. Whereupon St. Paul thus exhorteth, Gal. vi. 1: [St. Paul's exhortation in Galat. c. vi.] "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in any transgression, ye that are spiritual restore such a one with the spirit of meekness, considering yourselves, lest ye also be tempted." Here the title of "spiritual" may extend to particular Christians: but there is a presumption concerning public persons in the
Church, that they are such; because it is the opinion that they are such, which qualifies them to be made public persons in the Church. Now, when he speaks to the brethren in general to do this, he shews, that it may concern the body of the Church, as well as particular Christians. But when he speaks of the "spirit of meekness," it is manifest, that the intent of his speech concerns those penances, which were imposed upon sinners for trial of their conversions, in which he requires that "meekness," which the consideration of a man's own [weakness*] recommends.

§ 23. And, therefore, the same thing is taught by St. James by and by after the words afore quoted; James v. 19, 20:—"Brethren, if any man of you go astray from the truth, and some body bring him back; let him know, that he who brings back a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and cover a multitude of sins." For it is plain by St. Paul, that this extendeth to the recovery of a sinner by the keys of the Church, as they were managed during the apostles' time. Certainly, if we understand St. Paul's words, 1 Tim. v. 22, 24, of imposition of hands in penance (as I have shewed in my Book of the Right of the Church, p. 23b, that they may and ought to be understood), it is necessarily to be inferred; seeing they, who admit those sinners to be reconciled unto God by the prayers which the Church makes for them, with imposition of hands (signifying thereby, that it alloweth them to be sincerely penitent), are "partakers of their sins," which shall follow upon the re-admitting of them to the Church, being not worthily * qualified for it. Therefore the Church is to see, that a man be qualified for reconciliation with the Church, upon supposition of his reconciliation with God before he be reconciled to the Church. And in first procuring him, and then judging him, to be so qualified, consists the right use of those keys which God hath given the Church, towards them that transgress the profession of Christianity after they have made it.

§ 24. The reason of all this is derived from those things, which have been settled by the premisses. The condition,

---

* Corrected from MS.; "meekness,"  * Corrected from MS.; "worthy," in orig. text.

b c. i. § 25.
which the Gospel proposeth for the remission of sins to them who stand convict by it that they are under sin, is, that they return from sin, and, believing that our Lord Christ was sent by God to cure it, undertake to profess that which He taught, and to live according to the same. Those which profess so to do, the Church accepteth of without exception; because, this being the first account she hath of them, she cannot expect more at their hands, than that they submit the rest of their lives to that Christianity which she obligeth them to. If by transgressing this obligation, which they have undertaken, they forfeit the right which they obtained thereby, is it in the power of the Church to restore them at pleasure?

§ 25. In vain, then, is all that hath been said to shew, that the Gospel and Christianity, in order of nature and reason, is more ancient than the constitution of the Church and the corporation of it: and that all the power of the Church presupposeth the condition, upon which those blessings which it tendereth are due. And, certainly, our Lord, when He saith to His disciples, John xx. 23, “Whosoever sin[s] ye remit, they are remitted,” &c., intended not to contradict the sense of the scribes, when they say, “Who can forgive sins but God alone” (Mark ii. 7, Luke v. 21): much less to reverse the word of His prophets, ascribing this power to Him alone (Essay xliii. 25, Mich. vii. 18, Psal. xxxii. 5).

§ 26. What is then the effect of this promise to them, that have forfeited the right of their baptism; supposing, that when men first become Christians, the disciples of Christ and His Church remit sins by making them Christians, according to that which hath been declared? Surely the same, observing the difference of the case. For he, who, being convict of his disease and of the cure of it by the preaching of Christianity, is effectually moved by the help of God’s Spirit to embrace that cure, which none but the Church which tenders it can furnish, attains it not but by using it; that is, by being baptized. But he, who, being baptized, hath failed of his trust and forfeited his interest in Christ,
cannot so easily be restored. I have shewed you, what works of mortification, of devotion, and mercy, the recovering of God's grace and favour requires. Let no man therefore think, that the power of remitting sins in the Church can abate any thing of that, which the Gospel, upon which the Church is grounded, requireth to the remission of sin done after baptism. The authority of the Church is provided by God to oblige those, who are overtaken in sin, to undergo that, which may satisfy the Church of the sincere intent of their return; and the Church, being so satisfied, warranteth their restitution to the right which they had forfeited, upon as good ground, as it warranteth their first estate in it. But this presupposeth the wrath of God appeased, His favour regained, and the inordinate love of the creature, which caused the forfeit, blotted out, and changed (through that course of mortification which hath been performed) into the true love of goodness for God's sake.

§ 27. The Church, therefore, hath received of God no power to forgive sins immediately; as if it were in the Church, to pardon sin without that disposition, which by the Gospel qualifieth a man for it; or as if the act of the Church, pardoning, did produce it: but, in as much as the knowledge thereof directeth, and the authority thereof constraineth, to use the means which the Gospel prescribeth, in so much is the remission of sins, thereby obtained, truly ascribed to the Church. Lazarus was first dead, before he was bound up in his grave-clothes; and when he was restored to life, he remained bound, till he was loosed by the apostles. The Church bindeth no man but him that is first dead in sin. If the voice of Christ call him out of that death, he is not revived, till the love of sin be mortified, and the love of God made alive in him, by a due course of penance performed. If the motion of God's Spirit, upon the preaching of the Gospel, convincing a man that there is no means but Christianity to escape out of sin, and prevailing with him to embrace it, be effectual to obtain the promises of the Gospel; much more shall the actual operation of the same, moving him, that is dead in sin, to put sin to death in himself, that
he may live a Christian for the future, be effectual to regain the grace of God for him, who hath not yet the life of grace in him, but is in the way of recovering it by the help of God's grace.

§ 28. But he who is thus recovered to life by the ministry of the Church, is not yet loosed of the bands of his sin, till he be loosed by the Church, because he was first bound by it; as our Lord, having raised Lazarus to life, commands him to be loosed by His apostles. For if he, who accepteth of the Gospel and the terms of it, remain bound to be baptized by the Church for the remission of his sin; is it strange, that he, who hath forfeited his pardon, obtained by the Church, even in the judgment and knowledge of the Church, should not obtain the restoring of it but by the act of the Church? And therefore the Church remitteth sin after baptism, not only as a physician, prescribing the cure; but as a judge, admitting it to be effected. And the satisfaction of the Church presupposeth, that God is satisfied; that is to say, His wrath appeased, and His favour regained, by the means which the Church prescribeth; but requireth also, that he submit, not only to use the cure which the Church prescribeth, but to the judgment thereof in admitting the effect of it. And upon these terms, and upon no other, the virtue of baptism, mortified by sin, reviveth again, according to the doctrine of the School. For if nothing else but the

---

\[\text{But those who are bound by the Church, need to be loosed by her.}\]

\[\text{Chap. IX.}\]

---


---

1 See Morinus, De P cansit, lib. i. c. 6. pp. 12. 2. C. sq.—“Moment igitur S. Patres saccodetum judicia non esse pro animi liberitate exercenda. Et quamquam ex verbis Christi nullius limitibus definiatur eorum potentias; infinitae enim traditur, ‘Quodcumque ligaveris,’ &c., ‘Quorum remiseritis,’ &c.: nihilomi-
sincere resolution of living and dying as a Christian, can entitle any man to the promises of the Gospel; what is it that must entitle him to them, that hath once forfeited his title? Surely nothing but the renewing of that trust, which is forfeited by failing of it. And surely that trust is not so easily re-established, as it is first contracted. I have shewed you in the second Book, what reason we have to believe, that the severity of the ancient Church, in re-admitting those that failed of their profession at their baptism, necessarily argues the difficulty of being re-estate in the favour of God. There goes more, indeed, to the satisfying of the Church, that he, who had failed of his Christianity, hath sincerely renewed his resolution for it, than to the renewing of it. But that this resolution will as well be effectual and durable, as it is sincere; it is as difficult to assure a man's self, as to satisfy the Church. The power of the Church, then, in binding and loosing, that is, in remitting or retaining sin, consists not only in declaring a sinner either bound or loose; whether in general by preaching the Gospel, or in particular by refusing or restoring him to the communion of the Church (for, whom the Church bindeth for sin known to the Church, his pardon is not to be had without the act of the Church); but in constraining him, that will be a Christian, to mortify the love of sin in himself (as his sin declares it to be alive in him), is the power of the Church in remitting sin exercised; and in pronouncing sentence of absolution, in what form soever, the power of assuring the same.

§ 29. Let us now look over these same scriptures again: for by them, having no other, we must judge, whether this power extends to all sins, so that no sin after baptism can be pardoned without the ministry of the Church and the use of it; whether it extend only to notorious sinners, as an abatement of the sentence of excommunication (which being liable

nus easm dispositionem quae descripta est praecedere debere, et potestatem habe jure naturali et Divina esse restringendam. Est enim juris naturalis et Divini innocentes absolvere," &c. &c. Id., ibid., p. 13. 2. D.—The saying "de Baptismi absolvitur et reviviscencia," more commonly occurs in connection with a different subject, viz., the effect of baptism received "cum fictione ipsum non frustrante," as e. g. heretical or schismatical baptism with true matter and form, "atque ideo vires suas, cum illa (fictio) recedit, exerente:" see Morinus, ibid., lib. ix. c. 13. pp. 654. l. A, sq.

1 Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. iv. § 16, xxxiii. § 6—11.
to, upon demonstration of repentance, they are admitted to be reconciled by it; or, lastly, whether there be some other reason to determine the extent of it. Surely he that argues\(^1\),—because God hath given His disciples this power, and the Church after them, therefore He hath commanded all sinners to use it, denying all hope of pardon to them, that do not use it by declaring their sins to them whom the Church trusts for it,—makes a lame consequence. For will any reason allow him to say, that otherwise this power signifies nothing, when it is granted to extend to the curing of all notorious sins?

§ 30. That which we learn of it from St. Paul to the Corinthians, without all controversy, concerns no sins but such. The sin of him, that had married his father's wife, was so well known, that it had raised a party in the Church of such as pretended it to be consistent with Christianity. And when [2 Cor. xii. 21.] St. Paul is afraid, that, coming to them, he shall be fain to put many of them to penance for the sins, which having committed, they would have made no demonstration of conversion from them before his coming; it is evident enough, that he speaks of no secret sins: because the punishment, which he pretends to inflict, is for standing out against his letters in their sins.

§ 31. As for that sin, which the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to exclude from reconcilement with God by the Church,—apostasy from Christianity;—it is necessarily and essentially a manifest sin, because it consists in the visible renouncing of that profession, which had been visibly made.

§ 32. But, coming to St. James, we find, that he commands the priests of the Church to be sent for, promising forgiveness of sins upon their prayers. And, therefore, when he procedeth to say, "Confess your sins to one another, and pray for one another;" we gather, that he promiseth the pardon of those sins, which the sick person shall have confessed to the priests of the Church\(^1\). For if it be requisite for obtaining the prayers of a brother for the pardon of our sins, that we confess them to him; he that prescribes it, must needs understand those sins, which he promises forgiveness upon their prayers, to be declared to them afore. It is

---

\(^{\text{1}}\) See Bellarmine, De Pœnit., lib. iii. c. 2; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 1349. D, sq.

\(^{\text{21}}\) See above, § 21.
therefore manifest, that the apostle here delivereth a precept of confessing sin both to one another and to the priests of the Church: supposing the cure of sin [*to m*] be known to all Christians by the tradition of our common Christianity, and the visible custom and practice of all Churches; by works of humiliation and mortification, of devotion and mercy, whereby satisfaction is made not only to the Church (which receiveth offence by visible sin), but also to God (Who is offended by all sin), in that sense and to that effect, which hath been justified in the second Book [*a*]: namely, to the appeasing of His wrath, to the regaining of His grace and favour, to the restoring of the covenant of grace contracted at our baptism, which sin had made void; and therefore in virtue of that satisfaction for all sin, which was once made by our Lord Christ upon the cross, without which, that which we are able to do towards this effect, would all have been to no purpose. Whereupon [it follows*], that the Church is not satisfied in such a case, but supposing that God is satisfied first, and that the prayers, which the Church maketh for the pardon of sin, are granted and made, or ought to be granted and made, upon presumption that the sinner is in a way of obtaining pardon of God by those prayers, upon his submission to the use of those means, which either the priests of the Church by the authority thereof shall enjoin, or a brother by his skill and discretion shall advise. This being unavoidably the meaning of the apostles: first, it is manifest, that, all Christians being directed by the apostle to have recourse to the keys of the Church for the cure of sin in the danger of death, they may be more obliged to the same course in time of health; because it may then be used; whereas in danger of death, though it must be prescribed, yet it cannot be used but by him that surviveth: secondly, it is further implied, that the sin which a man confesseth to his brother, if he be not able to advise a meet cure for it, is, not only by the party, but by him also, to be brought to the Church. And so, in both cases, you have an injunction of the apostle for the submitting of secret sin to the keys of the Church. But you have

* Added from MS.
* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxiii. § 1—11.
* These words, or something to the same effect, appear to have dropped out of the text.
also a possibility for the cure of sin without the authority of the Church; inasmuch as it had been too impertinent for the apostle to have given a precept of "confessing sin to one another," if no sin could be pardoned without having recourse to the Church.

§ 33. The same is the effect of St. John's words:—"If a man see his brother sin a sin not unto death," &c. For it is manifest, that that sin which one man sees, is not notorious to the Church. And yet the distinction, which St. John maketh between the sin which he commandeth a private Christian to pray for, and the sins which he commandeth not the Church to pray for, with the difficulties that the primitive Church had about it, shew, that those sins, which private advice cannot cure, he would have brought to the Church. And St. John's meaning is, that a man should pray for such sins of his brother, as he is sure are not "to death:" supposing, first, his brother disposed by himself, or by his advice, to take the course that may qualify him for forgiveness. But if it prove doubtful, whether "to death" or not: the apostle, by saying, that there are some sins which he referr eth to the Church, whether to pray for pardon of them (to wit, in order to restoring them to the communion of the Church) or not, supposeth, that they are reported to the Church by him that saw them, when the Church saw them not; but first supposing, that they might possibly have been cured without bringing them to the Church. And if these things be true, then is the "bringing of a sinner back from the error of his way" (according to that precept of St. James which followeth) an obligation that is to be discharged, not only by the office of a private Christian in convicting a private Christian of his sin and of the means that he is to use for his recovery, but also by bringing him to the Church, if the case require it: which obligation will necessarily lie upon the sinner himself, in the first place; but so, that his own skill and fidelity to his own salvation may possibly furnish him his cure at home.

§ 34. The tenor of our Saviour's words throughly en- forceth the same: according to that which I observed in the first Book, p. 140, that all Christians may be said to bind

* Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xviii. § 42, sq.
sin, by shewing a Christian his sin, in case he refuse that
cure, which he that convicts him of his sin, convicts him that
[he ⁹] is to use; and to loose sin, in case he embrace it: but
this, in the inner court of the conscience, between God and
the soul. For though the words of our Lord—"If thy bro-
ther offend thee, tell him of it between him and thee."—
extend to private injuries, obliging a Christian first to seek
reparation by the good will of his party upon remonstrance
of the wrong, then not to seek it out of the Church but by
the Church; yet they necessarily comprehend all sins which
another man knows, which to him are 'offences.' And
therefore, when our Saviour saith, "If he hear thee, thou
hast gained thy brother;" it is manifest, that the effect of
His promise, which followeth,—"Whatsoever ye bind on
earth, shall be bound in heaven,"—is obtained by the act of
a private Christian, without recourse to the public authority
of the Church. And who will believe, that the skill and
fidelity of some private Christian may not furnish him as
good a cure, as he can expect to learn from any private
Christian', to whom he can have recourse? And yet the
process of our Lord's discourse shews, that the intent of it
concerns in chief the exercise of the keys of God's Church,
even upon those sins which are not notorious.

§ 35. Which whoso considers, cannot refuse to grant, that
St. Paul's injunction, for the restoring of him that is surprised
in sin, concerns both the office of private Christians, and
also of a whole Church and the body of it*. And, truly,
considering what hath been said concerning Scripture and
tradition†, it cannot seem strange, that the apostles, leaving
such authority with the Churches of their founding with
general instructions to those whom they trusted them with,
writing to the bodies of those Churches things respectively
concerning all Christians, should give directions concerning
all in general terms; which the visible practice of the said
Churches might determine to the respective office of each
quality and estate in those Churches: no more, than that
our Lord, finding the power of the keys not yet visible be-
fore Christianity, should propose His instructions in that

⁹ Added from MS.
⁷ See above, § 22.
⁸ So in orig. text. ? from the Church or any particular priest of the Church.
⁹ Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. vii. § 7, &c.
generality, which only His apostles' orders, and the practice of their Churches upon their instructions, determineth. For the power of the keys in the Church enables it further, until the world's end, to limit further whatsoever shall appear to require further determination, to the end of binding and loosing of sin which it importeth, according as the present state of the Church in every age shall require.

§ 36. Let us now consider, that, though I have made evidence by consequence from the writings of the apostles, that remission of sins committed after baptism may be obtained without the keys of the Church, yet it is hard to find any express promise to that effect in their writings; unless it be that of St. John's first Epistle: in which, notwithstanding, a limitation of that confession, which the apostle requires, to the Church and to those that are trusted by the Church, may reasonably be understood, supposing the way of curing sin by the ministry of the Church to have been customary and therefore known at that time. And, on the contrary, though I do believe these consequences to be unreprovable, yet it is to be considered, that St. Paul's indulgence seems to be granted upon a particular occasion, incident to distemper the ordinary course of the Church; namely, the prevailing of some sin to a faction of some great or the greatest part of the Church: which, as it necessarily intercepteth the use of the power of the keys, though provided and ordained by God for the curing of the said sins, so can it by no means argue, that God hath not appointed it for the ordinary means of curing them.

§ 37. As for the consequence, which was made* from the wherein testimonies of the Law and the prophets and of the Gospels before the establishment of the covenant of baptism, to shew, that they take effect also in sins after baptism; it may easily be considered, that they take place no further, than that disposition which is requisite to the forgiveness of those sins, whereby the grace of baptism is violated, may be supposed to be produced without help of the Church. Which as I conceive I have proved to be possible, so I conceive no man living can prove to be so easy, that all those who stand

---

* Corrected from MS.; "intercepted," in orig. text.

† Above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxiii. § 5—8.
in need of the remedy can presume (upon so good ground as the safety of the soul requires) to obtain it, or to have obtained it, of themselves, without that help which the ministry appointed by God in His Church furnishes. Which if it be true, it will inevitably follow, that the most part of Christians are for the most part bound in conscience to have recourse to the power of the Church, and the keys thereof, for the cure of those sins which are not of themselves notorious: and that other Christians may be tied in conscience to bring them to the Church for it, by making known those sins, which otherwise are not notorious; to wit, when they cannot reasonably presume, that of themselves they will apply themselves to the means which the cure requires. And if this be true, it will also follow, that it is in the power of the Church to make rules (of force to bind the consciences of those who are of the Church), limiting the terms upon which they shall stand bound to have recourse to the Church for that purpose.

§ 88. Indeed, had the apostles delivered any such faith,—that a man is justified, by believing, that he is appointed by God to salvation immediately upon consideration of Christ without any disposition qualifying him for it (only limiting his right in this appointment to the time that this appointment is revealed to him, which revelation is that faith which alone justifieth);—I would then confess, that this interpretation of Scripture would no way be receivable: because, indeed, no such scriptures could have proceeded from those that delivered such a faith. It would then be sufficient, that he, to whom this predestination is revealed by justifying faith, should say, "Lord have mercy upon me," at breathing out his last; or, rather, it would be needless, nay damnable, for him to desire that mercy, which if he were not sure of before he said it, he must be damned for want of that faith which only saveth. But if all Christians be justified by sincerely undertaking the profession of Christianity, and that this sincerity is inconsistent with doing contrary to that which this profession containeth; then let all men of discretion and conscience judge (not, whether the Church hath reason to believe, that every such a one will voluntarily charge himself with that humiliation which may seem to
mortify the passions that made him sin afore, and make his profession sincere for the future, but), whether himself hath reason to believe, that either he knows how to value it, or will effectually perform it, not being instructed and obliged to it by the Church.

§ 39. Seeing, then, on the [one] side, that God hath pro-
vided the ministry of the Church for the purpose (the effect of it in reconciling notorious sins being undeniable); on the other, [that] no reason can presume, that all Christians either know, or will supply to themselves, the work and effect of that ministry, being left to themselves: it followeth, that, though voluntary penance is not necessary for obtaining remission of every sin, yet it is necessary for the body of the Church, because there is no ground of presumption that the sins thereof are or can be cleansed without it.

CHAPTER X.

THE SECTS OF THE MONTANISTS, NOVATIANS, DONATISTS, AND MELETIANS,
EVIDENCE THE CURE OF SIN BY PENCE TO BE A TRADITION OF THE APOSTLES. SO DO TH THE AGREEMENT OF PRIMITIVE PRACTICE WITH THEIR WRITINGS. INDULGENCE OF REGULAR PENANCE FROM THE APOSTLES. CONFESSION OF SECRET SINS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. THAT NO SIN CAN BE CURED WITHOUT THE KEYS OF THE CHURCH, THERE IS NO TRADITION FROM THE APOSTLES. THE NECESSITY OF CONFESSION OF SECRET SINS, WHEREUPON IT STANDS.

AND this is that, which the tradition of the Church, that is, the original and universal practice of penance (evidencing that it could have no other beginning than the authority of the apostles, which only could oblige the whole Church),

§ 2. I told you at the beginning*, how near Montanus his heresy was to the death of St. John, when the age of the apostles ended. And it will not be amiss to tell you here, that I shall shew you in another place*, that in all proba-

* Added from MS.
+ See Bk. of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., ch. ix.
* See below, c. xxix. (misprinted xxviii. in folio edition), § 38, 39.
bility it is still elder by above twenty years than Eusebius\(^b\) his account (which there I allowed) doth make it. The pre-
tence thereof (among other austerities, which they pretended
to impose for rules upon the whole Church upon the auth-
ority of prophecies, inspirations, and revelations, which they
had or pretended to have\(^c\)) was to exclude some great crimes
from reconciliation with God by the means of the Church;
that is to say, in the language of those times, from being
admitted to penance. I demand now of any man, that will
employ a little of his common sense upon the business,
whether there had been any subject for Montanus to pretend
the introducing of greater austerity than was practised in
the Church in this point, if there had been no practice of
penance then in the Church, capable of greater strictness
than was commonly practised\(^d\). And if his common sense
gives no sentence, let him advise, either with that which
remains of Tertullian for Montanus, or against him in the
records of the Church; and tell me, whether they do con-
demn the reconciling of sin by penance prescribed in the
Church, or that strictness which Montanus pretended to in-
trude over and above the common practice: evidencing
therefore the force of that penance, which [was\(^e\)] generally
practised, by condemning him for endeavouring to enhance
it. Thus much for certain; had not Montanus pretended to
impose the austerity which he affected for a rule upon the
rest of the Church, the occasion for which he was excluded
out of the Church had not been. He had reduced the
Churches of Phrygia to his sense, rather by the credit of
those revelations than by any authority which he stood [pos-
sessed\(^f\)] of in them, so far as I learn; and from thence it
came to pass, that his doctrine continued so long in force
there, that the sect is [called\(^g\)] "\textit{Kata phrygas}"—"that
which the Phrygians follow," and the sectaries, \textit{Cataphryges}\(^b\)
in Latin. But when (according to the strict correspondence

\(\text{\textsuperscript{b}}\) See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr.,
c. ix. § 12. note b.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\) See ibid., c. x. § 9. note t.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{d}}\) See ibid., c. ix. § 12, sq. : and Re-
view of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 32.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{e}}\) Corrected from MS.; " professed,"
in orig. text.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{f}}\) Corrected from MS.; "call," in
orig. text.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{g}}\) See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr.,
c. x. § 11. note z.
that then was exercised between all Churches) it came to be communicated to the Churches of Asia: we find by Eusebius, how his pretence of revelations was rejected as counterfeit, or as unsufficient; and by consequence the laws, which upon the authority of them he pretended to impose upon the Church. That, being rejected by the neighbour Churches, he travelled to Rome, or sent to Rome to approve them there (that, being so received, he might upon new grounds tender them to his neighbours); we learn by Tertullian. That, being rejected there also, Tertullian, out of the passion he had for them, being drawn away from the Church, maintained their profession in a Church erected by schism upon that account at Carthage till the times of St. Augustin (by whom they were reduced to the communion of the Catholic Church); we learn by Sirmondus his Prædestinatus, and the same St. Augustin. But otherwise the Phrygians were counted sectaries by the rest of the Church, that is, necessarily schismatics, and perhaps heretics; if indeed, by being separated from the body of the Church, they became guilty of those excesses, which they are charged with by Epiphanius, St. Jerome, and others. Of these particulars you may see [an account] in St. Augustin De Hæresibus, and Sirmondus his Prædestinatus, both of them, Hæresi xxvi.

1 Corrected from MS.; "law," in orig. text.
2 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 9. note t.
3 See below, c. xix. § 2.
4 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 11. note y.
5 See ibid., note x.
6 See ibid., § 11.


* S. Hieron., Epist. xxvii. (alias liv.), Ad Marcellam; Op., tom. iv. P. 2. pp. 64, 65: who accuses them of believing Montanus to be the promised Paraclete, and of Sabellianism, and of holding second marriages to be fornication, and of certain horrid rites in the eucharist: which last however he does not wholly believe.


* These or some similar words seem to have dropped out of the text.

* S. Aug., De Hæres., c. xxvi.; Op., tom. viii. p. 10. A—C: mentioning the same points as S. Jerome, except that he says nothing of Sabellianism.

and lxxxvi. But all the while the subject of this separation is the discipline of penance, received by the whole Church as from the apostles; the limitation of the practice thereof being the ground, upon which the difference is stated. And for the ground of this ground: whether it could then be pretended, that the keys of the Church could do no more than cure the scandal of notorious sin, on the one side; or whether it could then be pretended, on the other side, that the keys of the Church import any power to pardon sin immediately, not supposing that disposition which qualifies them for pardon visible to the Church, and procured by those actions, which the authority of the Church enjoineth: all this I am content to refer to that common sense, which is capable to understand these particulars.

§ 3. I shall not need to say much of the Novatians at Rome and elsewhere, the Donatists in Africa, of the Meletians in Egypt, having said this of the Montanists; all of them (if we regard the subject of the separations, which they made in several parts of the Church) being nothing else but branches of the same sect, and forsaking the unity of the Church for their part of that cause which engaged Montanus: the Novatians, because they would not endure, that those, who fell away from the faith in the persecution of Decius, should be re-admitted to the communion of the Church upon demonstration of repentance; the Meletians, for the same cause, in Egypt, under the persecution of Diocletian; the Donatists, upon some appertenance of the same cause. Only they serve to evidence the discipline of penance to have been as universal as the Church of Christ; when no part of it is found free from debates about the terms limiting the exercise of it. They serve also to evidence the ground and the pretence of the power of the keys in the discipline of penance, by the same reason which I alleged afore.

§ 4. After these times, when the customs of the Church (which from the beginning was governed by unwritten law,}

---

* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xix. § 6.
* See ibid., c. x. § 40: and below, c. xix. § 14.
* Scil. in § 2.
delivered by word of mouth of the apostles, but limited more and more by the governors of several Churches) began to be both reduced into writing, and also more expressly determined by the canons of several councils, greater and less: it were too vain to prove that by discourse, which of itself is as evident, as it is evident that there are such rules extant, which in their time had the force of law to those parts of the Church, for which they were respectively made. Only I do observe the agreement, that is found between the original practice of the Church in this point, and that order which I have shewed you out of the apostles' writings\(^b\); evidencing that interpretation, which I have given of them, by that rule which common sense enforces, that the meaning and intent of every law is to be measured by the primitive practice of it. For we see so much doubt made, whether those three great crimes of idolatry, murder, and adultery, were to be reconciled by penance (that is, by the visible and outward demonstration of inward repentance) to the Church, not only by Montanus, but partly by Novatians; that the\(^c\) great Church of Antioch remained doubtful a great while, whether Cornelius or Novatianus should be acknowledged the true bishop of Rome\(^d\). We see the Eliberitan canons (which were unquestionably made divers years before the council at Nicea, and therefore may be counted as ancient as any that the Church hath) exclude some branches of those sins from reconciliation with the Church\(^e\). We see this \([\text{rigour}^f]\) abated by the succeeding discipline of the Church\(^g\).

§ 5. It is indeed said in the Church of Rome at this time, that the ground of the heresy (as without ground they call it\(^b\)) of the Montanists and Novatians was this: that, [The true cause of the schismas of Montanists and Novatians.]

\(^{b}\) Above, c. ix. § 15, sq.
\(^{c}\) Corrected from MS.; "that," in orig. text.
\(^{d}\) See Bk. I. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. x. § 14, sq.
\(^{e}\) See below, § 6, notes m—d.
\(^{f}\) Corrected from MS.; "vigor," in orig. text.
\(^{g}\) See § 7.
\(^{b}\) See Morinus, De Pænit., lib. v. c. 1. § 11. p. 252. 1. D, E,—"Post Tertullianum et Montanistarum hæresim, qui macchiae, homicidio, et idololatria, veniam ab ecclesia dari posse negabant, ecclesiæ disciplina in poenitentes severior esse ceæpit; sic ratione postulante, peccata hominum quo frequentiora sunt, eo severioribus peenis esse coercenda." Morinus, ibid., lib. iv. c. 10. § 1. p. 185. 2. C.—c. 9. (pp. 182. 2. C, sq.) is employed in proving, that "peenas aeceleribus imposita a nascente ecclesia ad hæresim usque Montani breves admodum fuisse:" and c. 10. (pp. 185. 2. C, sq.), that "easdem peenas a Montano ad Novatum paulo aquae, breves tamen admodum fuisse cum sequente severitate comparatas."
acknowledging the Church to have power to forgive less sins, they (the Novatians) denied it the power to forgive apostasy or idolatry; to which the Montanists added murder and adultery. But I have shewed in my Book of the Right of the Church, pp. 17—27, that within the Church also, as well as among the Montanists and Novatians, some of these sins were not admitted to communion; no, not at the point of death. And that there never was any opinion in the ancient Church, that the Church hath any power to forgive sin immediately, but only by the medicine of penance which it enjoineth; I refer myself to that which here followeth. Now it is plain, that neither those parts of the Church, nor the Novatians, did hold those sins desperate, but exhorted them to penance as their cure in God's sight; agreeing in not re-admitting them, whether for the maintenance of discipline, or for fear the Church, warranting their pardon who might prove not qualified for it, should become guilty of their sins: according to St. Paul, 1 Tim. v. 22, "Lay hands suddenly on no man, nor partake in other men's sins." For St. John, and the apostle to the Hebrews, had authorized the Church to make difficulty of it; though St. Paul had re-admitted a branch of one of them (the incestuous person at Corinth), whether for the unity of that Church, then in danger to be divided upon that occasion, or as reasonably satisfied of the truth of his repentance. But when the zeal of Christianity decreased, as the number of Christians increased within, and persecution without withdrew so many that there was no means left to preserve the body without abating this severity (the number of apostates in some persecutions being considerable to the number of Christians); we need seek no other reason, why the Montanists and Novatians should be schismatics (not properly heretics), than their separating from the Church rather than condescend to that which the body of the Church found requisite to be granted.

§ 6. Let us see what crimes they are, which the Eliberitan

doloribus cumulum, ut etiam cleri portionem sua strage perstringeret, &c.
"Quoniam infesta tempestat, quae plebem nostram ex maxima parte prostravit, hunc quoque addidit nostris

c. i. § 19—28.

§ 24.
canons (that is, the canons of the council of Elvira in Spain) exclude from the communion, even in case of death. As, if a man at age after baptism commit adultery in the temple of an idol (c. i°). If an idol-priest, having been baptized, shall sacrifice again (c. ii°). If such a one after penance shall have committed adultery (c. iii°). If a Christian kill a man by witchcraft, wherein there is idolatry (c. vi°). If a Christian commit adultery after penance (c. vii°). If a woman, leaving her husband without cause, marry another (c. viii°). If a father or mother sell a child into the stews, or a child itself (c. xii°). If a professsed virgin shall live in uncleanness (c. xiii°). If a man marry his daughter to an idol-priest (c. xvii°). If a clergyman commit adultery (c. xviii°). If he, who is admitted to communion (upon adultery) in danger of death, shall commit adultery again (c. xliii°). If a woman kill the child which

catus, placuit nec in fine habere eum communionem." Ibid., can. 7; ibid.
° "ITEM femina, que, nulla praecedente causa, reliquerint viros suos, et se copulaverint alteris, nec in fine accipient communionem." Ibid., can. 8; ibid., D.
° "Mater vel parentes vel quielibet fidelis, si lenocrinum exerceret, eo quod alienum vendiderit corpus, vel potius suum, placuit eam nec in fine accipere communionem." Ibid., can. 12; ibid., p. 972. A, B.
° "Virgines que se Deo dicaverint, si pactum prodiderint virginitatis atque eodem libidini servierint, non intelligentes quod amiserint, placuit nec in fine eis dandum esse communionem." Ibid., can. 13; ibid., B.
° "Si qui forte sacerdotibus idolorum filias suas junxerint, placuit nec in fine eis dandum esse communionem." Ibid., can. 17; ibid., E.
° "Episcopi, presbyteri, et diacones, si in ministerio positi, detecti fuerint quod sint moechati, placuit, et propter scandalum, et propter profanum crimini, nec in fine eoa commodo accipere deberunt." Ibid., can. 19. (18 in the text is a mistake); ibid., p. 973. A.
° "Si quia fidelis, habens uxorem, non semel sed semper fuerit moechatus, in fine mortis est conveniendum. Quod si se promiserit cessaturum, detur ei communio. Si resuscitatus rursum fuerit moechatus, placuit ulterior non lu-
she hath conceived of adultery (c. lxiii\(a\)). If a clergyman, knowing that his wife hath committed adultery, dismiss her not (c. lxv\(b\)). Sodomites (c. lxxi\(c\)). If a woman, forsaking an adulterer whom she had married afore, marry another (c. lxxii\(d\)). If a Christian be slain or confiscate upon the information of a Christian (c. lxxiii\(e\)). If a man accuse a clergyman (to wit, criminally, as a subject a subject, before secular powers) of a crime which he cannot prove (c. lxxv\(f\)).

§ 7. We see by these very particulars an abatement of that which Tertullian stood upon, that no adultery should ever be restored to communion again. For here penance is allowed adultery the first time, by the seventh\(g\). And she, that leaves her husband and marries another, is allowed the communion in danger of death, as also after her first husband is dead, by the ninth\(b\). And so are virgins that turn whores, if afterwards they repent and abstain before death, by the thirteenth\(l\). So for murder: a Christian woman, that kills her maid, is admitted to penance by the fifth\(k\);
and a catechumenae (that is, a woman professing Christianity before baptism), that kills the child conceived of adultery, by the sixty-eighth. So in idolatry: those, who only wear such a crown as those that sacrificed did wear, but sacrifice not nor are at the charge of sacrificing, by the fifty-fifth. And truly that seventh canon, which allows penance upon adultery only the first time, but refuses the communion the second time, even in danger of death, is manifestly more severe than that rule, which divers of the fathers (Origen, In Levit. xxv. Hom. xv.); St. Ambrose, De Paenit. ii. 10, 11; St. Augustin, Epist. liii. 9 liv. Homil. 1. 1) do mention as in force and use at their time, to wit, that penance cannot be done the second time. For though a man be not re-admitted to communion by penance upon falling into the same or a more grievous crime the second time, yet may he be allowed the communion in danger of death. Just as St. Ambrose, Ad Virginem Lapsam cap. viii., censures her to do penance till death.

1 "Catechumenae, si per adulterium conceperit, premiaverit" (leg. "et conceptum necaverit"). "Placuit in fine baptismari." Ibid., can. 68; ibid., p. 977. E.
2 "Sacerdotes qui tantum" (add. "sacrificantium") "coronam portant, nec sacrificant, nec de suis sumpstibus alicud ad idola præstans, placuit post biennium accipere communionem." Ibid., can. 55; ibid., p. 976. D.
3 "Communion of the," in orig. text; by an apparent misprint.
4 "In gravioribus enim criminibus semel tantum vel raro paenitentiae conceditur locusa. Ista vero communia, quam frequentiter incurrimus, semper paenitentiam recipiunt et sine intermediae redimuntur." Origen., In Levit. c. xxv. Hom. xv. § 2; Op., tom. ii. p. 262. 2. C.
5 See the passages above, in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 20. note y.
7 "In tantum autem hominum aliquando iniquitas progradetur, ut etiam post actam paenitentiam, post altarii reconciliationem, vel similia vel graviora committant, et tamen Deus facit etiam super tales oriri solem Suum; nec minus tribuit quam ante tribuebat largissima munera vitae ac salutis. Et quamvis eis in ecclesia locus humilli mus paenitentiae non concedatur, Deus tamen super eis." &c. Id., Epist. cliii. (Epist. liv. edd. bef. Ben.), Ad Macedonium, § 7; Op., tom. ii. p. 526. C.—And see above, in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. i. § 20. note y.
8 Serm. eccli. (Serm. 1. ex Homil. 1. edd. bef. Bened.) treats "de utilitate agendae paenitentiarum" (Op., tom. v. pp. 1350. D, sq.) but does not expressly assert, that formal penance from mortal sins cannot be repeated: unless that S. Aug. contrasts such penance at length with the daily repentance for sins of infirmity needed by all Christians. Neither is there anything of the kind in Serm. eccliii., on the same subject (Serm. xxvii. ex Homil. 1. edd. bef. Bened.); ibid., pp. 1363. B, sq.
9 "Sed tu quaem jam ingressa es agonem paenitentiae, insiste misera: forter inhaere tanquam in naufragii tabulae, sperans per ipsam te de profundo criminum liberari; inhaere paenitentiae usque ad extremum vitae; nec tibi presumeris ab humanae die veniam dari, quia decipit te qui hoc tibi polliceris voluerit. Quae enim proprie in Dominum peccasti, ab Ipso te convenit in die judicii exspectare remedium." S. Ambros., De Lapsu Virginis Con-
§ 8. Innocent I., Pope, *Epist. ii.*, expressly affirms, that this was done in consideration of the times; because, if men were lightly admitted after having fallen in persecution, who would hazard life for the profession of his faith? but that afterwards, either the Church must be Novatians, or grant penance in danger of death. And truly the breach, which the Novatians made, must needs oblige the Church to redmit unto communion in danger of death. But if the Church were obliged to be strict, when there was fear of persecution, lest all should fall away; then was it obliged to abate, when many were fallen away, that the body thereof might be restored and restored. And the words of Innocent that follow, are sufficient to shew, how much the Church then presumed upon that penance, that absolution, that communion, which a man was admitted to upon confession of sin in danger of death: for he saith, "*Tribuetur ergo cum pænitentia extrema communio*"—"*The last communion therefore shall be allowed with penance*." Now it is evident by the canons which Gratian hath compiled (XXVI. *Quest. vi.* [cap.] 77, [et] 8*, et *Quest. vii.* cap. 1*), that, when a man

secrate, c. viii. § 35; Op., tom. ii. p. 315. C, D.

* The question put to Innocent, was, "Quid de his observati operant qui post baptismum omni tempore incontinentem voluptibus dediti, in extrema fine vitæ sum pænitentiam simul et reconciliationem communio experscunt.*" The answer sets forth both the ancient and the more recent custom of the Church—"*De his observatio prior, durior; posterior, interveniente misericordia, inclinator est: nam constituto prior tenuit, ut concederetur ein pænitentia, sed communio negaretur. Nam cum illia temporibus crebris persecutionum essent, ne communiom concessa facilitas homines de reconciliationem securos non revocaret a lapsu, negata merito communio est, concessa pænitentia, et totum penitus negaretur; et duriorum remissionem fecit temporis ratio. Sed posteaquam Dominus noster pacem ecclesiæ Suis reddidit, jam terrore depulso, communio dani anebuntibus placuit, et propter Domini misericordiam quasi viaticum profecturum, et ne Novatiani heretici, negantis veniam, asperitatem et duritiam sequi videamur. Tribuetur*" ("*tribuetur," in Morinus) "*ergo cum pænitentia extrema communio, ut homines hujusmodi, vel in supremis suis pænitentibus, miserant Salvatore nostro, a perpetuo exitio vindicentur."* Innocent I., *Epist. iii.* Ad Exuperium, c. 2; ap. Labb. Conc. tom. ii. p. 1253. C, D. —See Morinus, *De Pœm., lib. x. 0c. 1. § 8, sq. and 2. § 1—4; pp. 721. 1, C, sq.

* See last note.

7 Decreti Pars II. Causa xxvi. Qu. vii, An Excommunicatus ab Episcopo possit reconciliari a Presbytero, illo inconsulto: under which question, canon 6. ex Concilio Martini Braçacensis, A.D. 572, enacta, that, "*si (quis) in desperatione positus post acceptam communionem iterum sanus fuerit factus, tantum oratione paritceps sit; sacramentum vero non recipient, donec constitutum pœnitentiam impleat tempus*" (tom. i. p. 354. b. ed. Pithazi FF. Paris. 1687) —and can. 7. ex Conc. Arausiac, A.D. 441; that, in a similar case, "*si supervixerint, stent in ordine pœnitentium*" (ibid.).

8 Ibid., can. 8. ex Conc. Carth. IV. A.D. 398 (ibid., p. 355. A.): that "*is, qui pœnitentiam in infirmitate petit, si casu, dum ad eum sacerdos invitatus venit, oppressus inirmitate obmutuerit vel in phrenesim versus fuerit,
was admitted to penance upon confession in danger of death, the communion was given him provisionally, as well to obtain the grace of God to strengthen him in that exigent, as for the quiet of his conscience: but nevertheless he stood bound over to perform the penance, which was or should be enjoined, in case he recovered. And therefore, when Pope Celestine I., *Epist.* i., inveighs against those who refused absolution and the communion in danger of death; and Leo I. Pope, *Epist.* lix.5, orders, that they be reconciled by giving them the communion: it is to be supposed, that they understand this penance to be enjoined in that case, because the custom of the Church required it.

§ 9. And this serves to void the doubt that may be made, what the keys of the Church can have to do in the remitting of sins as soon as they are confessed, which serve to loose sin no further than they serve to procure and to create that disposition which qualifies for forgiveness.

§ 10. You saw afore in the second Book4, what difficulty the ancient Church made in warranting the salvation of those that repent upon their death-bed, though they proceeded to submit themselves and their sins to the keys of the Church for their absolution and the communion of the eucharist at their departure. And though Gennadius (*De Dogmatibus Eccles.* cap. lxxx.5) say freely, that “he is a Nova-

---

4 "Penance upon a death-bed, how far to be considered as inadequate.


6 "Praecepta ab olii sequecantur indubitante credimus, etiam si in ultimo
tian and not a Christian," that presumes not faithfully of
God’s merciful purpose to save that which was lost, even in
him that departs upon confessing his sin; yet still this is but
a presumption of what may be, not a warrant of what is,
which the power of the keys regularly used promises. Other-
wise, what would Gennadius say to the great council of Arles
under Constantine, which denies absolution in that case,
can. i.": as you see the Eliberitan canons e do. True it is,
which St. Cyprian saith; "Nunquam sera est pœnitentia, si
sit vera"—"Repentance is never late, if it be true." But
who will maintain that to be true, which the terror of death
and remorse of conscience may rack out of him, in whom the
love of God and goodness hath not formed that resolution of
maintaining his professed Christianity, which makes God the
end of all his actions? whenas all that is done in such a
case, by common experience, may be imputed to a true
grounded desire of avoiding punishment for his own sake,
with a superficial desire of doing well for God’s sake.

§ 11. Though, on the other side, it may be presumed,
that such a one is not first moved with dislike of his sin,
when first he submits it to the keys of the Church: but hath
first done many such acts of sincere contrition, as his own
judgment directed him to, for the gaining of God’s grace;
and at length, to give himself further satisfaction, resolves to
humble himself, not only to the declaring of his own shame,
but to the undergoing of that penance, upon performance
whereof the rules of the Church also warrant his forgiveness.
§ 12. Between these contrary presumptions, the primitive severity of the Church, it appears, refused absolution and the communion, even in danger of death, to some of the most grievous sins (which afterwards was thought fit to be abated): not proclaiming despair to any sinner, but to oblige him not lightly to presume upon pardon of that sin, which the Church could never presume, that a man can repent him of enough. For, on the other side, it appears, what inconvenience the granting of reconciliation to all at the point of death may produce, if the intent of the Church in binding over to penance him that escapes, be not understood: namely, to give men cause to presume of pardon by the Church, when the keys thereof cannot have their operation in producing the disposition that is requisite.

§ 13. And thus the primitive practice of the Church seems to demonstrate, not only the tradition of the apostles concerning penance and excommunication, which it abateth, and the keys of the Church, which it manageth; but also the power, which it exerciseth, not to consist in pardoning sin at large and immediately, but in procuring that disposition to which the Gospel hath proclaimed forgiveness, and (upon knowledge thereof) in assuring the pardon which it pronounceth. For whose considereth the premisses, can never be so mad as to imagine, that men were refused reconcilement even at the point of death, or reconciled with a reservation of penance to be performed if they survived, merely for the satisfaction of the Church and the example of others; but because the Church remained not satisfied, that God was satisfied with their present disposition, as qualifying them for pardon according to His promise.

§ 14. Some men have mistaken themselves so far as to imagine, that, when a man was admitted to absolution by imposition of hands and the communion in danger of death by the ancient Church, he could stand bound no further to any penance. But it is very evident in the practice of the ancient Church, that, in regard some sins were not admitted

---

1 Morinus (De Pœnit., lib. x. c. 14. pp. 751. l. D. sq.) argues, that “Ecclœsia saltæm Latina annis prope trecentis omnis pænitentia ecclesiastica per reconciliacionem in morbo acept-tam finiebatur;” which assertion he afterwards extends though with some hesitation to the Greek Church: see however his statement in the preceding chapter, pp. 749. l. E. sq.
BOOK III.

To reconcilement by penance, therefore it concerned the penitent, in the first place, to make suit to be admitted; which being granted, and he having undertaken the penance imposed upon him, in the next place, he was admitted to the prayers of the Church (at all the solemn assemblies of the Church during the time of his penance) with imposition of hands, as the means to obtain pardon at God’s hands. So imposition of hands signified not absolution; but the way to it, and capacity of it, supposing the performance of penance imposed. And this is "petere penitentiam, et accipere penitentiam per manus impositionem", in the ancient canons (by name, Concil. Tolet. xi. can. 12) — "to demand penance, and to accept of penance by imposition of hands:" as appears by that form of the public service of the Church, which you have in the Constitutions, ii. 8, 9, where you have the form of prayer to be offered for penitents, when they were dismissed before the celebration of the eucharist, he that prayeth holding his hands over them kneeling. Neither was there any other absolution than this in use, according to the ancient custom of the Church. He, who, having declared himself offended at himself for that which he had done, had obtained of the Church to be admitted to penance, for the time that his penance continued, was prayed for by the Church, that his sin might be pardoned, in order to communion with the Church. The time of his penance being completed, his absolution was the restoring of him to communion with the Church in the sacrament of the eucharist. This is that absolution, upon which the Church warranteth his pardon; not by pronouncing him pardoned, but supposing him qualified for it by that disposition which his penance had produced. And though, afterwards, the form of absolution changed, and was pronounced by way of sentence, not by way of prayer desired: yet was there still the

---

1 See Bingham, XIX. ii. 4.
2 Corrected in MS.; "propter," in orig. text.
3 See Prim. Gov. of Churches, a. xi. § 2. note e.
4 Qui penitentiam in mortis agit periculio, non diutine a reconciliacionis gratia referendus est; sed si preceptum mortis urget periculum, penitentiam per manus impositionem accepts, statim ei reconciliatio adhibenda est." Concil. Tolet. xi. (A.D. 675), cap. 12; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. vi. p. 552. E.
6 "Antiquitus ordinariam et vulgaritatem absolutionis formamuisse deprecatoriam: post centum supra mille
more doubt to be made of the validity thereof, the more confidence it signified; because the more trust was reposed in the power of the Church, the less provision was made for that disposition, which the Gospel, before the being of the Church, requireth.

§ 15. One thing more I desire may be considered in the practice of the ancient Church, to evidence the same, which is this:—the Church, being necessitated to abate of the primitive strictness, and to admit all manner of sins to reconcilement by penance, that they might the better answer their trust to God in not warranting the pardon of sin without reasonable trial of repentance, took a course of lengthening the time of penance; during which the conversation of the penitent might yield assurance of it. For the canons, whereby so many years' penance is prescribed upon such and such sins, were couched in writing long after the times of Montanus or Novatianus; and therefore the customs, whereby they came in force before they came in writing, had their beginning from that obligation, which the Church desired to discharge, of not warranting forgiveness of sin but upon due grounds. In this case then, and generally, whosoever was enjoined penance to qualify him for communion with the Church, if he did any eminent act which might evidence the sincerity and zeal of his conversion, or his forwardness and eagerness in taking revenge upon himself, was not only of custom and course so much the easier re-admitted by the Church, but was ordered by the canons to be so much the easier and sooner re-admitted. For evidence whereof, as also of divers other particulars here alleged, I will remit the reader, that would be informed, to Morinus his great work De Administratione Pœnitentiae. It shall serve my turn here to point out to you the ground, which these effects evidence, to be this:—that the Catholic Church proceeded not in binding and loosing, as if it had any power to give pardon at large; but as supposing, that those, that are

\[\text{Length of penance evidences the purpose with which it} \]
\[\text{was enjoined.}\]

\[\text{\footnote{See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iv. § 4. note u.}}\]

\[\text{\footnote{Ioan. Morinus, Commentarius Historicus de Disciplina in Administrations Sacramenti Pœnitentiae, &c. &c.; fol. Antv. 1682: first publ. in its full extent in 1651.}}\]
bound by the Church, cannot be loosed but by the Church; nor loosed by the Church, but supposing the disposition that qualiﬁeth for pardon produced in them by that penance, which the authority thereof constraineth to undergo: and, therefore, that in the power of enjoining penance ﬁtting, as well as of declaring pardon, the power of forgiving sins in the Church is by the tradition of the Church declared to consist.

§ 16. I will conclude with the words of Firmilianus, Bishop of Cesarea Cappadocia, in his letter to St. Cyprian, among St. Cyprian’s [Epistles, Epist.] lxxv. He saith, that they used in their parts to hold synods every year; "ut si qua graviora sunt, communi consilio dirigitur; lap- sis quoque fratribus, et post lavacrum salutare a diabo vulneratis, per paenitentiam medela quaeatur; non quasi a nobis remissionem peccatorum consequantur, sed ut per nos ad intelligentiam delictorum suorum convertantur, et Domino plenius satisfacere cogantur"—"that business of greater weight may be ordered by common advice, and remedy found by penance for brethren that have fallen away, being wounded by the devil after the laver of salvation; not as if they got pardon of sins from us; but that, being by our means converted to understand their own sins, they may be constrained to make the fuller satisfaction to God." These are the very terms upon which my opinion standeth.

§ 17. Let us now compare the original and general practice of the Church with that which we have in the apostles’ writings; and say, by the agreement, whether their authority were the beginning of it or not. Shall we think, that all, who ever questioned the reconciling of some sins, were utterly void of common sense, in imagining, that the apostle to the Hebrews, and St. John writing of the "sin unto death," intended not to speak of that pardon which the Church may or ought to give or not give; when we ﬁnd no other motive for that severity, but never see any of the Church except, that they concern not that purpose, but, well and good, that they serve not to prove it? In like manner you have seen St. Paul witness the order then in the Church to "mourn" for those that were excluded the communion of

---

*a Epist. lxxv. p. 219, ed. Fell: lxxv. ¹ Corrected from M.S.; “this,” in orig. text.

[Agreement between primitive practice and the apostles’ writings.]

[Hebr. vi. ⁴, x. 26; 1 John v. 16.]

[2 Cor. xii. 21.]
the Church. You have seen St. John and St. James, after our Saviour, signify, that the means of procuring remission of sin by the Church is to be expected from the prayers of the Church. You may see, on the other side, the primitive Church make great demonstration of sorrow at the discovery of those sins, for which somebody is shut out of the Church or reduced to penance: as you may see by the authorities alleged in Grotius, upon 1 Cor. v. 2; and by Epiphanius his exposition of 2 Cor. xii. 21 (Hær. lix.); especially by that eminent example of Natalis, in Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. 287. And in the solemn service of the Church, before the celebration of the eucharist, from the beginning, you have seen a prayer appointed to be made for those that were under penance (as well as for those that were not baptized, and those that were vexed with evil spirits); that so they might be dismissed before the eucharist, to which they were not to be admitted. I say therefore, they, who see this, if they will see what they do see, have evidence, what the apostles instituted in the Church, as also upon what ground, and to what purpose; by what the Church immediately after them did practise.

§ 18. A third thing there is, which visibly derives, not only these ordinances, but the true intent and meaning of them, from the institution of the apostles; and that is the indulgence, which St. Paul useth, in abating the penance of that incestuous person whom I spoke of at Corinth. Indulgence, in Ammianus, signifies the discharging of taxes

---

7 Natalis had been made "a Bishop of the hearsey" of Theodotus: but is related by Eusebius (lib. v. c. 28. p. 197. A. B.), when brought to repentance, "εὑρεν διαοτήτι, καὶ ενδυσάμενος σάκκον, καὶ στοδον καταστασάμενον, μετὰ πολλῆς σπασίας καὶ δακρύων προσκήνων ζερεύμας τῷ επισκόπῳ, καιλυμνων ὅπως τοὺς πολλαὶ ἀδικίας τῶν τῷ κλήρῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λαϊκῶν συγχαίρῃ τοῖς ἵπποις τῷ ἐξετασίζοντι ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ ἱερείου Χριστοῦ," κ. Τ. Λ.

Serv. God at Rel. Ass., c. x.

§ 22—24.

* Ibid.

imposed upon the provinces of the Roman empire, by an act
of grace of the emperors, upon remonstrance of reasons
wherefore this or that province might deserve to be eased.
What can be more like this, than the abatement of that
hardship, whereby those, that were prescribed penance, were
to demonstrate their inward repentance to the Church? St.
Paul, we see, upon representation of the submission of the
Church and the guilty person both to the censure which he
had ordered, and of the real demonstration of sorrow made
on his part, and the intercession of the Church for his re-
concilement, thus condescends;—"To whom you grant
any thing, I also grant it: for if I have granted any thing, it is
for your sakes that I have granted it to him [to] whom I have
granted it, in the person of Christ; that Satan may have no
advantage over us: for we are not ignorant of his devices"
(2 Cor. ii. 10, 11). I shewed you before two reasons, which
St. Paul may be thought to point at by these words\footnote{c. ix. § 16.}. For
he acknowledgeth by the premisses a very considerable
demonstration of conversion in the penitent; sufficient to
argue, that St. Paul thought him really qualified for remis-
sion of sin. But in regard he declares here, that it is for
the Church's sake that he condescendeth, to prevent the ad-
vantage that Satan might have against them; he intimates
a jealousy of some mutiny in the Church against his author-
ity, in case he condescended not. For though he grant ab-
solution in this regard; yet he may well say he "granteth it
in the person of Christ," though we suppose the party not
really qualified for it; supposing, that he doth it to preserve
the unity of the Church, chiefly concerning the common
good of Christ's flock. For what St. Paul does by virtue of the
office committed to him by Christ, that he may well say he
doeth "in the person of Christ," as tending to the upright
discharge of his office. By the former of these reasons, we
evidently see the intent and effect of the keys of the Church
in purging of sin by the discipline of penance. For if in-
dulgence be granted in consideration of evidence, that ap-
pears to ground a presumption that the party is qualified for
remission of sins in the judgment of the Church; then is all
the discipline of penance to no other purpose, but to oblige
sinners to take that course, whereby they may appear to the Church qualified for remission of sin.

§ 19. But that which St. Paul here doth, is the very same, that the primitive Church always did from the beginning. For whoso shewed such zeal in taking revenge upon himself for his transgressions, that the Church might be satisfied, that God remained satisfied of his repentance; to him the severity of this discipline was so fully released, that those strict canons, that enjoined so many years' penance for divers great sins, may seem to have been but threatenings, inviting to shew that zeal in conversion from sin, that the Church might have cause to be satisfied of their inward repentance. And as often as there was fear of schism in any Church, the practice of the primitive Church witnesseth, how ready they were to receive those that would return, abating the hardship of penance: the reason being this, that what the Church condescended to for the avoiding of a greater mischief to the body thereof, which is schism, in that she could not be understood to warrant forgiveness of sins to those whom she received; further than that disposition of mind, which the parties themselves know that they returned with, might warrant it. For inasmuch as it was evident, that the Church waived the rule, by which they used to proceed, for unity's sake; it remained also evident, that the charge of making good that disposition, which qualifieth before God for the communion of the Church, devolves upon the conscience of them, that impose the necessity of waiving such wholesome rules upon the Church: whatsoever the form were, in which they were reconciled.

§ 20. Let us now see, whether the primitive practice of the Church will justify the voluntary confession of secret sins to the Church, as the means to obtain the pardon of them at God's hands.

§ 21. Tertullian, in his book De Paenitentia, is very earnest in persuading, not those that were fallen into notorious sins—for what need he persuade them to undergo penance, who, if they would continue Christians (that is, if they

---

4 See § 15. note q.

5 Written whilst he was a Catholic: p. xxxiii. a., prefix. Opp. Tertull. Venet. 1744, A.D. 201.

so., accord. to Pamelius (Vita Tertull.,
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would enjoy the communion of the Church), could not avoid it?—but, as it appears by his words, those that could not be constrained to have recourse to that penance, which the Church required for the purging of their sins or for assuring that they were purged. For when he pronounceth, that sins of the will, which no man but the party is guilty to, are to be purged by this penance (as he doth in the third and fourth chapters of that book); shall we imagine, that he undertakes of his own head to bring in a thing that was not wont to be done in the Church? Then might he have been rejected, as well as his master Montanus, when he went about to impose new laws upon the Church. But those new laws, I shew you, were excepted against from the beginning of pretending them. Let any man shew me, that voluntary confession of secret sins was ever excepted against in Tertullian; who writ that book when he was of the Catholic Church, earnestly persuading to it. Likewise, though he writ his book De Pudicitia when he was become a Montanist, yet it is easy to discern what he speaks in it as a Montanist, by discerning what the Catholic Church contests and what it allows of his doctrine. In the seventh chapter of that book, it is manifest, that he calls those sins to penance, which he were a mad-man that should take either for scandalous or for notorious. The Novatians, being a branch of the Montanists, and refusing to reconcile the greatest sins, are to be thought have followed their order in reconciling less sins; as it is manifest by St. Am-

So in orig. text.


Seil. A.D. 216 accord. to Pamelianus (as above quoted, p. xxxiii. b), who dates his turning Montanist in 211 (ibid., p. xxx. a).


1 Et hic enim illam Joannes commendavit, quod sint quasdam delicta quotidiana incursionis, quibus omnes
brose, *De Penit.* v. 2¹, that they did. Therefore they, and therefore the Catholic Church, did practise the discipline of penance upon sins neither notorious nor scandalous.

§ 22. In St. Cyprian you have several places, where he mentions penance for those sins, which were to be confessed according to the custom of the Church after a certain time of humiliation; when they were to be admitted to imposition of hands, that is, to the prayers of the Church for the pardon of him, whom the bishop's blessing (which the imposition of hands signifies) acknowledged hopeful for remission of sins: *Epist.* x.¹ et lv.² The same St. Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, manifestly instances in those, that had committed idolatry secretly or had resolved towards it, what befell them because they revealed it not to the Church; so that sometimes they did reveal it.

§ 23. Here cometh in the fact of Nectarius, related by *Socrates v. 19*: because, the custom being to confess to a simus objecti. Cui enim non accidit, aut irasci inique et ultra solis occasum," &c. &c. "Horum ergo erit venia per exoratorem Patris Christi. Sunt autem et contraria istic, ut graviora et exitiosa, quam veniam non capiant, homicidium, idololatria, fraus, negatio, blasphemia, utique et moecla et fornicatio, et tamen violati templi Dei. Horum ultra exorator non erit Christus; hoc non admitter omnino, qui natus ex Deo fuerit, non futurus Dei filius si admiserit." Id., ibid., c. xix. p. 682. B. C.

² "Sed ait se" (sc. Novatiani), "exceptis gravioribus criminius, relaxare veniam levioribus." S. Ambros., *De Paenit.,* lib. i. c. 3. § 10; Op., tom. ii. p. 393. B.—v. 2. in the text seems to be a mistake.

*"Nam cum in minoribus peccatis aut penitentiam justa tempore, et secundum disciplinam ordinem ad exomologias veniant, et per manus impositione episcopi et clerici, ius communicandis accipiant," &c.


*"Honor ergo datur Deo, quando sic Dei majestas et censura contemptitur, ut... proponatur a sacris agitque dicatur; ne ira cogitetur Dei, ne timeatur judicium Dominii, ne pulsetur ad ecclesiam Christi; sed sublata penitentia, nec ulla exomologesin criminis facta, despectis episcopis atque calcatia, paex presbyteris verbis fallacibus prudicetur," &c. Id., *Epist.* lix. (lv. ed. Pamela.), Ad Cornelium; ibid., p. 135.

*"Nec sibi quominus agant penitentiam, blandiantur, qui etsi nefandis sacrificiis manus non contaminaverunt, libellis tamen conscientiam polluerunt. ... Denique quanto et fade majoris et timore meliores sunt, qui quantum nullo sacrificiis aut libellis facinore constricti, quomiam tamen de hoc vel cogitaverunt, hoc ipsum apud aedoctes Dei dolentem et simpliciter confesantes, exomologesim conscientiam faciant, animi sui ponendus exponunt, salutarem medelam parvis licet et modicis vulneribus exquirunt; scientes scriptum esse, Deus non derisatur." Id., *De Lapso.;* Op., pp. 133, 134.

*"Gnia tis twn telivn prosofbhj twn st twn metaanias prosofbhj; kai kata meg auexamologhteta tis amartias, de othn ahrhj ma to baximi; o de prosofbhj prosfergjly twn gnwvov kai svygaugsefe, eva stn tis tis ahrhj kai evgou tis baximwv, kai all tis tis ahrhj ma tis tis ahrhj. Ev agh ygr, ev stn sunygguseftas autw tis skflios tis didwos, tis stn tis skflios; tis telivn paraikwv; twn agwv de katwv.
priest deputed to that purpose sins not otherwise known
(who was to direct what she should publicly declare, when
she came before the congregation), a certain noble woman,
whose case is there related, proceeded to declare that, which
caused such scandal, that thereupon Nectarius, then bishop
of Constantinople, thought fit to put down the office, which
that priest then held and executed, of receiving the confes-
sion of those sins, which were afterwards in part to be made
known to the Church, as the priest intrusted should direct.
For Socrates, relating the discourse which he had with the
priest which advised Nectarius to abolish the office aforesaid,
saith, that he told him it was to be feared, that he had given
occasion to bring St. Paul's precept to no effect, which saith,

"Communicate not in the fruitless works of darkness, but
rather reprove them:" which must suppose the publishing
of those sins, which a man may pretend by brotherly correc-
tion to restore. And it is manifest, that secret confession of
sins hath remained in the Eastern Church, and in that of
Constantinople particularly, even to this time: so that no
man can imagine, that it was abrogated by Nectarius.

§ 24. Origen (In Psal. xxxvii. Hom. ii.1) advises, indeed,
to look about you for a skilful physician, to whom you may
open the disease of your soul. Good reason. For, there being a number of presbyters by whom every Church was

* See Morinus, ibid., § 3. pp. 420. 1.
governed, and it being in a man's choice whom he would have recourse to, were he not to blame, that should not make diligent choice? But when he adviseth further, that, if he think the sin fit to be declared to the assembly of the Church, as where it is to be cured; doth he not require necessary penance upon voluntary confessions?

§ 25. St. Ambrose (De Pænit. ii. 7. i. 6. ii. 8, 9.) labour-eth to abate the shame of confessing sins. If he speak of public sins, there can be no reason why. For what hath he to do to abate that shame that cannot be avoided? That which may be avoided, is that, which cometh by confessing such sins as it is in a man's power to conceal.

§ 26. The same is evident in St. Augustin, Hom. ult. ex Quinquaginta.

§ 27. And is further cleared by this, that it is evident, that he, who was discovered not to have discovered to the Church that sin which he was privy to but the world was not, is by many acts of the Church constrained to undergo penance for that default. And in the Eliberitan canons it is provided, that he, who confesseth of his own accord, shall come off with a lighter penance; he, who is revealed by another, shall be liable to a harder censure: can. lxxvi.

§ 28. But no evidence can be so effectual, as the introducing of the law of auricular confession; that is, of confessing once a year, as well as receiving the eucharist once a year. For be it granted, as it is most true, that this law comes into force and effect by the secular power of those sovereignties of Christendom, which, complying with the interest of the Church of Rome, have agreed and do agree to

---

* So in orig. text. For the quotation, see the last note.

* See Morinus, De Pænit., lib. ii. c. 6. pp. 79. 2. C.—81. 2. D.
* See above, c. ix. § 2. note s; and below, § 94. note a.
enact the decrees of those councils, which have been held by
the authority of it (or the provisions thereof, during the time
that no councils are held), by temporal penalties upon their
subjects. Is it therefore imaginable, that the council could
have pretended to introduce this limitation, and demand the
secular power to enact it; had it not been a custom in force
before that act was done, that people should submit them-
selves to penance for those sins, which the Church without
themselves could not charge them with? Could any man
offer so much violence to his own reason as to affirm that
which himself cannot believe, he would easily be convinced
by producing the fashion of Ash-Wednesday; and the order
for the greatest part of Christians to declare themselves
penitents at the beginning of Lent, with a pretence of ob-
taining absolution to the intent of receiving the communion
of the eucharist at Easter: which, being more ancient than
that law*, sufficiently demonstrateth, that the effect of it
was not to introduce the confession of secret sins, which
always had been in use and force in the Church; but ex-
pressly to limit and determine that, which had been always
done formerly, for the future to be done by all, and at the
least once a year.

§ 29. It remains now to shew, [by+] the original and
general practice of the Church, that there is no tradition to
evidence, that no sin after baptism can obtain remission but
by the Church (speaking of such sins as make the grace of
baptism void): which is sufficiently done already, if we re-
member, that not only the Montanists or the Novatians, but
the Church also, did sometimes exclude some sins from all
hope of reconciliation by the Church; not excluding them
nevertheless from hope of pardon with God, but not engag-
ing the Church to warrant itc. For I demand, in what con-
sideration that pardon is obtained, which the Church sup-
poses possible for them to obtain. Is it not upon the same
score as all Christians obtain pardon of sin? to wit, by being
qualified for it with that disposition of mind which the

---

* See Bingham, XVIII. ii. 2: who
throws considerable doubt upon the
antiquity of this practice as connected
with Ash-Wednesday. It would seem to
be at any rate a tradition more ancient
than the law of the Lateran Council
referred to above (text to note r), for
which see below, § 34. note a.

+ Added from MS.

See Bingham, XVIII. iv. 4, 5.
Gospel requires: which therefore may be obtained without the ministry of the Church. For if it be said, that these persons would willingly undergo penance upon condition of being restored to the communion of the Church (upon supposition, that by the ministry thereof they are restored to God's grace), and that therefore the desire of reconciliation by the Church supplies it, as the desire of baptism is accepted when it cannot be had; if this be said, I will allow, that he who refuses the ministry of the Church (tendering him a reasonable presumption of attaining reconciliation with God by the means of it, according to the just laws of Christianity), can have no cause to promise himself pardon without it. In the mean time, it is not the desire of reconciliation by the Church, that qualifies him for remission of sin; but only takes away the bar, that hinders God's grace to work that disposition in him, which qualifies for it. For if it be a part of Christianity to be a member of the Catholic Church, then are not they capable of the promises made to Christians, that will not seek them by the ministry of the Church, when, and how far, and according as, their Christianity shall oblige them to seek them. To the same purpose I allege also the second reason of St. Paul's indulgence, and the effects of it in the practice of the primitive Church: to wit, the admitting of those, that had committed idolatry in time of persecution (or who were otherwise borne out in their sins by faction in the Church), to communicate with the Church; when in such cases there could be no presumption of sufficient disposition in the parties for forgiveness from God, but only to avoid a breach in the Church, of all things most prejudicial to the general good of the body. For can there be any appearance, that the Church in such cases could be satisfied of the true sufficient conversion of those that are admitted upon such terms; when it is manifest, that they are not admitted of choice, but to avoid a further inconvenience? Wherefore, seeing the Church could not justify the doing of it, if there were not possibility of their being qualified for the communion of the Church; it follows, that this possibility consists, in that the means of grace, being sufficient for all within the Church, may be

---

effectual without the ministry thereof, provided it be within the unity of it.

§ 30. Here I must allege the custom, even of the primitive Church, imposing no penance upon clergymen, that were degraded for those crimes, for which laymen were reduced to penance*. I remember the first book De Synedriis alleges this for an objection against the necessity of excommunication, seeing it was not necessary for the clergy: not considering, that excommunication is abated by penance, as penance is abated by degradation, in the clergy; but casting a foul aspersion upon the whole Church for imposing penance upon the people, whenas nothing required it, if the clergy needed it not: and this upon a mistake, whether in point of fact, or in point of right. For it is not true, that the clergy were not subject to penance, especially in the first times of Christianity; either when the crime was of a deeper nature than such as ordinary laymen did penance for, or when a clergyman, having been censured to communicate among the people (which was degradation at that time), relapsed#: though afterwards they were remitted to do their penance in private, not bringing them before the congregation for the prayers thereof with imposition of hands%. Neither is the reason, which the ancient canons give', to be neglected in point of right. For the loss of their rank in the Church being to them a rebuke, whereof lay Christians are not capable; it is necessary, that a difference should be made between them and the people. Especially, the interest of the Church requiring it in regard of another rule,—that no man, that had done penance, should ever be admitted to the clergy%; because of the common Christianity imbased in

* See Bingham, XVII. i. 2.
* Selden, De Synedr. Ebromorum, lib. i. cc. x., xiii., argues at length, that the power of exercising discipline is not "jure Divino:" dwelling, among other arguments, upon the "temperamenta et modi," wherewith the exercise of that power was modified and altered as time and circumstances varied; and instancing, among a list of particulars, "ordinum exemptiones" (Op., tom. i. p. 1072). But there appears to be no argument directly answering to the reference in the text. The only express mention of the subject (c. ix. p. 919) implies, that, if degradation or lighter punishments failed to effect a cure, the greater excommunication was resorted to in the case of clergy, as of laity.
% See Morinus, ibid.
% See above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iv. § 15. notes s, u.
them who have done penance, which in those, who are promoted to the clergy, is required of the best. For those, who for their qualities might best serve the Church, if they had done penance, were ever after unserviceable; if not, might be restored. Whereby it appeareth, that the Church presumed of them who knew their duty better than ordinary Christians, that the loss of their rank would be sufficient to reduce them to true repentance, without further constraint from the Church: as afterwards they were trusted to do their penance in private. But this is full evidence, that the Church did not think all sin incurable without the keys of the Church. For then the Church could not have referred the applying of the means of pardon, which they procure, to any presumption of any man's good conscience.

§ 31. The like appears in the reconciling of heretics and schismatics to the unity of the Church by shoals, that is, by whole Churches at once: upon whom as it is impossible to imagine that the discipline of penance should pass, so is it known, upon evidence of historical truth, that those, who were not to be baptized again (as some heresies were by the canons in force¹), were admitted only with imposition of hands², that is, with the blessing of the Church, acknowledging thenceforth to pray for them as Christians, not as those for whom she prays that they may become Christians; which, not supposing possibility of pardon for them, not undergoing the discipline of the Church, could not have been granted. I avow it to be truly said in this case, that the baptism received among heretics revives and comes to effect by this blessing of the Churchᵃ. For, seeing that the only necessary bar to the effect of it was the denying of that point of Christianity which distinguishes every heresy from the Catholic Church (or the destroying of the unity of the Church, speaking of schismatics), those that so return, professing thenceforth the whole faith, and maintaining the communion of the Church, cannot be said to want anything necessary to

¹ E.g. the Paulinists, by Conc. Nicen. (A.D. 323) can. xix. (ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 38. D, E): and so also the Montanists, Eunomians, Sabellians, Photinians, Manichees, Valentinians, Marcionites (i.e. all such heretics "as had not been truly baptized with due form of baptism"), by subsequent Councils: see Bingham, XVIII. ii. 8.  
² See authorities in Bingham, Lay-Baptism, c. i. sect. 21: and, at greater length, Morinus, De Pœnit., lib. ix. cc. 7—13; pp. 627. 1. C—553. 1. E.  
ᵃ See above, c. ix. § 28. note i.
qualify them for the promises of Christianity. Seeing then this possibility is not grounded upon the ministry of the Church, which passes not upon them, but upon the common profession of Christians, made by them when they were baptized, and the taking away of that bar which made it ineffectual afore, by returning to the unity of the Church though without any ministration of penance: neither can it be said, that the disposition qualifying for remission of sin is not to be attained in the Church without the ministry of the Church by the discipline of penance, nor that it is attained by the desire of it; but only that the bar is removed by submitting to it.

§ 82. A visible instance hereof I will propose, in the reconciling of England to the Church of Rome in Queen Mary’s days, an act of the highest nature that the power of the keys could do; and yet it is notorious, that pardon and absolution and the blessing of the Church was given them, who could not be induced to restore the Church goods, seized by Henry the eighth: a thing excluding all pretence for any presumption of true conversion in them whom it concerned, and yet found necessary for the restoring of the body in unity; but so, that the said necessity made it to be evidently for the general good, even upon these terms. For, maintaining those, who could not be induced to do right in the point, in the unity of the Church, there was no reason should be thought to warrant that absolution as to God, which it granteth as to the Church: because it appears, that it is granted to avoid a greater mischief; leaving them, who find themselves concerned by the ministry of the Church, the communion whereof they regain, to be reduced to that course which may assure their absolution as to God. But I use this instance only ad hominem, that my reason may be understood; not intending to justify the proceeding in point of right: as I do undertake to justify the Council of Nicæa⁰, in admitting the Meletians, who were

⁰ "Εδοκειν συν Μελητον μην... μενεν της θελει εαυτου, και μενεν πιεσαι αυτον μητε χειροστητου," κ.τ.λ. "τοις δε ου αυτου καταστραντες, μονακωτερα χειροστου πεπτωκοτας, καυσωνησαε ου τοιουτοι, εφι φεται εχεω μην αυτον την τιμη και λειτουργιαν, δευτερου δε ειναι εξαπατου πασ-
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guilty of the crime of schism, not only without satisfaction of their repentance, but all in their ranks, only suspending the exercise of their offices till those that were presently possessed should depart: or as I might undertake to justify Pope Melchiades, in offering to do the like for the Donatists; for which he is commended by St. Augustin (Epist. xlvii.) that the Church, supposing schism to be a mortal sin (that is, of that number which the now Church of Rome enjoins penance), could not do upon other terms than I have said; and if it had thought no sin reconcileable without the Church, could by no means have done.

§ 33. The same is to be said of those who are excommunicated and cast out of the Church without cause. For no man ever doubted that to be a case which comes to pass, so can no Christianity allow, that a man should be excluded the kingdom of God for another man’s fault. He, therefore, that hath the knowledge in Christianity, and the resolution for it, to keep himself to the duty of a Christian in such a case (though, being destitute of all advantage by the communion of the Church, it is difficult to do); he, I say, shall obtain pardon of sin without help of the Church, and not by desiring the ministry thereof, otherwise than as not desiring of communion with the Church remains a bar to the work of God’s grace.

§ 34. In fine, consider the primitive order of the Church, and that of the Church of Rome at this day by the law of secret confession once a year. For he, that considers how
much business the reconciling of a penitent made the Church in those days, will never imagine, that it could be presumed, that all sins, which now come under secret confession, should then be expiated by the keys of the Church.

[Origen.] § 35. I have given you the testimony of Origen; directing to make choice of some of the presbyters of the Church, to make acquainted with secret sin, that, if he should require penance to be done in the face of the congregation, his prescription might be followed. This enforces us to understand the other part of the alternative; that, if he required no such thing, it should be enough to take that course of humiliation and mortification which he should prescribe in private.

§ 36. And, truly, one of the canons of the Council at Elvira (xxxii.) orders penance to be enjoined by a priest, not by the bishop: which I understand to be, in private, and not in public; allowing it very probable, that this is not properly counted penance, but only suspension from the eucharist, enjoined by some of those canons in some case (xxi. l. lxxvii.), and is opposed to penance, can. xiv.; so that, probably, one of the presbyters might enjoin it in secret by these canons. But otherwise, seeing that all this while there was no penance but by order of the bishop (or,

1 Above, § 24. note r.
2 "Apud presbyterum, si quis gravi lapsu in ruinam mortis inciderit, placuit agere penitentiam non debere, sed potius apud episcopum: cogente tamen infirmitate, necesse est presbyterum communionem praestare debere, et diaconum, si ei iussisset sacerdos." Conc. Elberit. (A.D. 305), can. xxxii.; ap. Labbé, Conc., tom. i. p. 974. B.—In another edition, however, the canon stands thus—"Si quis gravi lapsu in ruinam mortis inciderit, placuit, agere penitentiam non debere sine episcopi consultu, sed potius apud episcopum agat, cogente tamen infirmitate. Non est presbyterorum aut diaconorum communionem talibus praestare debere, nisi eis iussisset episcopus." Ibid., B., C. 3 "Si quis in civitate positus tres dominii ad ecclesiam non accesserit, puero tempore abstineat, ut corruptus esse videntur." Ibid., can. xxiii.; ibid., p. 973. B.—"Si quis vero clericus vel fidelis cum Judæis eicum sumpserit, placuit eum a communione abstinere, ut debeat emendari." Ibid., can. 1.; ibid., p. 976. B.—"Si quis fidelis, habens uxorem, cum Judæa vel gentili fuerit maenatus, a communione arcessetur. Quod si alius eum detexerit, post quinquennium, acta legitima penitentia, poterit Dominicae sociari communi." Ibid., can. lxxvii.; ibid., p. 978. E: lxxvii. in the text appears to be a mistake for lxxviii., the former of the two canons being wholly irrelevant to the present subject.
4 "Virgines quæ virginitatem sumam non custodierint, si eosdem, qui eam violaverint, duexerint, et tenuerint maritos; eo quod solas nuptias violaverint, post annum, sine penitentia" (but another reading is —"post penitentiam annis anni"), reconciliari deebunt." Ibid., can. xiv.; ibid., p. 972. C.
as in some of St. Cyprian's Epistles, of the bishop and presbyters; sometimes, when the case was difficult, as in Firmilianus quoted afore, by order of a synod; what appearance is there in common reason, that all sins, that now come under secret confession, could then come under the keys of the Church?

§ 37. In the order which Nectarius abolished, any man may discern, there was nothing but a course of abridging public business of the Church by referring penitents to one priest set aside to that purpose. When that course was abrogated, still they had recourse to the bishop and presbyters; but it is manifest, so many could not be dispatched as afore.

§ 38. And now it is manifest, that to require of every man to confess all the sins, that ever he did since he confessed last, would be an unsufferable torture to men's consciences; and therefore it is only required, that they confess those which they have in remembrance. I ask then, how those which they have not in remembrance come pardoned? If by inward repentance, restoring the disposition of a Christian; it is that which I seek. If by being willing to confess them, if I had them in remembrance; he that is not qualified for remission of sins as Christianity requireth, is not qualified, because he would have been so qualified had it not been his own fault.

---

a E.g. "Si incommodo aliquo et infirmatis periculo occupasti fuerint (penitentes); non expectataa presenta nostra, apud presbyterum quemcumque praevertum, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, et urgere evertus et erigit, apud diaconum quique exomologesin facere delicti sui possint." S. Cypr., Epist. xviii. (Pam. xiii.), Ad Clerum; Epist. p. 40. ed. Fell: and see also Epist. xix. (Pam. xiv.), Ad Clerum; ibid., p. 41.—"Nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero imposita, eucharistia illi datur." Id., Epist. xvi. (Pam. x.), Ad Clerum; ibid., p. 37.—"Ante manum ab episcopo et clero in penitentiam impositam," &c. Id., Epist. xv. (Pam. xi.), Ad Mart. et Conf.; ibid., p. 84.—"Nec ad communicationem venire quia possit, nisi prius illi ab episcopo et clero manus fuerit imposita." Id., Epist. xvii. (Pam. xii.), Ad Plebem; ibid., p. 38.—See Bingham, XIX. iii. 3.

b See above, § 16.

c See above, § 23. note o.

§ 39. I add further, that it is at this day resolved by casuists of very good note, that a penitent is bound in conscience to impose upon himself further penance than that which his confessor enjoineth; in case he be satisfied in conscience, that he hath not imposed that which is sufficient. For in the case of clave errante it is manifest, that there is no remission by the keys; and yet remission is to be had by the Gospel antecedent to the Church. If then a man’s own Christianity may supply that means of forgiveness which the keys of the Church fail of procuring, it is manifest, that the use of them is not absolutely necessary for every particular Christian; though absolutely necessary for the whole body of the Church.

§ 40. Add hereunto the testimonies of ecclesiastical writers; by which it appears, that, as they maintained the discipline of penance (which I also would maintain so far as truth will allow), so they supposed remission of sins attainable without it*. The exhortations of Tertullian† and St. Ambrose‡ to ecclesiastical penance, will no way infer, that it was then actually a law in force, that all sins, that void the grace of baptism, should be made known to the Church for the obtaining of pardon by the keys of it. For how ill doth it become any law to beg obedience by alleging reasons, which must enforce it, if they be good, were there no law? But, on the other side, what express testimonies, what necessary consequences there are to infer, that there was no such law in the primitive Church; I remit the reader to the collections of the Archbishop of Spalato, [lib.] v. [c.] vii. [sectt.] 10—20§, and to the Answer to the Jesuit’s Challenge in Ireland. 

---

* See authorities in De Dominis and Ussher as quoted below, notes h, i.
† See above, § 21.
‡ See above, § 25.
§ Marc. Anton. de Dominis, Archi-
301. D—305. C. fol. Lond. 1620.
90, sq. ed. Elrington.
CHAPTER XI.¹

Penance is not required to redeem the debt of temporal punishment when the sin is pardoned. What assurance of forgiveness the law of auricular confession as it is used in the Church of Rome procureth. Of enjoining penance after absolution (pronounced =]. Setting aside abuses, the law is agreeable to God's [law]. Of the order taken by the Church of England.

And now it is time to infer from the premisses the judgment, that we are to make of the law of secret confession and penance in the Church of Rome; premising, in the first place (that which is evident, supposing the premisses), that the works of penance (which they call "satisfactions," because they will have them to make satisfaction for the debt of temporal punishment remaining, when the guilt and stain of sin is abolished) were never required by the Church but (according to the word of God) to render the conversion of the penitent so sincere and resolute, as may qualify him for pardon and God's grace.

§ 2. It is not necessary for this purpose, that I undertake here to shew, that God, pardoning sin, cannot [n]or ever doth reserve a debt of temporal punishment, to be inflicted in consideration of it. It is manifest to any man, that is neither acted by passion nor by faction, that the death which God inflicted on David's child gotten in adultery, and the other judgments which the prophet pronounces against him (2 Sam. xii. 10, 11), were punishments inflicted in consideration of those sins which the nature and kind of them answers expressly: for murder, that the sword shall not de-

¹ Misprinted IX. in folio edition.
* The word "performed" is substituted for this in orig. text: seemingly by mistake. See below, § 12.
* Admitting, that "satisfactionem non offerti Deo neque exigi ab hominibus pro culpa,"[""restat""] (says Bellarmine) "controversia solum de satisfactione qua justitiam restauratur simul solutis: restituta siquidem amicitia per gratiam Dei misericordiam et per redemptionem quae est in Christo Jesu:"—in discussing which Bellarmine lays down, 1. "quod semper, remissa culpa, maneat debitum luendae poenae," 2. "reatum poenae temporalis qui interdum remanet post amicitiam cum Deo reformatam, bonis operibus redimi posse;" De Poenit., lib. iv. cc. 1—3; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 1421. C, sq.
part from "his house;" for adultery, that his wives should be defiled "before the sun." Therefore when the prophet says to him, "The Lord hath set aside thine iniquity, thou shalt not die;" it will be requisite to take notice, that, though his sin is pardoned, speaking absolutely, because his life is spared, which was forfeit by God's law (though into no man's hands but God's), yet this pardon extended not to extinguish the sentence pronounced, nor yet that which he proceedeth further to pronounce concerning the child's death. Whether you will say, that in such a case sin is remitted, because, absolutely, the man is restored to God's grace; or not remitted, because, as to the punishments allotted, he suffers by God's vindicative justice: is a controversy about words, which I will not spend words to determine. This cannot be denied, that neither God's original justice, nor any covenant of His with man, hinders Him so to proceed.

§ 3. But what is this to the intent of penance imposed by the Church; which I have evidenced, both by the Scriptures and the original practice of the whole Church, to have pretended the abolishing of the guilt and stain of sin? Indeed it is not to be denied, that there is something more in that penance which the Church imposeth. For he, that exacts the same revenge upon himself at his own discretion and conscience, which the Church by the canons thereof should exact, pretends only to satisfy his own discretion and conscience, that God is satisfied with his repentance (and there lies the danger of satisfying a man's self with a palliative cure, instead of a sound one): whereas he, that does it upon the sentence of the Church, pretends to satisfy the Church, that God is satisfied with it, and [sic] to assure himself of his cure. But when this satisfaction to the Church presupposes satisfaction to God (at least, a presumption thereof, whether only legal or also reasonable); well may I, without this exception, make this the pretence of ecclesiastical penance. Neither had there been any cause to question the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church concerning the satisfaction of penance, had not the Church of Rome suffered it to be taught (for I should do them wrong to say

* Above, c. x. § 12—28.  
* Added from MS.
that they have enjoined it to be taught), that it tendeth to recompense the debt of temporal punishment, remaining when the sin is remitted. For though under the Gospel also God may decree temporal punishment upon that sin, which afterwards comes to be remitted upon repentance; yet he, who is restored to the state of God's grace (to whom "all things co-operate to good," as St. Paul saith, Rom. viii. 28), though he suffer temporal punishment for his sin by God's justice, yet by God's grace, to which he is restored, it is converted into the means of salvation, and of bringing to pass God's everlasting purpose of it.

§ 4. Before I go further, I must call you to mind that which I said of the change of attrition into contrition*: how it may be allowed by the covenant of grace; and how it intimated an abusive opinion, that the change which qualifieth a man for the promises which the Gospel tendereth, taketh effect in consideration of the intrinsical worth of it, and not only of God's promise; which you have seen to be false. This dispute was a long time canvassed in the schools without any reference to the remission of sin by the keys of the Church†. But the difficulty being started, that confession not made in charity (that is, out of the love of God above all things) may satisfy the positive precept, but cannot avail to the remission of sin; some sought a salve for this sore in the form of absolution, which then proceeded partly as a prayer, partly as a definitive sentence. For they thought the prayer obtained that grace, which might be a due ground for the sentence*. But when the opinion prevailed, that the form

---


† Corrected in MS. into, "by."


§ See Bk. II., &c., ibid., note k.

* "Difficultatem eo tempore excita- bat vulgata doctorum definitio, confessionem extra charitatem factam libere quidem posse ab onere confessionis iterandae, et precepto ecclesiae satisfacere; verum ad salutem nihil pro- desse. Respondent nihilominus in ipsa confessione proper subjectionem et humiliatem attributum conteri posse.
ought to be indicative; it remained to say, how confession and absolution should render him contrite, that comes only attrite. Thomas Aquinas, to say how the keys of the Church may be understood to attain the production of grace, imagined the immediate effect of them to be a certain “ornament” of the soul, fitting it for grace: by virtue whereof that grace, which a man gets not by penance when he is not contrite, quickens in him when he becomes contrite; as he that is baptized without that resolution which obtaineth the promises, becomes estated in them when it is rectified. And this opinion had vogue among his followers till the last age afore this: when, finding it more proper to raise than to resolve questions, it was laid aside by Cardinal Cajetan first.


* See Morinus as quoted in the last note.


then by the rest of his followers a. In the mean time the 
dispute of the change of attrition into contrition remained, 
most maintaining contrition to be necessary before absolu-
tion b, till the Council of Trent: upon the decree whereof, 
Sess. xiv. cap. 6 c, Melchior Canus d first maintained sorrow 
conceived upon mere fear of punishment, with the keys, to 
qualify for pardon of sin. Whose opinion is now grown so 
ordinary, that those, who hardly satisfy themselves in giving 
warning of the harm their own doctrine may do, go down 
the stream notwithstanding, in yielding to an opinion that 
 hath so great vogue e. I do not intend hereby to say, that 
the Council of Trent hath decreed this opinion, and obliged 
all to maintain it. The terms which it pitched upon are 
these f,—that sorrow for sin 'in consideration of the deformity 
of it and the fear of hell, with hope of pardon, but without 
any intent to sin again, though of itself it bring not pardon,

a See proofs in Morinus as cited in last note.
b "Lectorem notare velim antiquam sententiam de necessitate contritionis ante absolvendum conficiendi toto illo tempore ad usque concilium Tridentinum alii omnibus" (scil. of the various attempts, of which Morinus enumerates seven, to define the exact quantity and kind of attrition necessary) "sigillatum sumptis praevulisse, maximoque viros et magno numero paulo ante Concilium Tridentinum hanc sententiam mordicus defendisse, et alias improbasse. Sed post Concilium Tridentinum esse sententiam quae attritionem sufficeret docent antiquae praevaluerunt, major doctorum parte sensim in hanc sententiam inclinante... Non defuerunt tamen doctores insignes, post illud tempus in hunc usque diem, nec contemnendo numero... qui antiquam sententiam propugnaverunt aliique longe praeposuerunt." Morinus, ibid., § 12. p. 510. 1. A. B.
c "Contritio, quae primum locum inter dicta poenitentia accepsit habet, animi dolor ac detestatio est de peccato commissum, cum proposito non pec- candi de cetero. Fuit autem quovis tempore ad impetrandum veniam peccatorum hic contritionis motus necessarius; et in homine post baptismum lapsa ita demum preparat ad remis- sionem peccatorum, si cum fiducia Divini misericordiae et voto præstandi reliqua conjunctus sit, que ad rite susciptendum hoc sacramentum requiruntur... ilam vero contritionem imperfectam, quæ attritio dicitur, quoniam vel ex turpitudinis peccati consideratione vel ex gehennæ et poenam metu communiter concepitur, si voluntatem peccati excludat, cum epe venisse, declarat (sancta synodus) non solum non facere hominem hypocritam et magis peccatorem, verum etiam donum Dei esse et Spiritus Sancti impulsum, non adhuc quidem inhabitantis, sed tantum moventis, quod poenitens adjutus viam sibi ad justitiam parat. Et quamvis sine sacramento poenitentiae per se ad justificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat, tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in sacramento poenitentiam impetrandam disponit." Conc. Trid., Sess. xiv. cap. 4. (6 in the text is a mistake); ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 817. B—E.
d Morinus (ibid., c. 4. § 1. p. 512. 1. C) describes Canus as having been the first (with Henricus Salmanticensis) to teach, "Attritionem ex sola formidine poenae conceptum, talemque a poenitente cognitum, et inmutate esse habentem, legitimam et sufficientem esse preparationem ad gratiam in sacramento susciptiandam."—And see Melchior Canus, Relect. de Paenit., P. vi.; Op., pp. 932, 933. Col. Agripp. 1605.
e See Morinus as quoted in note b; and the "monita," with which the authorities he cites qualify and guard their doctrine.
f See above in note c.
yet disposeth to the attaining thereof by the keys of the Church." Which may be true, though only sorrow for the offence, and for God's sake, qualify for pardon by the keys of the Church: if we suppose that sorrow for a man's own sake, which of necessity must first arise in him who discovereth himself surprized in sin, to be the way and the mean, which God's Spirit actually assisteth him with, that hath forfeited the gift of It, to work him to that sorrow for God's sake, which qualifieth for pardon by the keys of the Church.

§ 5. Now what I am to say, will easily appear before I say it, to him that considers what I have said concerning the disposition that qualifieth for remission of sin without consideration of the Church and the keys of it*: the ministry whereof [I"] suppose instituted to procure that disposition, as supposing the covenant of grace which requires it. That he, who finds himself in the state of damnation by sin, must, if God send him justifying faith, in the next instant¹ believe, that he is predestinate to life (without that resolution for his future Christianity, which necessarily includeth sorrow for the offence of sin, and for God's sake; without ground to presume of his perseverance till death in it): I have shewed to be an imagination utterly destructive to Christianity*. That he, who confesses out of slavish fear, being absolved, should get that love of God above all which his pardon supposeth; though an imagination not more destructive to Christianity than that, may be destructive to the salvation of more Christians. That slavish fear of the punishment due for sin, though in a person guilty of sin, and not cured of the love of sin, is the work of the Holy Ghost, helping him that hath forfeited the gift of it; the way of recovering the state of grace lost demonstrateth. For if the Holy Ghost work not upon him that is in sin, how shall he recover out of it? But is it strange, that he, who, finding himself in the state of damnation by sin, knows the only means to be saved is to live as a Christian for the future, should resolve so to do in obedience to God and for His service; which he cannot do without that sorrow, which the present

* Above, c. ix. § 5—11.
² Added from MS.
¹ Misprinted "instance" in orig.
³ Above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxi. § 36—38.
loss of His favour implies? Surely, supposing the assistance of God’s Spirit, it cannot be otherwise. If this be the case of a Christian as a Christian, what can the keys of the Church (founded by God upon supposition of Christianity, to bring men to it, and to salvation by it) do, but be instrumental and ministerial to the work of grace in this case? Confession therefore cannot require contrition (that is, sorrow for God’s sake), nor absolution effect it. But confession must be the means to procure it, absolution the effect that must suppose it. When that course of humiliation and mortification, which the keys of the Church require, shall have had the operation in settling that resolution for Christianity which they may presume upon for the future, the sentence of absolution recovereth the effect of baptism, and reneweth the gift of the Holy Ghost; which “perfect love” that “casteth out fear” (according to the apostle) attendeth. This [1 John iv. 18] the primitive and catholic practice of the Church, as well as the covenant of grace and the condition thereof, demonstrateth. It was not then the custom to receive confession of sin and immediately to give absolution; binding the penitent over to make satisfaction for a debt of temporal punishment, remaining when the sin is done away. The first thing was to be admitted to penance; to undertake the state, and habit, and fashion of a mourner during the time; and so to gain the prayers of the Church for his pardon, to be joined with a man’s own endeavours. Is not the means of changing attrition into contrition visible, according to this course? Can it be visible by a word of the penitent, though professing at the present to love God, and hate sin above all things? That the sentence of absolution should create that
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Disposition which it findeth not, agreeth no better with the original practice of the Church, than with the original condition upon which we are baptized. And whatsoever "ornament" the soul may be imagined to get by it; that grace, which quickens in him that becomes contrite, can never be imputable to the keys of the Church in penance, which were employed without effecting it. Nor can it be said to quicken by virtue of any such imaginary "ornament," which by virtue of the covenant of baptism quickens of course without imagining of it. The bringing in of a definite sentence of absolution, instead of the prayers of the Church, which a man was admitted to by undertaking penance (the communion of the eucharist being his actual and final reconciliation), argues as much change in the inward Christianity as in the outward form of the Church. But if the prayers of the Church, joined with the penance of the penitent, be a competent means to regain the state of grace; a prayer immediately upon confession, immediately before absolution, is not. How much less since the Council of Trent: which makes the definite sentence the substance, the prayers that are used but the accessories, of the means of regaining the state of grace by penance.

§ 6. I proceed not hereupon to say, that the ministry of penance becomes void and uneffectual to the purging of sin, where it is exercised upon these terms. For as he, who relies upon the sentence of absolution for the producing of that disposition which is necessarily requisite to the remission of sin, must needs fail of that which he promiseth himself from that power of the Church, which God never granted upon such terms; so the imposing of penance may be understood to pretend the ransom of temporal punishment no otherwise than loosing the bond of sin, whereby it may be turned into a spiritual blessing. For though the granting of absolution and the communion of the eucharist before penance, is, in reason, and according to the original


* Misprinted 201 in folio edition.
practice of the Church, a contradiction to that sense; yet
nothing hinders the reason and the faith of Christians to
bear up, and not be carried away with those corruptions,
to which the imperfection of laws naturally induceth the
perverse inclinations which we are born with.

§ 7. In the mean time it is worth the while to consider,
what consequences the conceit of infallibility in the Church
(not distinguishing whether the present or the Catholic)
creates, as well in the opinions of doctors, as in the practice
of people. There is so much difference between the way of
ministering of penance in the primitive Church and the
practice of the auricular confession in the present Church of
Rome, as must needs signify the hope of pardon to suppose
the performance of penance in the one, in the other to be
grounded upon a sentence of absolution that supposes it not.
And yet it will not be acknowledged, that there is any decay
of discipline, any fault, any defect in the laws and customs
(for what is law but custom? what rule is there for men's
actions, that custom enforceth not?) of the Church, that
cause so much difference in the proceedings of it.

§ 8. Howsoever the custom of redeeming penance came
into the Church, and how prejudicial soever the voyage of
the Holy Land, or the like, may have been to the discipline
of it; the application of temporal good to some spiritual end
was a poor cloak for such a corruption, in comparison of
that zeal to Christianity, which fighting for Christians against
infidels pretendeth. This is the most material occasion, that
I find alleged" for that change, which the discipline of the
Church hath suffered in granting absolution before penance;
to wit, the indulgences granted them that undertook to fight
for Christians against infidels. And this is enough to ren-
der the abuse, and the decay of discipline by the means
thereof, visible.

§ 9. But when indulgences are proposed for a small sum

"Secunda occasio" (Morinus had been describing an earlier abuse, of re-
deeing penances for money) "in-
ominandum penitentiarum fuit co-
rum æquatio et commutatio cum uno
alioque opere laborioso propter evidentem
apparentem ecclesiæ utilitatem sus-
cepto... Magnum illud opus fere sem-
per fuit, arma contra ethnicos, heretici-
cos, schismaticos fere, aut qui ferat,
modo non possit, suis sumptibus aere.
" Morinus, De Penit., lib. x. c. 19. § 1.
p. 765. 1. B. And see that and the
following chapters.
not the indulgences, if rightly understood and had, but as, not being rightly understood and had, render the indulgences dangerous delusions: whether poor people will not rather be induced by our common corruption to embrace that sense, which makes the pardon of their sins void, as so had, than that which makes them to be deceived of their money to no effect by the Church; I leave to the conscience of discreet Christians to judge. And whether this be not horribly to abuse the keys of the Church, I leave to God and man to judge. In the mean time I only remind you of that difficulty, which the ancient Church made, in believing and admitting that those were saved, who, being admitted to the communion of the eucharist in danger of death, died before they could accomplish that penance, upon undertaking whereof they were admitted to it. For is not the case of him, that steadily purposeth to perform that penance which the Church imposeth according to rule if he survive, much more hopeful for salvation, dying afore, than his, that thinks his sin purged by the sentence of absolution without undertaking or performing any penance at all in order to the pardon of it?

§ 10. And here I summon the consciences of the doctors of the Church of Rome. Suppose a man take revenge upon himself according to a good conscience, that is, proportionably to the weight of his sin, according to the rules that were in force in more uncorrupt times of the Church; another, according to the doctrine that is current in the Church of Rome, professing himself truly sorry for his sin and receiving absolution, presumes of pardon for it, intending to satisfy for temporal punishment that remains, as he is directed: whether of these is upon the better ground? whether of them pretends to pardon upon the better title, supposing the premisses concerning the covenant of grace? He, who, satisfying his conscience upon the original word of the Gospel and the primitive practice of the Church, that he hath appeased the wrath of God by taking revenge upon himself, and is thereby returned to his first resolution for Christianity; or he, who, being touched with sorrow for his
sin and submitting the same to the keys of the Church, hath done what the current practice thereof requires him to do, for redeeming the temporal punishment of it? For it is evident in the doctrine of the apostles and the primitive practice of the Church, that the satisfaction of penance appeaseth the wrath of God upon this ground, because it evidenceth that resolution for Christianity to be restored, which a man otherwise ought not to presume of in himself, when he knows in himself that it hath been interrupted; much less ought the Church to presume of it in him, when the interruption thereof hath been visible to the Church. He then, who, having conceived sorrow for his sin, submits himself to the keys of the Church, to be restored to God's grace by the ministry thereof, and does as he is enjoined to do, if the Church and the person whom the Church trusts for him do their duty (that is, supposing the laws of the Church to be good and sufficient, and well and sufficiently exercised), hath a good and sufficient presumptuation that he is restored. But he, who proceedeth upon the common faith of the Gospel and the primitive practice of the Church (whereby all that is doubtful in Christianity must be resolved), attaineth that assurance of his restoring to the state of salvation, which I have shewed is attainable. But, not supposing the laws of the Church to be either sufficient or sufficiently executed, that presumption of pardon, which can be built upon it, is neither good nor sufficient, but rather [destructive] to salvation, by palliating the crime which it ought to cure.

§ 11. Now for the ground, which the Church of Rome gives a reasonable man to presume hereof: it is not to be denied or dissembled, that the Council of Trent, Sess. xiv. cap. 8, declareth, that it is the duty of all confessors to enjoin "wholesome and competent penance" upon all penitents (and that, by virtue of St. Paul's charge, 1 Tim. v. 22, —upon which the power of the Church in imposing penance

---

Footnotes:
7 Misprinted 202 in folio edition.
8 Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxi.
§ 36, 44.
1 Corrected from MS.; "peremptory," in orig. text.
2 "Debent ergo sacerdotes Domini, quantum spiritus et prudencia suggererit, pro qualitate crimini et peni-
BOOK III. is truly grounded, seeing the blessing of the Church, signified by imposition of hands, is as much granted in penance as in ordaining,—"lest they become partakers of other men's sins"), declaring withal the intent which they ought to aim at in imposing them. But we know also and see thereby, that there is no effectual course taken to see that this be done (whether it be possible to take a course that may be effectual to be done or not); and we know besides, how great vogue that opinion hath, which maketh attrition with the keys of the Church (that is, the shame of declaring a man's sin to his confessor) a sufficient disposition to forgiveness.

And therefore it is justly to be questioned, whether the law of secret confession, with these abusive opinions and scandalous practices, under which it is now exercised in the Church of Rome, is for the best or not; that is to say, whether the greatest part of them who submit to it, do not unduly persuade themselves that their sins are cured by it, when indeed they are not. For considering the ground of all superstition and counterfeit religion to be this, that man, sensible of the wrath of God due to his sin on the one side, yet favourable to that concupiscence which sin pleaseth on the other side, desireth a colour to persuade himself that he is reconciled to God by such means as indeed serves not the turn: I know not whether persuasion is the more catching (supposing the present division between the Reformation and the Church of Rome);—that a man is justified by believing that he is predestined to life, and by calling to mind the assurance which once he hath had of it;—or that he hath no more to do but to talk with his confessor and give him content, who it is great odds does not believe any penance to be required to qualify him for pardon, but to redeem the debt of temporal punishment remaining after it is had.

§ 12. Whereby we may conclude, what to think of the performing of penance after absolution is pronounced. I do remember what I have said of St. James: that, when he commanded the presbyters of the Church to be sent for to the sick, and to pray for him, with assurance of pardon for his sins, he

---

* Corrected from MS.; "signifieth," in orig. text.
* Corrected from MS.; "other," in orig. text.
* Above, c. ix. § 21.
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supposeth those sins to be declared by him to them (whereupon it follows immediately, "Confess your sins one to another and pray for one another"), together with his present disposition in regard of them; and that, if the case were such as required the hardship of laborious penance to satisfy the Church of the sincerity of his conversion, though they prayed for him (that is, suffered him not to go out of the world without the communion of the Church), yet they bound him over to perform that penance, if he recovered, which the Church required in the like cases. For can any man certainly know, that the whole Church used so to do from the most ancient times that we have record of, and doubt, that the apostle, speaking of that very subject, should suppose the same? Neither do I doubt, knowing what varieties fall out in all kinds of moral matters, that the same proceeding may be either necessary or reasonable in other cases. But that the regular proceeding of the Catholic Church should be laid aside, that no further satisfaction should be demanded than whether a man hath performed all that was enjoined him when he confessed last or not: this, I say, leaves it free to every man's interpretation, whether it tend to abolish the sin or not; and, by consequence, whether a man can or ought so to rest satisfied, or, further, be bound to see himself qualified for pardon according to the covenant of grace.

§ 13. To which purpose the form of absolution by way of [The pronouncing sentence, not of seeking pardon from God, is to be considered. Not that I doubt, that the Church hath power to restore to communion with the Church (which this sentence effecteth) and to loose the bond of that sin which it hath tied. For if it be necessary for every Christian to be of the Church, then is it necessary for him to seek remission of those sins, which are under the ministry of the Church, by the means which the Church hath appointed. But because I know, that the primitive form of absolution must needs agree with those scriptures, which shew the means of obtaining remission of sin by the Church, for a great part, to consist in the prayers of the Church; and that the effect thereof did consist in nothing else but in being admitted to the prayers thereof for penitents, with imposition of hands

signifying the same. And, therefore, the present form is an evidence, that the discipline of the Church is decayed in the matter of penance, since the zeal of Christianity came to decay; after that the powers of the world, professing Christianity, could not but countenance it with those privileges and penalties, which necessarily follow the religion of the state; and, by consequence, temporal respects were great ingredients in persuading men to be Christians.

§ 14. What the effect hereof may have been, I will not undertake. But when the world is obliged to take the sentence for good, as from God, and not obliged to presuppose the means to produce that disposition, which only qualifyeth for pardon; is not the scandal probable, in and to those, that have not more care of their souls than they see the Church have? Sentence of absolution is pronounced; penance is reserved in regard of temporal penalties due:—what doth this proceeding pretend, but that he, who saith he is sorry for his sin, so he be content to sue out his pardon from the Church, is qualified for it by the keys of the Church; that is, by the sentence of it, not by the ministry of it in producing that disposition which qualifies for it.

§ 15. It is not then to be said, that the Church in the discipline of penance hath not a certain jurisdiction; as every corporation must necessarily have, in imitation of that, which by the Roman laws is first and originally called jurisdiction, which the sword of the empire enforceth. For if no corporation can stand without power to provide laws for themselves; if all such are mockeries, if they be not enforced by penalties obliging obedience: then is the corporation of the Church, if ordained by God, by God enabled to enforce and constrain obedience; upon supposition, that a man desires to be saved by his Christianity, and that the communion of the Church is a part of it. And the exercise of this power is rightly called the jurisdiction of the Church, which ariseth upon the original constitution of it. But if this jurisdiction suppose the covenant of grace, and therefore cannot discharge any man that is not qualified as it requireth; then is the sentence of absolution to presuppose the disposition requisite for pardon to have been produced by the keys of the Church: that is, by using the means, which the Church as a physician
prescribeth; but further, as a judge, constraineth him to take, that findeth it requisite to be reconciled to the Church, because he is a Christian.

§ 16. And now it will not be difficult to judge of the law of auricular confession once a year, now in force by the Council of Lateran in the Church of Rome. For having marked the abuses hitherto reproved, so that I cannot be taken by any man, that hath any conscience left, to allow any of them; and having formerly inferred by necessary consequence, that it is in the power of the Church to limit and determine the circumstances of doing that, which a good conscience always will endure and probably will require any man to do: I must conclude it to be a law which the Church hath power to make.

§ 17. Not as if God had commanded the ministry of the Church to be secret. For as I have shewed from the beginning, that the prayers of the Church are, by the appointment of our Lord Christ and the practice of His apostles, the means to obtain pardon; so I have shewed, that it was also practised by the primitive Church. And therefore I do maintain, that, from the beginning, there was not, nor could be, any difference between the inward and outward court of the Church; as now there must needs be, wheresoever excommuni[cat]ion is inflicted upon notorious sins; and sins, that are not notorious, are cured in secret by the keys of the Church. For whether it were the knowledge of others, or a man's own conscience, that brought his sins to be cured by the ministry of the Church, they came before those that managed the power of the keys in behalf of the Church; and by their judgment, whether at large, or limited by canons provided afore-hand for the Church, was the cure appointed.

§ 18. The Council of Trent granteth, that God hath not forbidden public confession of secret sin. My reasons infer more:—that confession of sin in secret is an abatement of prudential discipline.
that discipline, which our Lord and His apostles instituted for the cure of sin by the Church; and, by consequence, an abatement to the efficacy of His ordinance. Neither can any thing be alleged for it, but the decay of Christianity by the coming of the world into the Church; and the necessity, which that bringeth upon the Church, to abate of that which the primitive institution requireth, that the ordinances of our Lord may be preserved to such effect as can be obtained with the unity of the Church.

§ 19. And therefore I deny not, that this law may be abused to become a torture, and snare, and an occasion of infinite scandals, to well-disposed consciences. For who will provide laws for so vast a body, as the whole Church of Christendom yet is, that shall give no occasion of offence? They that pretend it, are but Absalom’s disciples; that, to cure one, advance innumerable. No more do I deny, that the skill of all confessors (that is, all that must be trusted with that power which this law constituteth) is not, nor can probably be, able to value the sins that are brought to them, and to prescribe the cure which they require; supposing their conscience such, as will not fail to require that, which their skill finds to be requisite. In questions of this nature, though it were to be wished that such laws could be provided for the Church, as, being blameless, might render the Church blameless; yet they, that are capable of giving sentence what is best for so vast a body, will find it best (as in all other corporations or commonwealths) to improve the ordinances of God to the best of that, which can be obtained with the unity of the Church.

§ 20. And, therefore, setting aside those gross abuses, which may follow upon the persuasion, that those penalties, which are to be imposed by the power of the keys to produce that disposition which qualifieth penitents for remission of sins, tend only to satisfy for the temporal penalty, remaining due when the sin is pardoned; and setting aside those abuses in the practice of penance which tend to introduce this persuasion: I must freely glorify God by freely professing, that in my judgment no Christian kingdom or state can maintain itself to be that which it pretendeth more effectually, than by giving force and effect to the law of private confession.
once a year, by such means, as may seem both requisite and effectual to enforce it.

§ 21. Not that I do condemn that order, which the Church of England at the Reformation contented itself with (as retaining the reformation thereof of no reformation, and leaving men destitute of sufficient means for the remission of sin after baptism); to leave it to the discretion and conscience of those, who found themselves burdened with sin, to seek help by the means of their pastors; as appeareth both in the Communion Service, and in the Visitation of the Sick: but because I see the Church of England hath failed of that great piece of reformation, which it aimed at in this point; to wit, the [retrieving*] of public penance. This aim you shall find expressed in the beginning of the Communion against Sinners, in these words:—“Brethren, in the primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that at the beginning of Lent such persons as were notorious sinners were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of our Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be more afraid to offend: in the stead whereof, until the said discipline may be restored again (which is much to be wished), it is thought good,” &c.

§ 22. What is the reason, that so godly a desire of so evident a reformation could not take place, when reformation in the Church was so generally sought (besides those common obstructions, which all good pretences will necessarily find in all communities of Christians); I shall not much labour to persuade him, that shall consider the tares of puritanism to have been sowed together with the grain of reformation in the Church of England. This I will say, that, where visible penance is exercised for sins of themselves visible (and much more, which the conscience of those who commit them makes visible), there is a reasonable ground of presumption, that those, who see this done upon others, will not advance to the communion of the eucharist without visiting their own consciences, and exacting competent revenge upon their sins,
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*Misprinted 205 in folio edit.
* Corrected from MS. (which also corrects into, “receiving”): “re-ceiving,” in orig. text.
* Corrected from MS.; “with,” in orig. text.
though they use not the help of their pastors in taxing it. That vulgar Christians would have been moved voluntarily to seek the help of their pastors in taxing the cure of their sins, without seeing the practice of that medicine upon notorious sins which the discipline of the Church required, who can imagine? For nothing but example teaches vulgar people the benefit of good laws. Nor did secret penance ever get the force of a general law but by example. But where there is no pretence of casting notorious offenders out of the company of Christians, that thereby they may be moved to submit to the cure of their sins by satisfying the Church of their repentance, because the secular power enforces no sentence of excommunication: it is no Christian kingdom or commonwealth, though Christians may live in it, as Christians may be cast upon a coast that is not inhabited by Christians. For he that believes, not only that there is a Catholic Church in the world, but that he must be saved by being a member of it, may and will find imperfection enough in those laws, by which the keys of the Church are employed and exercised; but if he find no reconciliation of sin by the keys of the Church, because no excluding of sinners from the communion of it, will find no part of the Catholic Church there, because no part of the Catholic Church was ever without it.

§ 23. And, therefore, I must not fail to declare my opinion in this place: that in a Christian commonwealth, if by any means those, that are convicted of capital crimes by law, come to escape death, either by favour of the law or by grace of the sovereign (as many times it falls out), and likewise all those, that are convicted of crimes that are infamous, having satisfied the justice of the law, ought to stand excommunicate till they satisfy the Church. And, for the same reason, those whom the Church conviceth of crimes, which civil justice punisheth not, but Christianity maketh inconsistent with the hope of Christians, being excommunicate upon such conviction, ought not to be restored to the communion of the Church, until, by just demonstrations of their conversion, the Church be satisfied of them as qualified for reconcilement with God. For where there is means for those that are detected of notorious sins to be restored to the communion of the Church without the hardship of penance; there can be
no reason to imagine, that those, whose sins are secret, will of themselves submit themselves to the keys of the Church, to procure pardon, or to assure themselves of it.

§ 24. I find great reason to believe, that at the first those sins which were brought under public penance by the primitive Church, were only those three great crimes of murder, adultery, and idolatry, which the Montanists and Novatians excluded from reconciliation by penance, and the branches that were reducible to the same. For Pacianus, *Parænesi ad Penitentiam*, speaking expressly of this matter, expresses no more. But when the empire was Christian, and the Church became ingrafted into the state; then was the rule enlarged to all crimes that the laws of the state made capital: to which, in point of conscience, those that are infamous by civil law are not inferior, though, being not so pernicious to the world, they are not by civil law punished with death. The Reformation of Ecclesiastical Law intended here under Edward VI. hath taken notice of these terms.

§ 25. As for the Presbyterians, that would so fain be authorized by the state to swagger and domineer over the consciences of their poor neighbours, that they have not been ashamed to submit the original power of the Church to an appeal to the secular (which is, in English, to let Parliament-

---


2 See Morinus, *De Penitit.*, lib. v. cc. 1, 2, 4, 5; pp. 249. 1. A, sq.

3 "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, ex auctoritate primum Regis Henrici 8. inhinta: Deinde per Regem Edouardum 6. proiecta aucto etque saepe ad pleniores ipsarum reformationem in lucem edita." (sic.) Lond. 1571: and again in 1640, and 1641; and republished Oxf. 1850.—The Sect. de Excommunicatione, c. 3, Quibus in causis excommunicatio debet adhiberi, p. 168. (Oxf. 1850), restricts that sentence, somewhat vaguely, "ad horribilium criminum atrocitetem, . . . in quibus ecclesia gravissimam infamiam sustinet, vel quod illis evertatur religio, vel quod boni mores pervertuntur: illius autem generis sunt de quibus Paulus dicit, "Qui talia faciunt in regnum Dei non introibunt," &c. But c. 16, De reis qui mortis sententiam acceperunt (p. 177), seems to assume, that excommunication is due to all capital crimes. The last clause in the text is altered in MS. into, "hath a provision in it concerning this business."

4 On Oct. 20, 1645, "the Lords and Commons at Westminster gave directions in an ordinance for suspending scandalous persons from the Lord's Supper," which "ordinance concludes with a proviso, that the members of both houses who are now members of the Assembly of Divines" (scil. at Westminster), "or any seven of them, shall be a standing committee to pronounce upon the causes of suspension from the Lord's Supper, not mentioned in this ordinance." Collier, *Ecc. Hist. of Great Brit.*, Pt. ii. Bk. ix. vol. ii. p. 840. b.—"Twas resolved by the Lords
men live as they list, so themselves might be enabled to do what they listed with little ones): to give them the power of the Church, is to destroy the Church; the power whereof they pretend not to exercise to the curing of sin, but only to the abolishing of scandal", which the Church never pretended to abolish but by curing the sin. And yet they must give me leave to ask further: either how that conscience can be cured of sin, that is not wounded with it; or how it can be wounded with it, that is bound to believe the pardon of sin before repentance. So necessary it is, that they be required to disclaim the remission of sin, and the opinion of saving faith, without supposing repentance, and the same to be procured by the keys of the Church; before we suppose them to be a Church.

CHAPTER XII.*


BATTLE I leave this point, I am here to consider, what ecclesiastical power it is, and how well grounded, which the Church of Rome pretendeth to exercise in extreme unction: so called, because it belongeth to the sick in extremity; and, being accounted by them in the number of the seven sacraments, is applied unto the sick, over and above the sacraments of penance and of the eucharist.†

and Commons in February following, a choice should be made of Elders throughout the kingdom of England and Wales. On the 14th of March this resolution was formed into an ordinance." Id., ibid., p. 841. a.—Collier goes on to remark, that "this scheme of religion is drawn upon Erastian principles; for the ordinance sets forth, that the congregational, classical, provincial, and national assemblies, were all of them to be subordinate to the Parliament." Ibid.

* See above, c. ix. § 15. note i.
† See an ample statement (with citations) of the practice and doctrine of the Church of Rome, in Joan. Launoy, De Sacram. Uinctiosis Infirmarum Liber, c. 1; Op., tom. i. P. i. pp. 444, sq.—His patristic authorities antecedently to Pope Innocent I. amount to three, Origen, Victor Antiochenus, and S. Chrysostom: for the first and third of whom, see below, § 12, 13; and the words of the second—" Dici tamen
§ 2. The question of the sacraments, wherein the nature of them consisteth, and by consequence how many of them there are, I wholly set aside from the present discourse: because I conceive it will be determined more briefly, and upon more settled grounds, all at once, when I shall have discovered what powers they are, which the Church indeed exerciseth by those actions, which are or which may be pretended to be sacraments.

§ 3. But it is plain enough, that the Church of Rome pretendeth also to exercise the power of the keys in extreme unction; because, according to the words of St. James afore quoted, they assign the effect of it to be the remission of sin. On the contrary, they, who by the promise of bodily health, to be restored to the sick upon the unction which the apostle prescribeth, do gather, that the whole office there commanded was temporary (as only intended for those ages when the miraculous grace of healing was in force in the Church), by consequence, do not admit any office to be in-charged, or any power estated, upon the Church by it.

§ 4. That which hath been premised to shew, that the circumstances of the apostle's words, together with the original and general practice of the Church, argueth aloud his intent to concern the exercise of the keys of the Church, and the power of them, towards those that are in danger of death, engageth my resolution to be this;—that the unction of the sick pretendeneth only bodily health, upon supposition of the cure of sin by the keys of the Church.

potest orationem hae omnia efficere, oleum autem eorum omnium, quae sunt externum tantum symbolum esse (In cap. vi. Evangel. Marci, in Bibl. PP., tom. iv. p. 308. A.)—signify the same with those of the other two.

* See below, c. xxix. § 9, sq.

"Convenit inter theologos duos esse effectus hujus sacramenti. Unum quod sanat corpus, si ita expedit animae salut. Alterum, quod abstergit reliquias peccatorum. Una tantum est inter theologos questio. Nam quae sint peccatorum reliquias, non eodem modo omnes explicat. Quidam esse volunt peccata venialia; sed improbabilitate... Alii nomine reliquiarum intelligunt proinitatem sive habitum ex peccato relictum. Sed il adhuc improbabilius loquantur... Dico igitur reliquias peccatorum duplices esse, et utramque abensionem ad effectum hujus sacramenti proprae dictum per Catinere. Primum enim reliquiae dicitur peccata, quae interdum remanent post omnia alia sacramenta, sive mortalia sive venialia sint... Secundo nomine reliquiarum peccati vaeit etiam quidam torpor et mecor et anxietas, quae ex peccato relinquiqu solet, et quae maxime hominem morti vicinum vexare potest." Bellarm., De Extr. Uinct., lib. i. c. 8; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 1511. C.—1512. D.—See also Launoy, as above quoted, cap. ii. Observ. 1; pp. 463, 464.

* E. g. Calvin concludes (Instit. IV. xiii. 18); "Ut igitur maxime demus unionem sacramentum fuisset earum virtutum quae tum per manus apostolorum administrabatur; nihil nunc ad nos pertinet, quibus virtutum administratio commissa non est."

† Above, c. ix. § 21, 32.
sick, together with the prayers of the Church for the recovery of their bodily health (which Christianity alloweth not without praying principally for the health of the soul), is no way commanded by St. James, but as an appertainance or an appendant to the exercise of the power of the keys in reconciling the sick to the Church, whereupon the prayers thereof become due; and, therefore, without further promise of remission of sin, or grace, than that general promise, which the enjoining of prayer for the sick presupposeth. The reason of this assertion is now to be deduced out of the Scriptures; supposing for grounds those things, which hitherto have been settled.

§ 5. When our Lord sent His disciples to preach the Gospel, and to do those works that might witness them to be the disciples of Him that was sent by God; it is said (Mark vi. 13), that “they cast out many devils, and anointed many sick with oil, and healed them.” Now it is evident, that the miracles of the apostles, as did their Master’s, tended to one general purpose,—by bodily cures, to intimate the cure of sin, and the recovery of life and health to the soul, which our Lord pretended to bring and tender them: though by His works convincing them, that He was the Messias, Whom they expected to bring them deliverance from their bodily enemies, and the happiness of enjoying freely the land promised [to*] their fathers.

§ 6. Whereby we may see, what consideration those writers of controversies have of the Scriptures, that ground the action of the sick (which they will have to be a sacrament of the New Testament) upon this action of the apostles?; whereas the Gospel, though now in preaching by the apostles as well as our Lord, yet was not established till His death past and accepted by God, and by His resurrection declared to be accepted, as the ratification of that amassage of reconcile-

---
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* Misprinted “by,” in folio edit.
ment and peace which He came to publish. Far more discreet is that which the Council of Trent hath said; that, "being intimated by St. Mark, it is published by St. James."

At least, if we understand the ground, whereupon we maintain, that the cure of sin is intimated by that bodily health, which St. Mark relateth to have been restored by the apostles.

§ 7. For so indeed it is. The bodily cures, which the apostles then did, seemed to intimate, that the embracing and undertaking of Christianity is, from Christ's death forwards, in consideration thereof, the cure of the soul, and the restoring of it from death to life. Which if it be so, then hath the Church no further power in the pardoning or abolishing of sin, than the absolute necessity of this condition will allow: that is to say, that it be understood to pardon sin, in as much, and no otherwise, than as the ministry thereof moveth to induce men to be Christians, whether in profession or in performance. Thus those, who by that Christianity, which the Church maintaineth, are induced to believe, that they are lost for ever unless they undertake the profession of Christianity, being induced so to do, are cleansed from sin, and made heirs of everlasting life, by the baptism which the Church giveth. Thus those, who have forfeited the right which they attained by being baptized by forfeiting the profession upon which they attained it, being reduced by the Church to a disposition of making it good for the future, are thereby re-estated in the same right again. And all the prayers, which the Church can tender to God for remission of sins, can no way be presumed or understood to be of force with God, but upon supposition, that those, for whom they are made, are either in the state or in the way of performing that which their Christian profession undertaketh. This reason,—added to those circumstances of St. James his words and the original practice of the Church afore quoted, which


* Above, c. ix. § 21, 32.
BOOK III. shew that he intendeth to speak of the applying of the keys of the Church to the sick,—throughly convinceth, that remission of sin is not attributed to the anointing of the sick, but [is] as an appertenance of the power of the keys passing upon them, and upon supposition, that, by submitting to it, the Church, being enabled to warrant their pardon, could with confidence pray for that bodily health, which they chiefly need in that estate. For if, supposing this condition, nothing can hinder remission of sin; if, not supposing the same, nothing can warrant it: what reason can we imagine, why the power of the Church, and those persons which are entrusted on behalf of it, should be employed in this business, but to procure that disposition, which only qualifieth for remission of sin.

§ 8. And, therefore, I cannot allow the excuses which the school doctors use, to maintain the effect of this unction in the remission of sin, considering it precisely without that dependance, which in the words of the apostle it hath, upon the keys of the Church. They say, the effect of it is to wipe away the remains of sin, whether original or actual, consisting in that proneness to the enjoying of the creature, that faintness and sluggishness in following true virtue, that weakness in tending to God, which remain even in him that is perfectly restored to God’s grace. For these if they be sin, then are they cured by the same means by which his sin is cured (which how it is effected by the Church, hath been oft enough said): if not sin, God forbid but the prayers of the Church should prevail to weaken them in the sick; but, as those prayers have their force upon supposition of the condition, so must they be understood to have the effect of forgiveness, ascribed them here by the apostle, in virtue of
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* Added from MS.
* Apparently altered in MS. into, “is upon.”
* "When St. James promises pardon and health upon prayer and anointing, pardon belongs to prayer, which supposes the keys, health belongs to anointing.” Added in margin in MS.
* Misprinted 208 in folio edit.
* See Bellarmine as quoted above, § 3. note r.—The Council of Trent (as above quoted, c. ii. ibid. D) decrees, that the “res et effectus” of extreme unction is “gratia Spiritus Sancti, cujus unctio delicta, si quae sint adhuc expianta, ac peccati reliquias abstergit, et negroti animam alleviat et confirmat, magnum in e(o) Divino misericordiæ fiduciæ excitando: qua infirmus sublevatus, et morbi incommoda ac laboris levius fert, et tentationibus demonis calcaneo insidientia facilis resitit, et sanatatem corporis interdum, ubi salutis animae expedierit, consequitur.”
that disposition, which the ministry of the Church shall have produced.

§ 9. And, therefore, I am not moved with those arguments which are produced; to prove, that the bodily health here promised hath no relation to the miraculous graces of the apostles’ time*. It is said, that those graces are not given according to men’s ranks in the Church, but according to God’s good pleasure: as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xii. 4—11; where he reckoneth up that variety of graces, which the Spirit of God then stirred up in the Church, without any intimation, that they were given rather to public than to private persons in the Church: and, therefore, that it had been impertinent for St. James to name the presbyters of the Church, had he intended to speak of curing the sick by any such graceb. But it is easy to answer, that such graces, though common to private persons in the Church, yet, in reason, were most frequently imparted to those that were most eminent in Christianity: and that public persons in the Church were made such upon presumption of their eminence above others in Christianity: which presumption, though it possibly may fail, yet of necessity must hold good for the most part: and that upon this account, as the apostles, the heads of the whole Church, were most eminent in all graces, so it is in reason to be presumed, that the presbyters of the Church (whosoever were the office of presbyters of the Church for the present1) were oftener endowed with those graces than private Christians. Whereupon it will follow (for a thing, which no reason can be shewed why it should not come to pass, though the Scripture offered no further evidence that it did come to pass), that private persons, enjoying the grace of healing by the Holy Ghost, might restore to bodily health by anointing with oil; not extending their function to the procuring of forgiveness for
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* Bellarmine, De Extr. Uncet., lib. i. c. 3; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 1498, 1499.

b "Inducat, inquit, ‘presbyteros.’ At si de miraculo ageter, dicet potius, Inducat prophetas, aut alios, qui donum habent curationum: nec enim soli aut omnes presbyteri etiam tunc habent donum curandi. Neque refert, quod per presbyteros nolunt adversari significari sacerdotes, sed seniores; nam nec seniores omnes habebant donum curationis, non enim illud donum erat alligatum statu aut dignitati, ut patet ex Paulo Rom. xii., 1 Cor. xii., et Ephes. iv.” Bellarm., ibid., p. 1498. D.

1 See below, c. xvii.

a Corrected from MS.; “after,” in orig. text.
sin, which the public ministry of the Church pretendeth to procure. For, on the other side, notwithstanding the promise of bodily health in St. James, it is no inconvenience to grant, that the prayers of the Church might fail of it; though it be not granted, that they fail of forgiveness of sin, when the person is qualified. The reason is, because the promise of forgiveness of sin by the Gospel is absolute, the condition being cleared; that is, supposing the person qualified for it: but for bodily health there is no further promise by the Gospel, than it shall seem to God, that the condition of bearing Christ’s cross in this or that man requireth.

§ 10. It is also said, that, according to St. Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 22, “tongues are a sign to unbelievers, not Christians;” and therefore it is not to be supposed, that the grace of healing was to be exercised to the benefit of believers, but to the conversion of infidels. For St. Paul, that cured Publius of a fever (Acts xxviii. 8), “left Trophimus at Miletimus sick” (2 Tim. iv. 20), and had Epaphroditus by him sick to death (Phil. ii. 26, 27), and cured not Timothy of his “frequent infirmities” (1 Tim. v. 23). But I answer again with St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 7; that “the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit with:” that is to say; those graces which do manifest that the Spirit of God is in the Church, and therefore that Christianity comes from God, are given nevertheless to Christians to do good to Christians with; though not to all always, but to such as God, Who hath given them the grace, shall move them to do good with it. But though I maintain, that the promise of bodily health upon the prayers of the Church belongs to those graces, by which it then appeared that God is in His Church; yet, in that He requires the presbyters of the Church, in that He promises remission of sin, it is not to be imagined, that bodily health, and the exercise of that grace which procured it, is only intended; and so, that the precept concerns the Church no more than that grace appears: but that the effect of it reaches to all ages of the Church, abating that

---

1 "Præterea non est probabile apostolum jussisse fidelibus ut miracula quærerent, signa enim infidelium sunt, non fidelium, 1 Cor. xiv." Bellarm., as quoted above in § 9. note h.

* Corrected from MS.: “so,” in orig. text.
which depended upon the miraculous graces proper to the apostles' time. For, suppose remission of sin past warrant-ed the sick by the keys of the Church that have passed upon him, yet all Christians are to assure themselves, that their spiritual enemies are most busy about them in that extremity: whether out of despair to prevail, if not then, or out of hope then to prevail; their malice being heightened to the utmost attempt of casting him down by the extremity of that in-
stance. God forbid, then, that the prayers of the Church should be counted unnecessary in such an instance; though the remission of sin be provided for otherwise. For all ob-
structions to God's grace (requisite in so great weakness to overcome) being the effect and consequence of sin: neither can it be said, that the apostle attributeth the remission of sin to the unction, by the promise which he annexeth to the injunction, whereby he employs the keys of the Church to that end; nor can it be endured in a Christian to count the removing of them unnecessary and superfluous, espe-
cially the patient being so disposed, and in such a capacity for the effect of them, by submitting to the ministry of the Church for the remission of his sin. And therefore certainly, as it is necessary to presume, that the promise of bodily health is not absolute and general, but where it pleaseth God to give evidence of His presence in and to His Church by the effect of His temporal blessings; so that health of mind, necessary to resist the tempter with, which Chris-
tianity obliges us to suppose that Christians prayed for with bodily health, the prayers of the Church are not effectual to obtain, but upon supposition of that disposition which the Church requireth; and that, procured by the keys of the Church, supposing the party obliged to have recourse to the Church for it.

§ 11. How well this opinion agreeth with the sense of the Catholic Church, I have argument enough; both in the sayings of the Fathers, whereby they express the reason of anointing the sick, and in the practice of the Church.

§ 12. Origen, Homil. ii. in Levit."—"Est et adhuc dura et laboriosa per penitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat pec-
cator in lachrymis stratum suum, et sunt ei lachrymae sua

panes die ac nocte; et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum, et quærere medicinam: secundum eum qui ait, 'Dixi, pronunciabo adversum me iniquitatem meam Domino, et Tu remissisti impietatem cordis mei.' In quo impletur et aliud quod [Jacobus] apostolus dicit, 'Si quis autem infirmatur, vocet presbyteros ecclesie, et imponant ei manus, ungentes cum oleo in nomine Domini, et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum, et si in peccatis fuerit, remittentur ei' "—"There is yet a hard and painful remission of sins by penance, when the sinner washeth his couch with tears, and his tears become his bread day and night; and when he is not ashamed to declare his sin to the priest of God, and seek his cure: according to him that saith, 'I said, I will declare my sin to the Lord against myself, and Thou forgavest the impiety of my heart.' Wherein is also fulfilled that which the apostle saith, 'But if a man be sick, let him send for the priests of the Church, and let them lay hands on him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and if he be in sin it shall be forgiven him.'" Here he gives priests the power of forgiving sin, from St. James.

§ 13. St. Chrysostom, De Sacerdotio iii. 8°.—"Oυ γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ἡμᾶς ἀναγεννῶσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ [τὰ] μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἔχουσιν ἔχουσιν ἀμαρτήματα: ἀσθενεὶς γὰρ τις, φθηνίν, ἐν υἱῶν προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ προσευχῆς ὁσιῶσαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν, ὀλεθριάσεις αὐτῶν ἐλαφρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐναματί τοῦ Κυρίου"—"For not only when they regenerate us" (by baptism), "but afterwards also, have they power to remit sins; for 'is any man sick among you?' saith he, 'let him call the [priests] of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.'"

Shall we then ascribe the effect of this power to the bodily act of anointing with oil? or to their prayers, not supposing that disposition to be procured by their ministry which the promise of remission supposeth? Neither of both will stand with the premisses; seeing the prayers of the Church cannot be effectual to them, that submit not to the ministry of

* § 6; Op., tom. i. p. 384. E. ed. in orig. text. Bened.—8 in the text is a mistake.
† Corrected from MS.; "effects,"
‡ Corrected from MS.; "pastors," in orig. text.
the Church, when it becomes necessary for the procuring of that disposition which qualifies for remission of sin. So that the sense of the ancient Church, declared here by Origen and St. Chrysostom, must be understood to proceed upon consideration of the power of the keys, exercised upon the sick person that receiveth the unction, with prayers for his ghostly and bodily health.

§ 14. St. Augustin, De Tempore, Serm. ccxv. — "Quoties [St. Aug-
aliqua infirmitas supervenerit, Corpus et Sanguinem Christi
ille qui agrotat accipiat; et inde corpusculum suum ungat, ut
illud quod scriptum est impleatur in eo, 'Infirmatur aliquis,'"
&c.—"Videte, fratres, quia in infirmitate ad ecclesiam ["cucur-
accurrerit, et corporis sanitatem recipere et peccatorum in-
dulgentiam merebitur obtinere"]—"As oft as any infirmity comes, let him that is sick receive the Body and Blood of Christ; and then let him anoint his body, that that which is written may be fulfilled in him, 'If any man be sick,'" &c.—
"See, brethren, that he who shall have recourse to the Church in sickness, shall be thought worthy to obtain both the recovery of bodily health and indulgence for his sins." Now I ask, whether the rule of the Church will allow the communion of the eucharist to him, that hath not recourse to the Church for the cure of his sin, when he ought to have recourse to it. For if we suppose the eucharist to be given him upon confession of sin, then the reason which I pretend appears. If without, it is because nothing obliges him to have recourse to the keys of the Church at that time. And so the prayers of the Church and the eucharist and the unction are therefore effectual, because the Church rightly supposeth him qualified for remission of sins without recourse to other means: for daily sins and hourly are abolished by daily and hourly devotions, with detestation of the same; and yet more firmly abolished by partaking of these offices ministered by the Church. Here I must give notice, that I undertake not that this sermon is St. Augustin's own; which, I see, is censured among those pieces that have crept under his name by mistake, or by imposture: for the style

---

\(^1\) Serm. ccxv. in Append., \(^2\) Op., tom. v. Append. p. 437. C.
\(^a\) Louvain edition: spurious, by the Benedictine editors; who attribute it to Cæsarius (A.D. 502).
also seemeth to make it some hundreds of years later than his time. But I think it more advantage to my opinion, that it held footing in the Church so long after St. Augustin, than that it appeareth to have been the sense of his time. For the sense of the now Church of Rome, that remission of sin is to be attributed to the unction¹, appears to be of so much the later date.

[§ 15. And therefore I allege also the words that are quoted out of the book De Rectitudine Catholice Conversationis, among St. Augustin’s works."—“Qui ægrotat, in sola Dei misericordia confidat, et eucharistiam [Corporis ac Sanguinis Christi] cum fide et devotione accipiat, oleumque benedicium fideliter ab ecclesia petat, unde corpus suum ungatur; et, secundum apostolum, ‘oratio fidei salvabit infirnum, et allevabit eum Dominus;’ nec solum corporis sed et animæ sanitatem accipiet”—“Let him that is sick, trust only in the mercy of God, and receive the eucharist with faith and devotion, and faithfully send for the consecrated oil from the Church, that his body may be anointed with it; and, according to the apostle, ‘the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall give him ease;’ and he receive health, not only of body, but soul also.” This indeed is something like that which they say now in the Church of Rome;—that our original inclination to evil, dulness and faintness to do good, and averseness of the mind from spiritual exercises, are those “relics of sin,” which this unction cureth. In the mean time, remission of sin is or ought to be presupposed by the keys of the Church, passed upon him that duly receives the eucharist; nor can that health of the mind, which cureth these infirmities, be attributed to the unction which pretends bodily health, but to the prayers of the Church, prescribed to be made for the sick in that estate. And since [there are] those, that deduce the office of anointing the sick, and by consequence the effect of it, from the practice of the apostles curing with oil; as Bede⁷, Theophylact⁸, and Euthymius,]
upon Mark vi. a: how will they justify the spiritual promise of remission of sin to depend upon the bodily act of anointing the sick, but upon supposition of that disposition of the soul which qualifieth for it; which cannot be supposed, when recourse ought to be had to the keys of the Church for obtaining it, and is not. And, therefore, there can be no greater argument thereof in the practice of the Church, than this,—that the ordinary use of this unction, both in the eastern and western Church, is after receiving the eucharist b; which supposeth in the Church a legal presumption at least of the parties being in the state of grace.

§ 16. The words of Venerable Bede, upon Mark vi. 13 c, [Bede, and Pope Innocent I.] are by no means to be neglected.— "Dicit apostolus Jacobus, 'Infirmatur quis in vobis? inducat presbyteros ecclesie, et orent super ipsum, ungentes eum oleo in nomine Domini; et si in peccatis sit, dimitteret ei.' unde paet ab ipsis apostolis hunc sanctae ecclesie morem esse traditum, ut energumeni vel alii quilibet aegroti ungantur oleo, pontificali benedictione consecrato" — "The apostle James saith, 'Is any man among you sick? let him bring the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him:' whence it appeareth, that this custom was delivered to the holy Church by the apostles, that the vexed with evil spirits and other sick persons be anointed with oil consecrated by the blessing of the High-Priest." I believe no less. By that which the apostles did then, it appeareth, that thereupon St. James ordered, and the Church used, to anoint the sick in hope of bodily health, but with prayers for the soul also; and that by the ministers of the Church, when the

---


b See however ample proofs that the custom of administering the eucharist after extreme unction continued down to the 16th century, in Launoy, Expositor Ecclesia et Traditio de data infirmis post unctionem Eucharistia; Op., tom. i. P. 1. pp. 594, sq. The contrary and now (in the Roman Church) general rule appears to have arisen upon some words of S. Thom. Aquinas, and is enacted by a synod at Chartres in 1526: see Launoy, ibid., pp. 603, 606. — "Cela nous donna occasion de voir dans la bibliothèque un ancien rituel, qui prescrit l'extrême unction avant la sainte Viateque." Voyage Litteraire des Deux Benedictins, tom. i. p. 185.
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case required their presence; that is, when the ministry of
the keys was requisite. But when he saith, that "the vexed
with unclean spirits" as well as the sick were to be anointed
with it, he toucheth that, which he declareth more at large
upon James v. 14, 15. — "Hoc et apostolos fecisse in evangelio
legimus, et nunc ecclesiae consuetudo tenet, ut infirmi oleo con-
secrato ungantur a presbyteris, et oratione comitante sanentur;
nec solum presbyteris sed (ut Innocentius Papa scribit) etiam
omnibus Christianis uti licet eodem oleo, in sua aut suorum in-
firmitate ungendo; quod tamen oleum non nisi ab episcopis licet
confici: nam quod ait '[Oleo] in nomine Domini,' significal oleum
consecratum in nomine Domini; vel certe quia, cum ungunt in-
firmum, nomen Domini super eum invocare debent" — "This we
not only read in the Gospel that the apostles did, but also
the custom of the Church now holdeth, that the sick be
anointed with consecrated oil by the priests and cured by
prayer accompanying the same; nor may only priests, but
also all Christians, as Pope Innocent writeth, use the same
oil, when they or theirs are sick, by anointing; which oil not-
withstanding is not to be consecrated but by the bishop: for
that which he saith, ' [With oil] in the name of the Lord,'
signifieth that the oil must be consecrated in the name of the
Lord; or he saith it forsooth, because, when they anoint the
sick, they are to call upon the name of the Lord over him." The
words of Pope Innocent, Epist. i. 1: "Quod non est dubium
fidelibus agrotantibus accipi vel intelligi debere, qui sancto
de oleo chrismatis perungti possunt; quo ab episcopo confecto,
non solum sacerdotibus sed omnibus uti Christianis licet, in
sua aut suorum necessitate, inungendo" — "Which" (words of
St. James) "are without doubt to be taken and understood of
believers that are sick, who may be anointed with the holy
oil of anointing; which, being consecrated by the bishop,
not priests only but all Christians may use, when they or
theirs need it, by anointing." And by and by: "Nam paen-
tentibus istud infundi non potest, quia genus est sacramenti;
nam quibus reliqua sacramenta negantur, quomodo unum genus
putatur conditi?" — "For it cannot be poured upon penitents,
because it is a kind of sacrament; for how should it be thought, that one kind can be allowed them, [to] whom the rest of the sacraments are refused?" Bede again: "Si ergo infirmi in peccatis sint, et haec presbyteris ecclesie confessi fuerint, ac perfecto corde ea relinquere atque emendare satagerint, dimittentur eis; neque enim sine confessione emendationis peccata quenque dimitti: unde recte subjungitur, 'Confitemini ergo alterutrum peccata vestra, et orate pro invicem, ut salvemini': in hac autem sententia illa debet esse discretio, ut quotidianas leviaque peccata alterutrum coaequalibus confiteamur, eorumque quotidiana credamus oratione salvari: porro gravioris leprae immunditiam juxta Legem sacerdoti pandamus, atque ad ejus arbitrium, qualiter et quanto tempore jussert, pacificari curamus"—"If the sick then be in sins, and shall have confessed them to the priests of the Church, and endeavoured to leave and mend them with a perfect heart, they shall be forgiven them; for sins cannot be forgiven without profession of amendment: in which sentence this discretion is to be, that we confess daily and light sins to one another's equals, believing that they are cured by their daily prayers; but open the uncleanness of greater leprosy to the priest, according to the Law, and see them reconciled at his discretion, how and how long he orders." This is the very sense that I give the apostles, according to that strait communion Christians then held with Christians as members of the Church. Why not rely upon the advice and prayers of Christians as Christians, who are commanded to procure the salvation of Christians next their own, in matters whereof they may be thought capable? Therefore those sins, which St. James directs the priests to pray for, are such, as for the weight of them must resort to the keys of the Church for their cure. But when Bede, when Pope Innocent, allows all Christians to anoint themselves or theirs with consecrated oil; when the sermon De Tempore1 commands them to anoint their bodies; when the book De Rectitudo Catholicae Conversationis2 directs them to send for it from the Church: it is manifest, that they speak ofunction alone; whereas St. James speaks ofunction joined with the keys of the Church, and that the

---

2 See above, § 14.

---

2 See above, § 15.
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priest’s office is required in that case. It is also manifest, that Pope Innocent calls thatunction a sacrament, which Christians give themselves; which though he refuses peni-
tents, yet those, whom the priest shall have given the com-
munion to, could not be refused it: which refers remission of
sin to the keys of the Church, but the hope of bodily health
to the unction with prayer, such as the case requires.

§ 17. In the Penitential of Theodore of Canterbury thus
it was read, according to Burchardus his collection, xviii. 141.
—“Ab infirmis in periculo mortis positis per presbyteros pura
inquirenda est confessio peccatorum; non tamen illis imponenda
quantitas penitentiae, sed innotescenda, et cum amicorum ora-
tionibus et studiis eleemosynarum pondus penitentiae sublevan-
dum; ut, si forte migraverint, ne obligati excommunicatione
alieni vel ex consortio veniae riant: a quo periculo si Divinitus
ereptus convaluerit, penitentiae modum a suo confessore im-
positum diligenter observet; et ideo, secundum canonicam au-
thoritatem, ne illis jana pietatis clausa videatur, orationibus
et consolationibus ecclesiasticis sacra cum uctione olei ani-
nati, iuxta statuta sanctorum patrum communione viatici refi-
ciantur”—“Of the sick, that are in danger of death, a clear
confession of sins is to be demanded by the priests; yet is
not the quantity of penance to be imposed upon them, but to
be notified, and the weight of it to be eased with the prayers
of their friends, and zeal in giving alms; that, if they chance
to depart, they be not (as bound by excommunication)
strangers, and without the participation of pardon: from
which danger if God save him, and he recover, let him dili-
genously observe that measure of penance which his confessor
imposed; and therefore, according to the authority of the
canons, that the door of pity seem not shut upon them, being
comforted with the prayers and consolations of the Church
with the holy anointing of oil, let them according to the
constitutions of the holy fathers be refreshed with the com-
munion of the eucharist.” The same Burchardus, xviii. 11m,

same extract is quoted by Petitus in his edition of Theodore (tom. i. pp. 81, 82. Paris. 1677), both from Burchard
and from a MS. Penitential “Magistri
Bartholomei Oxoniensis Episcopi:” giving it (as does Burchard) according
to the corrections above made in the margin.

m Burchard., ibid., fol. 184. 1. b: as “ex decret. Eusebii Papae, c. 10.”
quotes that which follows, out of the decrees of Pope Eusebius, cap. x.: in whose decretales now extant (which Isidorus Mercator is thought to have forged) I find it not
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but he, who observes, how proper the order which he prescribes in the case is to that which the former passage prescribed in that case, may perhaps have reason to think, that it is out of the same Penitential of Theodore, and that the passage premised is the very order to which he refers.—"Si quis penitentiam petens, dum sacerdos venerit, fuerit officio linguæ privati, constitutum est, ut, si idonea testimonia habuerit quod ipse penitentiam pelisset, et ipse per motus aliquos sua voluntatis aliquod signum facere potest, sacerdos impleat omnia sicut supra circa ægro tum penitentem scriptum est; id est, orationes dicit, et ungat eum sancto oleo, et eucharistiam ei det, et, postquam obierit, ut caeteris fidelibus ei subministret"—"If a man that demands penance, while the priest is in coming, be deprived of the office of his tongue, it is decreed, that, if he have competent witness that he had demanded penance, and he by some motion is able to make some sign of his will, the priest fully do all that is written afore about the sick under penance; that is, say the prayers, and anoint him with the consecrated oil, and give him the eucharist, and when he is dead, do service for him as for other believers." By these remarkable passages you see, that, even when penance and the anunction both were ministered, and prescribed to be ministered, by the priest, bodily health was expected from the unction, remission of sins from the keys of the Church. How much more,—having shewed by Pope Innocent and Venerable Bede and others, that the anointing of themselves and theirs was referred to particular Christians,—is there reason to presume, that this was done, in case when there was no question of binding and losing sin by the keys of the Church.

§ 18. We have, lately published at Paris, a letter of Amulo, bishop of Lyons under Carolus Calvus, next successor to Agobardus, concerning some forged relics; pretending, that

n There are but four "Decreta Eusebii Papae" (A.D. 309), given in the collections of Councils, &c. (e.g. Labb., tom. i. p. 1593); among which the above decree is not. For the forgery of Isidorus Mercator, see Cave.

fits of convulsions and epilepsies were stirred at the presence of them, for evidence that they were cured by them as true relics. To which he saith:—"Si autem et languores aliquac debilitates accidunt, justa evangelicum et apostolicum praceptum præsto habet unusquisque, ut inducat presbyteros ecclesiae, et orient super eum, ungentes eum oleo in nomine Domini; et oratio fidei salvabit infirmum"—"But if any sickness or infirmity happen, it is ready for every man, according to the precept of the Gospel and apostle, to bring in the priests of the Church, that they may pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick." Here, because the occasion is public and notorious to the Church, the prayers of the priest are directed; though without reference to the ministry of the keys.

§ 19. Certainly Proculus the Christian, that cured Antoninus, son of Severus the emperor, by anointing with oil (according to Tertullian, Ad Scapulam iv.), did it not as a priest, which he did to an infidel; but as a private Christian, having hope in God by himself to make His presence in the Church appear. Only this difference we find, that—whereas Proculus did this as a simple Christian, endowed with one of those miraculous graces, whereby God manifested His presence in the Church at the beginning of Christianity—afterwards it was provided, that the oil should be consecrated by the bishop with the prayers of the Church; in virtue whereof, whether applied by the priests or by private Christians, there might be hope that it might operate.

§ 20. St. Chrysostom, In Matt. Hom. xxxii. Eth., comparing the entertaining of the apostles at home, there mentioned, with obeying their successors in the Church:—"Καὶ γὰρ ἡ τράπεζα αὐτὴ πολλῷ τιμωτέρα ἐκεῖνη καὶ ἡδίων, καὶ ἡ λυχνία [τῆς λυχνίας]. καὶ Ἰσαίου δοςει πιστεύω καὶ


q See above, § 16.

éνκαίρως ἐλαῖῳ χρισόμενοι νοσήματα ἑλυσαν—"For both this table is far more precious and pleasant than that, and this light; which all know, who, anointing themselves with oil seasonably and with faith, have avoided diseases."

§ 21. St. Augustin, De Civ. [Dei] xxii. 8:—"Hipponensem[St. Augustin.] quondam virginem scio, cum se oleo perurnisset, cui pro illa orans presbyter lacrymas suas instillatorat, max a demonio fuiisse sanatam"—"I know a certain maid of Hippo, having anointed herself with oil, in which the priest praying for her had dropped his tears, was straight cured of a devil." Here is nothing but the cure of the body by consecrated oil; only, that the priest, who gave it the maid, prayed for her when he gave her it.

§ 22. Therefore, when Hilarion cured the son-in-law and daughter of Constantia with oil, we are to understand the consecrated oil, with which the hinds and shepherds of Egypt cured themselves of the bitings of serpents by his direction: Hieron., in Hilarione.

§ 23. Nor did Malachias, in St. Bernard,[Malachias in St. Bernard.] pretending any more thereby than bodily cure.

§ 24. Therefore I do not marvel, that Innocent I. should speak of unction without penance; who seems expressly to grant, that sick persons should anoint themselves with that oil which the Church should send them for that purpose: to wit, upon supposition, that they need not the keys of the Church for the cure of their sins. For Friar Thomas of Walden (De Sacram. Tomo. ii. cap. penult.?) understandeth

lib. xxii. c. 8. § 8; Op., tom. vii. p. 667. F.

"Constantia quedam sancta femina, cujus generum et filiam de morte liberaret unctione olei." S. Hieron., Vit. Hilarion.; Op., tom. iv. P. ii. p. 90.—A little before (ibid., pp. 85, 86) he had mentioned, that "...itine ars noxae regio, postquam pluvias irrigata est, tantam serpentum et venenatorum animalium ex improviso ebullivit multituidinem, ut percussi innumerabiles, nisi ad Hilarionem concurrerent, statim interirent. Benedicto itaque oleo universi agricolae atque pastores tangentes vulnera certam salutem resumebant."

The story referred to however run thus—that the wife of a nobleman near Bangor Abbey, being dangerously sick, sent for Malachy (who was at one time Abbot of Bangor), "ut descendeter, priiusquam moreretur, infirmam unciturum oleo:" that, the unction being delayed, she died, but at the prayers of Malachy was restored to life again: who then "unxit eam nibilominus, scien in hoc sacramento remitti peccatae, et quod oratio fidelis salvet infirmum. Post haec abilat ille, et illa convaluit; et vivens incoluisse tempore aliquanto;" &c. S. Bernard., Vit. S. Malach. Episc. Hibern., c. xxiv. § 53; Op., tom. ii. p. 686. E.—687. E.—It is also said (ibid., p. 686. F.), that Malachy prayed for her restoration to life, "consternatus animo, sibi imputans quod fraudata gratia sacramenti obierit."

See above, § 16. notes f, g.

"Nec solum presbyteris sed (ut
him, as indeed his words import if you offer them no violence, and the practice of the priests* of Egypt, who are said to have sent it to the sick*, and of the Greek Church in giving it to those that are wellb, seems to imply; to wit, 114 that as, when the oblations of those who cannot be present at Church are received, they are partakers of the benefit of those prayers which the eucharist is celebrated with, because they are thereby acknowledged to belong to the communion of the Church; so the sending of that unction, which they apply to themselves, importeth the blessing of the Church to go along with their prayers, which it is used with. Thus much for certain:—when the Greeks contend, that this unction belongs also to those that are well, as the complement of their penanceb, arguing from the act of the apostles, who anointed those to whom they preached repentance; and allowing it to the sick, as that which for the present may be applied unto them, whenas the exigent of their case will not allow them to perform penance: as you may see by Arcadius, V. 4*: they do clearly enough express the reason which I give.


* Corrected from MS., which also corrects into “monks.” The persons in question were both, at least in one instance.—The orig. text is a mere misprint.


* pp. 385. 1. B, sq., as referred to in the last note.
CHAPTER XIII.

THE GROUND OF THE RIGHT OF THE CHURCH IN MATRIMONIAL CAUSES.

Marriage of one with one insolubly is a law of Christianity: the law of Moses not enjoining it; the law of the empire not aiming at the ground of it. Evidence from the primitive practice of the Church.

In the next place we are to consider, what interest the Church hath in the marriages of Christians: and that, without granting marriage to be one of the sacraments of the Church, or any thing implying what a sacrament is, and by consequence how many there are; but yet, supposing for disputations’s sake that it were a sacrament: that is, not supposing the contrary, but demanding nothing but that which must be granted, whether it be so or not, that our discourse may proceed. Two things I suppose, the one as proved in due place:—that the Church is by God’s law a society which all Christians are bound to have communion with;—and that God hath given a peculiar law concerning the marriage of one with one, and that indissoluble, to all Christians:—for upon supposition hereof all the interest of the Church in matrimonial causes standeth. Which is, therefore, now to be proved: thence enforcing, that whatsoever grows questionable among Christians concerning marriage upon the account of that law which is proper to Christianity, belongs to the Church to determine.

§ 2. For it is not my purpose to say, that Christian states have nothing to do in matrimonial causes: but that the interest of the state and of the Church (though not distinguishable by the persons, when the same persons belong to both) are to be distinguished by the causes, and grounds, and considerations, upon which they arise and stand; so that what comes from a reason concerning civil society, belong[s] to the state, what from the law which Christians only acknowledge, to the Church, to limit and determine. If then any difference arise among Christians concerning marriage, that supposeth not some provision brought in by the Gospel; I will not undertake, that the determination of it belongs to the Church.

* See above, c. i. § 2, &c.
by God's law. On the contrary, therefore, that which becomes questionable upon that account, I challenge to belong to the Church to determine; that is, to those that have right to determine on behalf of the Church. For I appeal to the common sense and experience of the world to evidence this;—that, when any law is given to any society or body, founded upon reasons, which afore the founding of it were not in force, there will of necessity fall out new cases, in which it will be questionable, whether the reason of the law is to take place or not. And let the Christian world be witness, whether it be not requisite to acknowledge, that, if Christianity come from God, then God hath provided a course to secure Christians in conscience, that their marriages are not against the will of God. Therefore, according to Aristotle's reason, the law which God hath given Christians concerning marriage being general, and the cases which men's particular occasions produce being infinite, and so not determined by the law, it followeth, that they are referred by God to the determination of that society (that is, of those that act in behalf of it with right to conclude it), which God hath founded upon the acknowledgment of those laws whereof this is one.

§ 3. In the first place, then, I am not afraid to undertake, that the law of the marriages of Christians (that they be of one with one, and indissoluble) is given by our Lord to His Church, and maintained by it. For I am confident to make evidence out of that which is received by all Christians, together with the premisses, that it could neither have come into the world but by Christianity, nor have been maintained so inviolable as it hath been by the canons of the Church. I say then, that it is impossible for any reasonable man to imagine, that so difficult a law as for all men to be tied to one wife indissolubly, as marriage hath always been indissoluble among Christians, could have taken effect among all Christians, had it not been received from the beginning for a part of that Christianity, which our Lord Christ and His disciples delivered to the Church; nor preserved so inviolable as it hath been, but by the society of the Church.

"ο θεος γενει των μην νόμων κρατειν παραλον, των δι καθ έκαστα τω δορίς και την πολιτειαν κρίνειν." Aristotle,

Politr., IV. iv. 31. And see also his Eth. Nicom., V. viii. 1, x. 3: and Rhetor., I. xiii. 13, 14.
§ 4. He, that will give a reason how this law could have Charp. XIII. \\
[No other taken place otherwise, must either allege the law of Moses way by the law of the Roman empire; there being no other law extant, when Christianity took place.

§ 5. For the law of Moses; it is evident, that at such time as Christianity came into the world, it was counted law-ful, according to it, to have more wives than one, and to put away a man’s wife by a bill of divorce. I demand then, how this should come to be prohibited by virtue of that law, which was hitherto thought to allow it.

§ 6. It will be said, by the true interpretation of the Law; which, having been obscured by the false glosses of the Scribes and Pharisees, our Lord by His Gospel (Matt. v. 31, 32; xix. 3—9: Mark x. 11, 12: Luke xvi. 18) clears, and enjoins upon Christians for the future. But I shewed before in the second Book, that, when our Lord saith so oft in His Sermon on the Mount, “You have heard it was said to those of old,” His meaning is, that Moses said so to their fathers, when he gave them the Law; not that the Scribes and Pharisees said so to their predecessors, when they corrupted it.

§ 7. Besides, there are two things evident in the Scripture beyond contradiction. The first, that divers laws of Moses either make it lawful, or suppose it lawful, to have more wives than one. Deut. xxi. 15—17, the Law supposes a man to have two wives, the one beloved, the other not; and provides accord-ingly. Exod. xxi. 6—11, the Law gives him leave, that hath bought the daughter of a Jew, to marry her to his son (who, if he have another, is bound to pay her the marriage debt of a wife); so that, if he do not, she is to go free. Deut. xxi. 10—14, the Law enables him, that hath taken a captive in the war whom he likes, to marry her; not conditioning, if he have no other wife. Call these two latter wives, or call them concubines; so long as the law of God allows them, evident it is, that it allows that which Christians by their Christianity think themselves bound to forbear. Add hereunto, that the king is bound not to take too many wives, Deut. xvii. 17: that David is not reproved as transgressing this law, though Solomon is; but, on the contrary, that God imputes it as a favour to him, that He gave him many wives, 2 Sam. xii. 8; which He could

c. xxxii. § 32, 33. b Corrected from M.S.; “corrupt,” in orig. text.
not do, had He not allowed it: I say, add the practice, as the life of the Law, to the letter, as the carcass of it; and I may justly conclude, that polygamy is not prohibited by the law of Moses. Besides, the Law provides, that a Hebrew slave (who may go free at the seventh year), if his master have given him a slave of his own to wife and he have children by her, must part wedlock with his wife, and leave her and [her] children to his master for his goods (Exodus xxi. 3, 4); nullifying the contract of marriage by the choice of him, who prefers his freedom before his wife and [her'] children in bondage: a thing utterly inconsistent with the insolubility of marriage by Moses' law.

§ 8. Secondly, our Lord in the Gospel saith not only, "It was said to them of old, He that puts away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce, but I say unto you," &c., as Matt. v. 31, 32: but further, when they ask Him, Matt. xix. 7, "Why did Moses then command to give a bill of divorce and send her away?" He answereth, "Moses for your hard-heartedness suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so; now I say unto you, that he that puts away his wife except for fornication, and marryeth another, commits adultery; and he that marrieth her that is put away, commits adultery." And all this, having laid His ground afore:—"He, That made them from the beginning, made them male and female, and said, Therefore shall a man leave father and mother and cleave to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh; so they are no longer two but one flesh: therefore, what God hath joined, let no man part." Whereby it is evident, that He derives not the prohibition of putting away a wife to take another from any interpretation of Moses' law; to the provision whereof He opposeth the provision which hereby He introduceth: but from the commission which He pretendeth, by virtue whereof He restor eth the primitive institution of Paradise; which the law of Moses had either dispensed with, or did suppose it to have been formerly dispensed with. For He saith not only, "You have heard that it was said to them of old," which may be thought to be understood of the Scribes and Pharisees; but also, 'Moses said,' and "I say," opposing His own saying to that of Moses, so far as prohibiting that which he had allowed imports, without licens-

1 Added from MS.
ing that which was prohibited by the Law. And upon this ground—that by marriage man and wife become "one flesh,"—He proceeds to prohibit the divorces which Moses' law alloweth; so that the reason, why marriage is indissoluble, is, because man and wife are "one flesh" by the Gospel of Christ according to the first institution in Paradise. This indeed is the difficulty, which I here suppose already declared; how this first institution lost, or may appear to have lost, the force of a law, till revived by our Lord Christ: though I conceive the evidence of this truth cannot be obstructed by not declaring the reason of it here, St. Paul having so fully laid down the effect and intent of his Master's law, I Cor. vii. 1—6:—"Now, of that you writ to me about, it is good for a man not to touch a woman: nevertheless, because of fornication's sake, let every man have his wife, and every woman her husband; let the man render his wife the benevolence that is due, likewise the wife to the husband: the woman hath no power of her body, but the man; likewise the man is not master of his own body, but the wife: defraud not one another, unless upon agreement, for a time, that ye may attend to fasting and prayer; and come together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinence." For here it is manifest, that, because man and wife are "one flesh," they have an interest in one another's bodies, not to be disposed of upon any other to the prejudice of it. And, upon this supposition, the marriage of the first Adam in this earthly paradise, being the figure of the marriage between the second Adam and His Church, becomes the rule and measure of the marriages of Christians in the Church; as the same apostle declares at large, Ephes. v. 22—33.

§ 9. And this will serve also to make evidence, that the law of Christians' marriage cannot be imagined to come from the laws of the empire; granting, as the truth is, that they allowed no man to have more wives than one at once. For there is nothing more evident than this, that this mutual interest in one another's body was never acknowledged by pagans, nor cannot be thought to have stood by their laws. It were to be wondered at, otherwise, that (whereas not only

---

* Corrected from MS; "institutions," in orig. text.

1 Corrected from MS.; misprinted "stand," in orig. text.
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the Romans", but in Greece the Athenians", and the Germans among the barbarians, as Tacitus saith, "contented themselves with one man one wife") God's people should be licensed to have more than one. But he, that reflects upon the consideration in which these pagans restrained themselves, will not find it strange, that God's people should be permitted that, which they denied themselves. For this mutual interest in one another's bodies, which God provided for the means to prevent the sad effects of man's inbred concupiscence in dishonouring their bodies with uncleanness, we shall not find to have been had in consideration among them; or that uncleanness seemed at all dishonourable to man, but [was] prohibited as injurious to men's beds, and the successions of families.

§ 10. The laws of the empire made it no adultery for the man to lie with another woman, which in the woman it was: as the Christians complain. Lactantius, Instit. vi. 239:—

"Non enim, sicut juris publici ratio est, sola mulier adultera est, quaee habet alienum; maritus autem, etiam si plurès habeat, a criminé adulterii solutus est; sed Divina lex ita duos in matrimonium, quod est in corpus unum, pari jure conjungit, ut adulter habeatur, si quis compagem corporis in diversa distractet"

"—For the woman only is not the adulteress, having another man, but the husband free from the crime of adultery, having more women, as is the course of public law; but the law of God joins two in wedlock, that is, into one body, upon so equal right, that the party is to be counted an adulterer, which shall part the body so compacted into more." St. Hierome, Epist. ad Oceanum:—"Aliis sunt leges Caesarum, aliae Christi; aliud Papinianus, aliud Paulus noster præcipit: apud illos viris impudicitia fræna laxantur, et solo stupro atque adulterio condemnatis, passim per lupanaria et ancillulas libido

= Ciae, De Oratone, i. 40.—Sueton., Jul. 52.—And see Selden, Ux. Ebr., lib. iii. c. 19; Op., tom. ii. pp. 763, 764: and De Jure Nat. et Gent., lib. v. cc. 6, 7; ibid., tom. i. pp. 522, 523; 525, 526.

* So Selden, as quoted in last note; and see Hermann's Polit. Antiq. of Greece, § 119. It would seem to have been more generally and formally the case with the Spartans: see Herod. v. 40, and Müller's Doriāns, IV. iv. 3.

* "Prope soli barbarorum singulis uxoribus contenti sunt, exceptis admodum pauci, qui non libidine sed ob nobilitatem plurimis nuptis ambiatur." Tacit., Germ. 18.

P See Bingham, XXII. v. 3.


permittitur; quasi culpam dignitas faciat, non voluntas: apud
nos, quod non licet uxoribus, æque non licet viris, et eadem ser-
vitus pari conditione censetur"—"Other are the laws of the
Cæsars than that of Christ, other is that which St. Paul than
that which Papinian prescribeth: among them the reins are
let loose to men’s uncleanness, and rape and adultery only
prohibited, lust walks free all over stews and maid-slaves, as
if the estate, not the will, made the fault: among us, that
which wives may not do, neither may husbands; the same
obligation is taxed upon equal condition." St. Augustinu,
De Adult. Conjug. ii. 82:—"Sed isti, quibus disiplicet ut inter
virum et uxorem par pudicitiae forma servetur, et potius eligunt,
maximeaque in hac causa, mundi legibus subesse quam Christi,
quoniam jura forensia non eisdem fæminas quibus viros pudicitia
nexibus videnter astringere; legant quid Imperator Antoninus,"
&c.—"But those who like not that the same form of chastity
should be observed between man and wife, and had rather,
especially in this cause, be under the laws of the world than
of Christ, because the court laws do not seem to tie women
by the same bond of chastity as men; let them read what the
Emperor Antoninus," &c. Who knows not the lawfulness of
unnatural lusts among the pagans, that reads the first chapter
to the Romans? And can we think it strange, that husbands
should not be forbidden unmarried persons?

§ 11. Wherefore, where the laws allowed not one man
more wives than one, there they punished not wandering
lusts, but provided for men’s reputation and their successions.
Whereas the law of Moses, which gives a man leave to marry
a Jewess, sold [to] him for a slave, to himself, or to his son,
provides her an interest in his body for the preventing of un-
cleanness; as you saw before. And, all those idolatrous na-
tions, which God’s people were environed with, using more
wives than one, it is the less marvel, that God allowed His
people something in it, that the race of those that feared Him
might not be quite extinguished and over-run by the multi-
tude of them that served idols.

§ 12. And this is the true reason, why St. Paul declares [Why con-
those, that are converted to Christianity, not to stand obliged

* S. Aug., De Conjug. Adulterinis, lib. ii. c. 8. § 7; Op., tom. vi. p. 408. B.
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conversion, not bound, according to St. Paul, to stand to those marriages.

to the wives or husbands which they had taken before; 1 Cor. vii. 12—15: supposing, first, that by Moses' law the marriages of Jews with idolaters were void and unlawful to be used, as we see by Ezra ix., x., and Nehem. x. 30; on the other side, that in the Roman empire the wife as well as the husband had power to divorce herself and to dissolve wedlock\(^1\): which is argument enough, how far they were from being the marriages of Christians. Whereupon I say, that the marriages of pagans not being made upon the same ground as the marriages of Christians (which is the mutual interest in one another's bodies), as it is no marvel, on one side, that St. Paul obliges them not to part as Moses did (because those, that were not tied by law, might, for the particular love they had to their wives turned Christians, tie themselves to them alone; and upon those who did so, the wives had great advantage to draw\(^2\) them to Christianity, as he alleges), so it is evident, on the other side, why he allows them to part; to wit, having no confidence of that faith in wedlock from them, which Christians of necessity profess. The reason why the marriages of Jews with Gentiles were void by the Law, is thus given by St. Augustin, De Adult. Conjug. i. 18\(^\ast\):—"Namque hoc Dominus aliquando per Esdras prophetam fieri jussit, et factum est; dimiserunt Israelitae uxores alienigenas, quicunque tunc habere potuerunt; per quas fiebat ut et ipsi ad alienos seducerentur deos, non ut ille per maritos vero acquirerentur Deo: nondum enim tanta gratia Salvatoris illuzerat, et promissis temporalibus Veteris Testamenti adhuc inhiabat illius populi multitudine: et propter eam, cum bona terrena, quae pro magno expectabant a Domino, viderent etiam his abundare qui multos falsos colebant deos, blanditiis usorum prium eos verebantur offendere, deinde inducebantur et colere"—"For this the Lord once commanded to be done by Esdras the prophet, and done it was; the Israelites dismissed their stranger wives, as many as then had of them; by whose means it came to pass, that even they were seduced to strange gods: ... for as yet so great grace of our Saviour had not shined on them, and the

---

\(^1\) This was not the case under the early Republic (Plautus, Mercator, IV. vi. 1—8): but became so under the Empire (Juuv. vi. 228, Martial. lib. vi. epigr. 7, Cic. Epist. ad Famil. viii. 7.).

multitude of that people yet gaped for the temporal promises of the Old Testament: and therefore, seeing those who worshipped many false gods abound with earthly goods, which they expected at God's hands for great matters, first, upon the blandishments of their wives, they were afraid to offend, then they were induced also to worship them." But under the Gospel the marriage of Gentiles, not being against God's law, becomes not unlawful when the one turns Christian. And, justice allowing to part for fornication, unbelief, being a greater fornication, justifies him or her that parts in consideration of it, having never contracted it insoluble.

§ 13. All this is evident by the ancientest instance of this case, that the Church hath, in Justin the Martyr's Apology for the Christians⁷; or rather in Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iv. 17⁸, where the passage of Justin is related entire, which in R. Stephen's copy of Justin⁹ is maimed in this part. It is the case of a gentleman, so debauched to the lust of women, that he was content his wife should play the good fellow as well as himself, that she might not have to reproach him with. It pleased God, the wife, being reclaimed to Christianity, thought it necessary to relinquish so riotous a husband; but, being persuaded by her friends, had the patience to try, whether there remained any hope of reducing him. And when he, being gone to Alexandria, had flown out more loosely than ever into the debauches of the place, that she might not seem a party to his wickedness, dwelling with him, whom it was in her power to part with, she sent him "τὸ καλούμενον ῥεποῦδιον," saith Justin; such a "letter of divorce," as the law alloweth the wife to discharge herself with⁹.

§ 14. Which example justifies the relation of Basil of Seleucia concerning St. Thecla, the first martyr of the woman-kind, in his first book of her life; that, being contracted to a nobleman of the country called Thamyris, [she⁸] being converted to Christianity by the preaching of St. Paul at Iconium,

---

⁸ 2; Op., pp. 58. D—59. D.
⁹ pp. 157. D—139. C.
* The whole story except the first few lines and the last sentence is omitted in the MSS. of Justin, and accordingly in the edition of his works at Paris in 1651, ex officina Rob. Stephani, p. 129.
⁸ In Euseb. as above cited, p. 138.
⁸ Added from MS.
forsook her spouse, a declared enemy to Christianity. I say, that there is in all this nothing contrary to Christianity, the other example justifies. Only, both of them give us sufficient occasion to say, that St. Paul is not well understood by them, that would have him to extend that cause of divorce which our Lord had delivered, unto the case of desertion upon the conversion of the other to the faith. For if the premises be true, it is not a divorce which St. Paul allows, but a nullity which he pronounces, of those marriages, which stand not upon profession of that interest in one another's bodies which Christianity requires.

§ 15. And therefore St. Augustin, in his Book De Fide et Operibus, cap. xix., doubts of her, who, being a concubine, professeth, that if her lord should dismiss her, she will never marry any body else; whether she is to be admitted to baptism or not. For indeed there is no doubt in the case. Not because the Church from the beginning generally condemned those concubines, who under a profession of fidelity to their own lords (professing interchangeably to know no woman else) contented themselves with that right of a wife which Christianity requires, without the secular privilege of dowry, or the right to it, which obliges the husband to expense answerable. For the same Augustin, De Bono Conjug. cap. v.5,


5 Bellarmin (De Matrim. Sacram., lib. i. c. 12. Controv. tom. ii. pp. 1608, 1609), having laid down, that "conjugium infidelium solvi posse" (in certain cases)... "extra controversiam ex doctrina B. Pauli," and going on to notice, that "neque obstat illud, 'Quod Deus conjunxit,'... Quod Deus conjunxit," &c., "neque illud, 'Qui dimiserit uxorem, excepta causa fornicationis,'" &c., answers thus to the last-quoted text—"Dicendum est igitur cum Augustino... Christum loqui de matrimonio inter fideles, Paulum de matrimonio contracto inter infideles:"... concerning which "Dominus nihil præcepert; de his ergo Paulus consilium dat," &c.—But the difference of this view of the case seems rather in statement than in practice.

' "De concubina quoque, si professa fuerit nullum se alium cognitorum, etiam si ab illo cui subdita est dimittatur, merito dubitatur, utrum ad perciendum baptismum non debeat admittt." S. Aug., De Fide et Opp., c. xix. § 35; Op., tom. vi. p. 185. D. E.

' "Solet etiam quæri, cum masculus et femina, nec ille maritus nec ulla uxor alterius, sibimet non illorum procreatorum sed propter incontinentiam solius concubinitatis causa copulatur, ea fide media ut nec ille cum altera nec ulla cum altero id faciat, utrum nuptiam sint vacanda. Et potest quidem fortasse non absурde hoc appellari communium, si usque ad mortem alterius eorum id inter eos placuerit, et prolationem generationem, quamvis non ea causa conjuncti sint, non tamen vitaverint. Ceterum si vel utrumque vel undum horum desit, non invenio quemadmodum has nuptias appellare possumus." Id., De Bono Conjugali, c. v. § 5; ibid., p. 322. C.—E.
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declares such a conjunction as this to be marriage as to God's law, though not as to the privileges of the world; whereas, not supposing this profession, he condemns it for mere adultery. And they are expressly allowed by the Council of Toledo, can. xvii. Though St. Leo, Epist. xcv., allow the marriage of a woman to a man that already hath a concubine, as no married man. For that may be upon supposition, that there never was any such troth between him and his concubine: which must be the reason, why St. Augustin condemns them in another place; Hom. xlix. [ex] Quinquaginta. St. Jerome truly, and Gennadius (De Eccles. Dogmat., cap. lxxii.), allow the same effect to a concubine as to a wife, in making a man "digamus" as to the canons: and for this reason, "Conjugales ergo tabule et jura dotalia, non coitus, ab apostolo condemnatur?"—in the words of St. Jerome—"Is it then the deed and right of jointure, or carnal knowledge, that the apostle condemneth?" This is not then the reason, why St. Augustin refuses a concubine baptism; but because she is a concubine

---

See last note.

1 "Si quis habens uxorem fidelem, si concubinam habeat, non communicet. Ceterum qui non habet uxorem, et pro uxore concubinam habet, a communione non repellatur; tantum ut unius mulieris, aut uxoris aut concubinae (ut ei placeretur), sit conjunctione contentus; alias vero vivas abjiciatur, donec desinat, et per ponentiam revertatur." Conc. Tolet. I. (A.D. 400), can. xvii.; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 1226. B.

2 In answer to a question "de puellis quae viria concubinai habentibus nuperint," S. Leo replies, that "paterno arbitrio viria juncta carent culpa, si mulieres quae a viris habebantur in matrimonio non fuerunt." S. Leon. M., Epist. clxvii. (ii. ed. Quen., al. xciii.), Resp. ad Inquis. v.; Op., tom. i. p. 1422.—xcv. in the text is a mistake.

In answer to a question also, "de presbytero vel diacono qui filiam suam virginem illi vior in conjugium dederit qui jam habebat conjunctam mulierem, ex qua etiam filios susceperat," S. Leo replies, that "non omnis mulier juncta virio uxor est viri," &c., "aliiu est uxor, aliud concubina," &c. "Igitur cujuslibet loci clericus, si filiam suam vior habenti concubinam in matrimoniium dederit, non ita accipiendum est, quasi ejam conjugato dederit: nisi forte illa mulier, et ingenua facta, et dotata legitime, et publicis nuptiis honestata videatur." Id., ibid., Resp. ad Inquis. iv.; ibid.

1 "Concubinas vobis habere non licet. Et si non habetis uxores, non licet vobis habere concubinas, quas postea dimittatis ut ducatis uxores; quanto magis damnatio vobis erit, si habere volueritis et concubinas et uxor.

S. Aug., Serm. ccxciii. (al. xlix. ex l.), § 2; Op., tom. v. p. 1504. B.—"Serm. xlix. et l.," which is the reading above in the text in the folio edit, seems to be merely a mistake.


* See above in note m.
without mutual profession of that interest in one another's bodies, which makes her a wife as to Christianity.

§ 16. Nor am I moved to the contrary by seeing, that St. Augustin refused baptism to those that put away their wives and married others, as adulterers manifest: which is the occasion of his book De Fide et Operibus, as he says in the beginning of it. It was but his opinion, or at the most a local custom.

§ 17. For Concil. Eliber. can. x. — "Si ea quam catechumenus reliquit duxerit maritum, potest ad fontem lavacri admitteri; hoc et circa feminas catechumenas erit observandum." — "If a woman dismissed by a pretender to Christianity marry a husband, she may be admitted to the font of baptism; the same is to be observed concerning women that pretend to Christianity:" — in case they dismiss [a wife or?] a husband that marries again, and then desire baptism: because of the nullity of marriage made in unbelief, when one party turns Christian. In the Constitutions of the Apostles, viii. 33: — "Πιστὸς ἡ πιστὴ δοῦλοι συμαφθέντες, ἡ ἀφωστάθωσαν ἡ ἀποβαλλέσθωσαν" — "A Christian man or woman, married in bondage, let them either part or be ejected." Here the marriage of slaves is supposed void to the party that turns Christian. The Church further commands it to be voided. How stands that with that which went afore, viii. 32: — "Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔχει γυναῖκα, ἥ [ἡ] γυνὴ ἀνδρα, διδασκέσθωσαν ἐαυτοῖς ἀρκεῖσθαι" — "If he have a wife, or a woman a husband, let them be taught to contain themselves to one another;" according to Christ's law. But if the one party be not under Christ's law, so that it cannot be presumed that a slave will do so, they must be parted.

§ 18. And by these means it remains demonstrated, that it is our Lord Christ alone that hath introduced a new law into His Church of the marriage of one to one alone. Which though it be expressed in the Scripture rightly interpreted: yet, had
not the practice of the Church, having received this right sense for law to their conversation, [given?] bounds to the licentiousness of those wits, whose interest might be to destroy the strictness of the law; it cannot be imagined, that there should never be any visible attempt within the body of the Church to infringe the validity of it. For seeing there is no more mention in the Scripture of that dispensation in the first ordinance of marriage in paradise, whereby it was lawful under the Law to have more wives than one; and seeing it is a maxim of such appearance in the Scripture, that nothing is prohibited by the Gospel which the Law alloweth: would no such pretence have framed a plea for those, that never wanted will to study the reconciling of carnality with Christianity? Supposing the consent of a body, whereof they thought themselves to be members, it is no marvel that there would not; not supposing that, it must needs appear utterly unreasonable.

§ 19. As for the insolvability of marriage by divorce, I will not say there hath been so absolute a consent in it by the practice of Christians, as in the marriage of one to one. It is argued, indeed, in the late book called Uxor Ebraica* (pretending only to relate the opinions and practice of Christians in matter of divorce, but intending—as it should seem by the author’s opinion declared elsewhere, that there is no such thing as ecclesiastical power, or any society of the Church by God’s law—to infer, that the Church hath nothing to do with matrimonial causes; which it hath nothing to do with, if any thing but the law of the Church can secure the conscience in point of divorce), pp. 543, 544 b; that, so long as the Christians were mingled with the Jews, they observed the judicial laws of the Synagogue, and therefore counted all divorces good before God, which were according to Moses’ law: and, therefore, that whatsoever was in force among Christians before Constantine, was in force merely by the voluntary consent of Christians; which was to give way, when the secular power

---

* Misprinted "giving," in orig. text.
* Scil. in his work De Synedriis Ebraeor., and elsewhere: see above, c. x. § 30, note f; and Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. ii. § 11, xi. § 1, sq.
* Scil. of the ed. of 1646.—lib. iii. c. xxvii. pp. 818, sq. ed. 1726.
should otherwise provide, as in matter of divorce, so in other
matrimonial causes. This is that which seems to be intended
p. 559. But this pretence is rooted up by proving the Church
to be a society and body founded by God, to communicate in
the service of God, for the attaining of everlasting life. For
thereupon it remains evident, that the laws thereof came not
originally from the voluntary consent of Christians (unless
you understand that consent whereby they submit to the
Christian faith, that they may be saved, and thereupon find
themselves tied to submit to them, from whom they receive
that faith whereby they hope to be saved), but from those who
first delivered Christianity to the Church; that is, from our
Lord and His apostles. And, had Christians been left to their
own choice, it is not possible they should have imposed upon
themselves (that is, that the whole Church should have re-
ceived) that charge of not divorcing, which the rules and cus-
toms of the Church evidence to have been in force through
the whole Church, as by and by it will appear. As for the
time when the Christians observed Moses' law, that excellent
saying of Justin the Martyr takes place;—"Pelvonari tois
keiménois nómois, kal tois idiois blios níkási tois nómovs"—
"They obey the laws, and by their own lives go beyond the
laws." For the Jews' law was then their civil law; because
authorized by the Romans, in as much as they restrained it
not. So, by complying with the Jews, they gained the free
exercise of their Christianity, as well as invited them to admit

---

\[ \text{"dipouleiros"} \]

---

\( ^c \) Of "tria veluti praevia eum principia," laid down by Selden in lib. iii.
c. xxvii. Op., tom. ii. p. 818, "primum est, Judaiismi seu discipline circa legis-
liae Judaicae, adeoque divortia, in Christianismo primitivo retentio ac usus:" of
which he proceeds to allege proofs in pp. 819, 820, concluding, that, "Hæc
vero cum igitur se habuerint, sequitur ut quicquid juris de divorciis ante Judaicæ
sive ex Hilleliana sive ex Sammumana disciplina a Christo sive correctum
 fuerit sive confirmatum, id in Christianismo eorum qui ex Judæis erant
primitivi seculi manusisse existimemus: et quicquid eis illicitum hac in re non
habebatur, etiam Christianis ex gentibus licitum pro persuasioorum discrimi-
nine habitum esse non est quod dubitemus."—"Dubitari nequid quin Con-
stantinus Caesar Christianissimus atque

\( ^d \) Scil. of the edit. of 1646; the se-
cond passage cited in last note.

\( ^e \) S. Just. Mart., Epist. ad Diogn-
tum, § 5; Op., p. 536. B.
and receive it. But did they therefore renounce the law of Christ, where it restrained them more than the law of Moses? Did they allow themselves more wives than one, when Moses allowed it the Jews, and they complied with Moses? Certainly, the law that allows a man more wives than one, never constrained any man to make use of that allowance. So well might the Christians, acknowledging Moses’ law, acknowledge themselves bound not to use the power of putting away their wives, when Moses’ law allowed it.

§ 20. But it is further argued there, lib. iii. cap. xxviii. xxix. xxx. (at least it seems upon the same ground to be argued), that the Roman laws, from Constantine to the fall of the Eastern empire, in a manner do allow divorce upon such causes as the sovereign thought fit: which laws, being made by Christian princes, intending to limit that infinite liberty, which the former laws of the empire allowed either party, to dissolve marriage at pleasure, with all that he brought, must needs pretend to secure Christians in point of conscience, divorcing upon no other causes than those laws allow. Constantine therefore restrains the liberty of divorce to three causes on either side: on the wives’ side, if the husband should murder, poison, or rob graves; on the husbands’, if the wife should be an adulteress, an impositor, or a bawd:—and this, at such time as he advised with bishops in

'C. xxviii., pp. 827, sq., treat of the "morum ac usus Christiani primiicii circa divorcia reliquiae, ac constitutionem de eisdem Caesariana-rum a Christianismo primum in imperio Romanum sub Constantino recepto usque in seculum Justinia- neum:"

'C. xxix., pp. 836, sq., of the "jus Caesarium quod post Justiniani seculum in imperio Romano, maxime in Oriente, circa divortia obiuit usque in tempora recentiora:"

'C. xxx., pp. 840, sq., of the "leges moreaque circa divorcia in Christianismo Ostrogotho- rum et Wigisothorum (per Italian, Hispanicam, Galliam), Burgundionum veterum, Alemanorum, imperii Caroli- linei seu occidentis populorum, Britan- norum veterum, Anglorum, Scoto- rum, Hibernorum."—C. xxviii., p. 828, starts with the position, that "simulac ferme Christianismus in imperio Romanum receptus est, id est. . . anno Christo 331, Basso et Ablavio consuli-
all that he did, granting then an appeal to their courts by
an act dated the same year (as it is probable), and lately
published in Sirmundus his Appendix to Theodosius his
Code, without date for the year, but directed to the same
Ablavius P.P. to whom the former is directed, Cod. Theod.
lib. iii. tit. xvi. —which Theodosius the younger, a very
Christian prince, extends to many more: Justinian (the
legislative humour being then predominant) limits the mat-
ter otherwise, as he thought fit: his successor Justin goes
beyond him, in allowing divorce upon consent of parties
though at neither party's choice. Which law is not found
to have been repealed, till it was left out of that collection
of laws called the Basilica, into which Leo the Wise about
the year 900 compiled all the laws which he meant should stand
unrepealed. The particulars you may see curiously collected
there. Which I should make no account of; did it not
appear also by sundry testimonies of later times there al-
ledged, that the Greek Church did proceed according to the
said laws in blessing marriages made upon such divorces, and
consequently allowing the communion of the Church to those
that made them. Balsamon upon Syn. vi. can. lxxxviii.
121 defines an unreasonable cause of divorce to be that, which makes the judge to wit, according to the law) allows not. Nor he has any exception to them from any canon of the Church, writing upon Photius his Nomocanon, tit. xiii. 4. 30°. And upon Can. Carthag. cv.¹, alleging Justinian Novell. cxvii.⁸, he saith, that the canon is not in force (to wit, the law having provided otherwise); referring himself to that which he had written upon the sixth synod, quoted afore. Harmonopolus also, in Prochiro⁹, says plainly, that divorces were judged amongst them by the imperial laws. And Mattheus Monachus, Quest. Matrim., Juris Graeco-Rom. tomo i. p. 507x. So also the canons of Alexius, Patriarch of Constantinople¹⁰ about 1030, alleged by our author out of a written copy, p. 613x. And Michael Chrysocephalus, upon Can. Apost. xlviii., p. 600a. Besides Mattheus Blastares in Nomocan.,


⁶ "Certe et in codice veteri MS. Canonum orientis habentur "ἐν συνοδικῶν κρίσεις—ex judiciis synodicis"— Alexii patriarchae Constantinopolitani canones hi de matrimonii solutionibus cum primis hic observandi. Vixit ille sub anno 1030, idem cujus aliqua habentur in Zonara editione." Selden, ibid.: quoting among others this canon of his—"Τῶν ἐν συμφώνων διὰ ανείρηται τοῖς νόμοις τῶν γάμων διαλυσάμενοι δια τοῦ διατύπου γάμων εὐλογητος ἡράξε τῆς ἡγίας ἐκκοιταί τιμής." They appear to be still unpublished: see Harles’s Fabricius, lib. v. c. 41; tom. xi. pp. 558, 559.

⁷ Scil. of edit. 1646.

⁸ "Et Michael Chrysocephalus nondum editus, "Ἀποκελεσμένος," inquit ibi" (scil. in can. Apost. xviii.), "Αὐτήτης η μη κατά νόμως τοῦ οἰκείου
alleged by Arcadius p. 517*: where he, being a Greek, confesseth, that the Greek Church had sometimes practised according to the civil laws; which, had they not secured the conscience, it could not, it ought not to have done. And what case can there be in point of marriage, wherein the law of the land secures not the conscience, if in point of divorce it do? Or where is [then*] the indissolubility of marriage, and the interest of the Church in marriage grounded upon it?

§ 21. But because it would be too gross for a Christian to say, that man’s law, allowing divorce, can secure a Christian in conscience against God’s law, forbidding it (our Lord having said, “Whoso puts away his wife but for adultery”—“εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ πορνείῳ”—“and marries another, and he that marries her that is put away, commits adultery;” Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, Mark x. 11, 12, Luke xvi. 18): it is pretended there, p. 455d, that πορνεία in the Gospels signifies any thing that is dishonest; and that what the state judges dishonest, is just ground of divorce.

§ 22. You must know, that in our Lord’s time there was a difference (which is supposed to be the occasion of the question made to our Lord) between the schools of Hillel and Shammai (two great heads of the Pharisees) about the meaning and extent of the law concerning divorces, Deut. xxiv. 1, &c.: which allows him that likes not his wife, because he “hath found,” or having found, “matter of nakedness” in her, to put her away. For Shammai confined the intent of it to that which is dishonest and deserveth shame, as nakedness doth*. But Hillel extended it to any

verbs διαφυγεία. ’’ Selden, ibid., c. xxxi. p. 848.—p. 600. edit. 1646.
† Added from MS.
‡ “Exsententia scholarum Sammæanæ uxor marito haud erat repudianda... nisi si inveniebat in ea rem turpitudi- nis, secundum id quod scriptum est,
thing that offends the husband; as, say they, for example, if she burn his meat. As for R. Akiba, that allowed it if a man can get a fairer wife, his opinion is but the enlargement of Hillel's; which expoundeth Moses his words, "If he have found in her matter of nakedness," to signify either nakedness or other matter besides. This question then being on foot at that time, it is argued, p. 478, &c., that our Lord intends nothing else but the resolution of it; the Pharisees demanding nothing else, and therefore making no opposition to that which he resolves, Matt. xix. 3—9.

§ 23. And thereupon great pains is bestowed, cap. xxiii. and xxvii. to shew, that our Lord's exception—"παρεκτός λόγου πορφερας," or "μὴ ἑπὶ πορφερα,"—signifies no more than ἀπεγέρθη in Moses according to the opinion of Shammai. For if we suppose our Lord to have spoke in that Hebrew which the Jews then spake, and now we read in the Talmud and Chaldee paraphrases; then must He use the word which the Law useth, ἀπεγέρθη (which the Gospels must translate πορφεραν) : if in Syriac, the word ἀπεγέρθη, properly signifying the uncleanness of the stews, is necessarily understood by the circumstance of the place where it is used, to signify all uncleanness, but may be extended to all sin, whereby we go a whoring from God, as the Scripture uses to speak. So, according to this opinion, our Lord, excluding only arbitrary divorce, allows it where Moses according to Shammai allows it; for any cause of dishonesty, or that deserves shame, as nakedness does. And if these premisses be pertinent to that which follows, that is, to justify those divorces that are made according to the imperial laws related afterwards (for the author all the while protests to determine nothing, p. 496m); the inference must be this,—that those causes of divorce, which Christian powers by their laws have allowed or


" Ex sententia etiam Rabbi Aquiba, si invenerit aliam pulchriorem aut sibi commodiorem, juxta id etiam quod scribitur, 'Si non invenerit ea gratiam in oculis ejus.'" Selden, ibid., p. 763: from the Mishna, ibid.

" Corrected from MS. "wickedness," in orig. text.


Selden, ibid., pp. 787, sq.; 824, sq.

Selden, ibid., pp. 790, sq.

shall allow, are the true interpretation of that cause, which 122 Moses under the term of ἁρσυς or "nakedness," our Lord of "πρόβελα," which is usually translated "fornication," al-
loweth.

§ 24. I forbear to relate any more of that, which is alleged to shew, that πρόβελα in the words of our Lord may signify the same that ἁρσυς in Moses according to R. Akiba. For the reason, which I rely upon, admits no consideration of it. The resolution of our Lord is manifestly inconsistent with the law of Moses, and therefore with any interpretation that can be thought agreeable to it. For when He saith,—"Moses for your hard heartedness . . . but I say unto you," &c.; what can be more evident, than that He repeals the provision of the Law, and restrains what Moses had allowed? Is it not manifest, that, when He allegeth, that God having made first one man and one woman joined them in marriage to be parted no more, He granteth, that Moses' law had abated of this, and declareth the reviving of God's first appointment among His own disciples? Can the allowance of divorce, according to the Law, stand with the primitive institution of paradise, more than having more wives at once? Can we suppose the Pharisees come to our Lord to decide between Hillel and Shammai, Who condemns all Pharisees? Or is it a marvel, that He, Who pretended to be the Messias, should introduce a provision differing from Moses, and from all that pretended only to interpret his law? That there should be no further dispute of the matter of His resolution, when there lay no dispute but about His authority, whether from God or not? Suppose our Lord, to them no more but a prophet, to His disciples the Messias; why should they dispute that, which they knew His disciples admitted, when they saw the primitive appointment of God, related by Moses, clear on His side? That is to say, why should they not be put to silence now as well as other times, when they could not answer His allegations out of the Scriptures? It is therefore utterly unreasonable to imagine, that our Lord, intending to restrain those divorces which Moses' law al-
loweth, should use a term of the same extent with that which He intended to restrain. The Jews indeed insist upon this;

n Scil. in Selden, ibid., pp. 789, sq.
that a prophet had always power to suspend the obligation of any positive precept for the time; as Elias, that of sacrificing nowhere but at Jerusalem (Levit. xvii. 1—9, Deut. xii. 5—18, 26, 27, xiv. 21—26), when he sacrificed in mount Carmel (1 Kings xvii. 22—39). But our Lord introducing a new law instead of Moses his law, their ancestors crucified Him therefore; and they to this day maintain it.

§ 25. Indeed there is cause to believe, that the prophet Malachy, reproving the oppressions which the Jews then laid upon their wives for the love of strangers, which they had married over their heads contrary to the Law (Mal. ii. 14—16), propounds the liberty of divorce, which the Law allows, for an expedient acceptable to God, as His own provision: when he saith, "For the Lord God of Israel saith, If thou hatest, put away;" as the Jews there expound it. For they, who construe it, "The Lord God of Israel saith, that He hateth putting away," cannot give account, why the prophet should mention the matter of divorce, where his purpose is to blame the oppression of Israelitish wives for the love of strangers married against the Law. Whereas, when he addeth, "For one covereth violence with his garment, saith the Lord of Hosts," he aggravateth the same fault by this consideration, that the covenant of marriage (signified usually in the Scripture by covering the woman with the man's garment, Ezek. xvi. 8, Ruth iii. 10) is employed for a means of oppression and violence upon her, that out of love entered into it. And, the prophet Malachi holding his commission by virtue of Moses' law, how shall he say, that God hates that, which by His law He provided, though for a remedy of further mischief?

§ 26. There is indeed great dispute, whether the allowance of Moses' law did secure them, that put away their wives under the law, in point of conscience to God. And it is certain, if that be true, which I have settled in the second Book concerning the inward and outward, the civil and spiritual obedience of God under Moses' law, and the difference between them, that it could not always do it. For could he, that knew

---

* See Selden, ibid., c. xxi. p. 777.

* It is so in the English authorized version.

* See Bellarm., De Matrim. Sacram., lib. i. c. 17; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 1643.

* Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. v. § 10, viii. § 12—17, ix. § 15, x. § 15, &c.
he put away his wife for lust or for wrath or for advantage, think that he loved his wife, whom all men know they are to love above others, being bound to love all Israelites as himself? But, on the contrary, he that had lighted upon a wife of crooked conditions, and having done his reasonable endeavour to reclaim her had found her incorrigible, how should he think he did her wrong, using the power, that God's law had given him so moderately, in putting her away? Had God given them a law, which could in no case be used without sin? For had the "nakedness," which the Law allowed for a just cause of divorce, signified nothing else but that which our Lord by His Gospel allows; what question remains, whether the conscience be secured by it or not? But among Christians, covenating with God upon express promises of the world to come, under a stricter and more excellent rule of obedience, with promise of helps proportionable to go through with it, is it marvellous, if an obligation be acknowledged of bearing with patience the manners of the wife, which a man himself chooses, never giving over the hope of reducing her to reason until she falsify the trust of wedlock? That, when the matter is come to that point, it should no more be matter of precept, but matter of counsel, to endure such a wife, when the infamy of a man's bed may be saved, and hope of reclaiming her may remain? So that the question, whether the meaning of Moses his words be the meaning of Christ's, is the same in this particular of marriage, which the Christians have generally with the Jews,—whether our Lord Jesus, perfecting the Law by bringing in the Gospel, be the Christ or not. The resolution whereof, as it necessarily infers the difference between them which I have settled in the second Book, so that difference will as necessarily infer this provision of our Lord to be several from that of Moses.

[Origen.] § 27. Out of Origen, In Matt. [Hom.] vii., a pleasant con-

* See above in note r.

† Added in MS.

"Τάχα δὲ καὶ τῶν τολμῶντων τις ιουδαΐκης ἀνδρὶ ἐνακοινωθεὶ τῇ τῷ Ἰσχυρῷ ἡμῶν διδασκαλίᾳ, φησὶν, ὅτι καὶ Ἰσραήλ εἰς ὧν ὁ Ἡρῴδης εἶναι, ὡς ἐν ἀνθρώποις τῆς γυναικος αὐτῶν παρεκτὸς ἐν κατηγορίᾳ τοῖς ἐνακοινώσατο, ἠτέρησεν ἀπολύσει τὴν γυναῖκα, ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης Μωσῆς, ὥς ἐν τῇ σκληροκαρδίᾳ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἄνθρωπον ἔπεσεν καὶ ταῦτα ἐν σώματι φύσεως εἶναι τῇ λόγῳ τῆς πορείας, διὰ τῶν ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἄνθρωπος, τὸ "Οὐτὶ εὕρετο ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσχισμα πράγμα."

Origen., In Matth. tom. xiv. § 24. (Hom. vii. in Matt. in older edd., e.g. tom. iii. fol. 18. B. Paris. 1512); Op., tom. iii. p. 647. C.—quoted by Selden,
ceit is alleged:—"Forsitan audax aliquis et Judaicus vir adversus doctrinae Salvatoris nostris dicet, quoniam et Jesus dicens, ‘Quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam excepta causa fornicationis facit eam maechari,’ permisit uxorem dimittere, quemadmodum Moyses, quem retulit propter duritiem cordis Judeorum hoc præcepisse: et hanc ipsam inquiet esse causam fornicationis, per quam juste uxor a viro dimittitur, secundum quam et Moyses precipit dimittere uxorem, si inventa fuerit res turpis in ea”—

"Perhaps some bold Jewish fellow may say (crossing our Saviour’s doctrine), that even Jesus, saying, ‘Whosoever shall send away his wife but for fornication, makes her commit adultery,’ hath given leave to put a wife away; even as Moses, who He relateth did command this for the Jews’ hard-heartedness: and will say, that this is the very same cause of fornication, for which a wife is justly put away by a husband, according to which Moses also commands to put away a wife, if a foul thing be found in her.” Whence it is argued, that there were then, that expounded our Lord’s words to the same intent with Moses*. That there were, Origen says not; that there might be, I grant. But they must be “Jews,” and “adversaries to our Saviour’s doctrine,” that should do it. For he, that should say so, must blame our Saviour for pretending to contradict Moses (which Origen supposeth no Jew could deny), saying indeed the same thing otherwise; he must contradict the synagogue for allowing divorce, where Moses allowed it not, if the “foul thing,” which Moses allows divorce for, be only that “fornication” for which our Lord allows it. Then, he, that would make use of Origen to prove, that the terms of our Lord and of Moses may signify the same thing, must first answer the argument wherewith he convinces him that thus should blaspheme our Lord. Adultery, saith he, is no cause of divorce but of death by Moses’ law; therefore that dishonest thing, for which the Law allows divorce, is not adultery*. In fine, he that examines all that is said or can be said

Ux. Ebr., lib. iii. c. xxiii. p. 796, from the old Latin translation, with the two trifling inaccuracies marked in the margin.

* "Certe nec apretendeus est hic locus Origenis, unde hauud difficile videtur conjectare της τοπεις in re divortii latiorem significacionem, qualem memoravimus, a Judaeis saltem aliquot Hellenismo suo illius sevi assuetioribus esse admissam." Selden, as quoted in last note.

"Ἀλλὰ λεγεῖ οὖς αὐτὸν ἔτι ἐνερ γι κατὰ τοῦ νόμου μοιχωμένη λι-
of the diverse significations of ροπελα in the Scriptures, will find but two: the one proper, in the case of man and wife; the other, by translation to the alliance between God and His people, perpetually compared to a marriage all over the Scripture. That this signification cannot take place here, this may serve to evidence;—that the cause, upon which our Lord allows divorce, must be something between the wife and the husband, as it was in the Law. For would it not be impertinent, to punish transgression of God's covenant with dissolution of wedlock?

§ 28. The proper signification of ροπελα indeed is larger in the Scriptures than according to the Attic Greek; to signify all uncleanness, as the matter requires. For when St. Paul says (1 Cor. v. 1), "Ολος ἄκουεται ἐν υἱίν ποπελα;" "for a man to have his father's wife" would not have been ροπελα in ordinary Greek. But it is no marvel, if the Jews that spoke Greek, call all that ροπελα, which their usual language called πωμα, the Syriac πωμα: so that ροπελα in our Lord's words is exactly expounded by Hesychius, and the Etymologick, turning "πομος, μοιχος;" who, being Christians, do usually expound that property of the Greek, which is usual among Christians, out of the Bible.

§ 29. And this is demonstrated to be the signification here meant, because it is not possible to shew, that ever there was any opinion, rule, or practice, received in the Church, that it is lawful to divorce but in case of adultery. I do truly conceive, that there was anciently a difference of opinion and practice in the Church, whether it be lawful to marry again upon putting away a wife for adultery; or whether the bond of marriage remain undissoluble, when the parties are separated from bed and board for adultery. But this difference argues consent in the rest; that is, that, excepting the case of adultery, there is no divorce to be among Christians. Neither do I now speak of the base times of the Eastern Emp-
picle; of which I will give you such an account as I find most reasonable, when I come to the difficulty that is proposed. I say, it may appear, that the Church originally granted no divorce but for adultery; whether the innocent party, or whether both, were allowed to marry again, living the other, or not.

§ 30. It is acknowledged by our author, that Tertullian (Cont. Marc. iv. 34, De Pudicitia cap. xvi.) both expounds our Lord’s words in this sense, and determines against divorces out of them: that Origen (In Matt. Hom. vii.) accepts them in the same sense, and disputes for it: that Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. ii. sub finem) condemns the divorces which the Roman laws then licensed, and marriage upon them: that St. Chrysostom (In Matt. Hom. xvii. and lxiii., Libro de Virginitate, Serm. i. de debitore decem millium), St. Ambrose (In Luc. lib. xvii.), St. Jerome (Epist. xxx. In Matt. xix.), St. Basil (Ad Amphil. can. ix., In Hæxæ-æm. Hom. vii.), Asterius (Hom. ult.), St. Augustin (De Adulteriniss Conjugiis ad Pollentium), follow the same sense, and and

See below, c. xiv. § 34.
Selden, Ux. Ebr., lib. iii. c. xxvii. p. 826, c. xxxi. pp. 850–853. The passages are too long to be quoted here at length: but all bear out the truth of Selden’s admission.

Id., De Pud. c. xvi.; ibid., p. 568. D.: written when a Montanist.


Id., ibid., Hom. Ixii. al. lxiii. § 2, 3; ibid., p. 622. B—E.
Id., De Virginitate, § 28; ibid., tom. i. p. 288. D, E.

Id., De Decem Mill. Talent. Debitore Hom., § 7; ibid., tom. iii. p. 13. C.
Id., In Hexæ-æm., Hom. vii. § 5, 6; Op., tom. i. p. 68. B, C: denying "τὴν ψυχής ἀναλυειν καὶ ἀναθρωπήν," or again drunkenness, to be a sufficient cause of separation between man and wife.
deliver the same doctrine: which seems to be also St. Gregory Nazianzen’s, when he calls a wife "[τυχόν] κακὸν οὐδὲ διόταν θέμπτος"—"an evil, which being got is not to be let go."
The record is yet to seek, that may shew any such opinion in the Church; and, having escaped so diligent hands, I may well challenge all the world to produce it.

§ 31. For whereas it is said, p. 155, that Origen (ubi supra?) argues, that there are faults no less destructive to any society or communion in wedlock than adultery is; and, therefore, that adultery is named but as an instance, in a sentence to be extended by reason of equity necessarily inherent in the case to all faults equally destructive to marriage: I grant, that Origen hath so argued, and that Grotius (out of whose Annotations upon Matt. v. 31, 32, all this dust hath been raised?) hath seconded him in it. But it is one thing to say, that, by consequence of reason, where the fault is no less destructive to marriage than adultery is, there ought to be the same liberty of divorce; another thing to say, that, by the letter of our Lord’s words, all causes of divorce, that Moses' law or the civil laws of Christian states allow, are allowable in point of conscience. The one leaves the weight of the fault, and the equality of it with adultery, to be judged by the Church. The other takes away the Church, and the judgment of it; which Origen never meant to do. Again I say, that those things, which are disputed by Origen, were never held of such consideration to the Church, that either the opinion or much more the practice of the Church should be valued by them. It is plain he was allowed so to argue; but it is as plain, that his arguments took no effect, either in the opinion, or in the practice of the Church.

§ 32. As for St. Augustin, who was so much perplexed, whether our Saviour might not mean spiritual fornication in those words (Retract. i. 19*), having delivered it for his opi-

---

Above, § 30. note g.  
* "Sed quam velit Dominus intelligi fornicationem, propter quam liceat dimittere uxorem, utrum eam que dam-
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nion before in his exposition of the Sermon in the Mount; will any man believe, that he, who so stiffly holds, that it is unlawful to marry after divorce for adultery, as St. Augustin, in his books De Adulterinis Conjugiis ad Pollentium and elsewhere, does, can allow divorce for any thing but adultery? The truth is, he that considers the business throughly shall see, that it was that supposition that obliged St. Augustin to this doubt; as, on the contrary, the improbability of the doubt is that, which chiefly renders the supposition improbable. Which being a thing not yet observed, so far as I know, and there being no means to judge what is in the power of the Church, and what is not; in matter of divorce, otherwise; I will go out of the way to debate rather [than*] to resolve it, before I go forwards.

CHAPTER XIV.

SCRIPTURE ALLEGED TO PROVE THE BOND OF MARRIAGE INSOLUBLE IN CASE OF ADULTERY, UNEFFECTUAL. ST. PAUL AND OUR LORD SPEAK BOTH TO ONE PURPOSE, ACCORDING TO ST. JEROME AND ST. AUGUSTIN. THE CONTRARY OPINION MORE REASONABLE, AND MORE GENERAL IN THE CHURCH. WHY THE CHURCH MAY RESTRAIN THE INNOCENT PARTY FROM MARrying AGAIN. THE IMPERIAL LAWS COULD NEVER BE OF FORCE TO VOID THE POWER OF THE CHURCH. EVIDENCE FOR IT.

Some texts are alleged to prove the bond of marriage undissoluble, which to me, I confess, do not seem to create Scriptur...
any manner of consequence. St. Paul saith (Rom. vii. 2, 3); “The wife, that is under a husband, is tied to her husband living by the law; but if her husband die, she is clear of her husband: so, living her husband, she shall be styled an adulteress if she become another husband’s; but if her husband die, she is free from the law, so as to be no adulteress if she become another husband’s.” Where, say they, it is “plain,” that she, who marries before her former husband is dead, is an adulteress. As also in 1 Cor. vii. 39: “The wife is tied by the law as long as her husband lives; but if her husband fall asleep, she is free to marry whom she please, only in the Lord.”

§ 2. And yet it is manifest, that St. Paul in the first place speaks according to the Law, in the second according to Christianity; and that there is no question, that under the Law marriage might be dissolved. Therefore the words of St. Paul are not superficially to be considered; when he saith (Rom. vii. 1), “Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to those that know the Law), διό εὐμόνος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ διόν χρόνων σε’.” For the meaning cannot be, that “the law hath power of a man, as long as the man lives that the law hath power upon;” but, “as long as the man lives who hath power over him by the law;” as it is evident by the inference;—“For the wife living is tied by the law to her husband; but if her husband die, she is clear of her husband.”

And the comparison, from which St. Paul argues, holds thus;—as a wife is no longer tied to her husband by the power which the law gives him, when he is dead; so are not Christians tied to God by the power which the Law gives Him, when it is voided by the death of Christ, but by the new bond which the covenant of grace knitteth. Now, by the Law, the bond of marriage is not to be dissolved but by the will of the husband; but if the husband will, it is dissolved by a bill of divorce: and, therefore, that exception is necessarily to be understood in St. Paul’s words: which being understood,

---


*b So Cajetan and others alleged in Bellarmine, ibid., A, B.
it will be ridiculous to infer, that therefore the marriage of Christians is indissoluble; though divers of the Fathers, it is true, have thought it a good inference.

§ 3. But among Christians, when St. Paul says, "The wife is tied by the law as long as her husband lives," his intent can require no more, than that she is free, when he is dead, to marry again; not, that she can no way be free while he is alive.

§ 4. Again, Eph. v. 28—32:—"He that loveth his wife: for never did any man hate his own flesh, but feed and cherish it, as our Lord His Church; for we are members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones: therefore shall a man leave father and mother, and cleave to his wife, and they two shall become one flesh: this mystery is great, but I mean in Christ, and in the Church." The marriage of Adam with Eve was intended by God for a figure and prophecy of the incarnation of Christ, and His spiritual marriage with the Church by virtue of it; as the Scripture, wheresoever it speaks of the first and second Adam, declareth. Therefore, as I said, their marriage was an indissoluble union of one with one; as the marriage of Christians, which reviveth it. Be the marriage of Christians then a sacrament, as much as any man would have it to be; be it a commemoration (if Adam's was a prediction) of the incarnation of Christ, and of His marriage with the Church; let it contain a promise of grace to them that exercise it as Christians should do: it is therefore indissoluble in the point of right, I confess; that is to say, it is the profession of an obligation upon the parties to hold it indissoluble. But is it therefore indissoluble in point of fact? May not the obligation so professed be transgressed? And is not marriage a civil contract, even among pagans and infidels; and that by God's appointment? And may not the law, which God hath restrained the marriage of Christians to, presuppose the conditions of a civil contract? And are not civil contracts void, when one party transgresseth

1 Bellarmine (ibid., C) cites the comment on the passages from S. Paul, of S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Primasius, Anselm: besides Origen in Matt. xix., S. Augustin (as in note g above), and S. Hieron. Epist. ad Amandum: for all which, with others, see Bingham, XVI. xi. 6, XXII. ii. 12; and Cotelerius, Annot. in Herm. Pastor., PP. Apost. tom. i. p. 88, quoted by Bingham: and below, § 18, 21.
the condition on which they are made? Or cannot marriage signify the marriage between Christ and His Church, cannot the observation of it oblige God to give grace, unless we understand all such conditions thereby to be extinguished? The union of the Word with our flesh, the union of Christ with His Church, depends only upon that effectual grace which Himself purposed from everlasting, because (as I said) upon supposition of our perseverance. The union of wife and husband signifies it no less; though, the obligation being transgressed, it may become void. But how shall marrying as a Christian should marry be the means to obtain grace, unless as well the union as that promise may be forfeited by transgressing the condition upon which it is made?

§ 5. The chief difficulty then lies in the words of our Lord, Matt. v. 31, 32, xix. 3—9: in which I must, in the first place, consider, that there are diverse things observable in them to shew, that our Lord, though He declared not openly that the Gentiles should embrace Christianity and the Jews refuse it, yet nevertheless propounds it so, that He must be understood to intend it for the Gentiles so converted, as well as for the Jews. That of Origen, in the first place. For, the Law appointing death for the punishment of adultery, what need the exception of adultery to the Jews, among whom divorce for adultery was death? Secondly, His words in St. Mark x. 11, 12:—“Whoso putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery against her; and if a wife put away her husband and marry another, she committeth adultery.” For by the Jews’ law, though the husband might put away his wife, yet the wife could not put away her husband. And though Josephus report, that Herod’s sister Salome sent her husband a bill of divorce: yet he reports it as that which never was done afore; and, therefore, cannot

k Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxviii. § 8: and c. xxvi. throughout.
1 See above in c. xiii. § 27. note w.
be thought to have come to a custom in our Lord's time. CHAP. XIV.
Thirdly, how could our Lord say, according to the Jews' law, that he who married a woman divorced committeth adultery; whenas what hindered a man then to marry a divorced wife out of mere charity, to keep her from committing adultery? Lastly, if we consider St. Paul's words, whereby he teacheth (as I have shewed*), that, the wife having the same interest in the husband as the husband in the wife by the Christian law, the wife can no more leave her husband than the husband the wife (1 Cor. vii. 1—5, 10, 11): it will appear, that his doctrine, extending to the condition of man and wife by the then Roman law, is derived, as it must needs be derived, from this sense of his Master's. Seeing, then, that divorce, not only among the Jews but among the Romans, was always understood to dissolve the bond of marriage: what appearance can there be, that our Lord, when He saith, "He that putteth away his wife, unless for adultery, and marrieth another, committeth adultery, and he that marrieth her who is put away committeth adultery," intendeth not to extend the exception to marrying again, as well as to putting away? and, therefore, that he who putteth away for adultery, and she who is not put away for adultery, may marry again? For if those, whom He spoke to, could understand nothing by divorce but that which they saw; and the divorce which they saw, or heard of, enabled all parties to marry again: then that divorce, 127 which the exception of fornication allows by our Lord's law, understanding that exception, enables to marry again.

§ 6. Two reasons are opposed from our Lord's words. First, in St. Mark x. 12, St. Luke xvi. 18, the exception is not expressed; and yet it is said, "He that puts away his wife and marries another, committeth adultery." To which it is answered, that the Gospels are (as St. Justin the Martyr calls them*) "remembrances" of the sayings and doings of our Lord; the effect whereof was delivered to, and received by, them who were baptized, as the law of Christianity: and that, therefore, in recording them, it was thought enough to

---

*a Above, c. xiii. § 12.
remember the heads of those things, which were undertaken to be believed and observed: that, therefore, all that undertake to expound the four Gospels, do use to add whatsoever any of them hath more than the one which he hath in hand, to make up his sense: in fine, therefore, that in this point the sense of our Lord is not to be measured by that which St. Mark and St. Luke hath less, but that which St. Matthew hath more: and, therefore, that, when our Lord saith, "He that puts away his wife and marries again, commits adultery, and he that marries her that is put away, commits adultery," He is to be understood with this exception—"unless for adultery".

§ 7. It is objected, secondly, that, by this account, she that is put away for adultery may marry again, and neither herself, nor he that marries her, be chargeable with adultery; which were a gross inconvenience,—that, by the law of our Lord, a woman by committing adultery, or man in like case, should advance himself, to marry again with a good conscience. For if it be true,—he that puts away but for adultery, and marries again,—and,—he that marries her who is put away but for adultery, commits adultery;—then will it follow, that he who puts away his wife for adultery, and marries another, and he that marries her that is so put away, commits no adultery. To which I answer, that it follows not, that our Lord so saying should mean this consequence: but rather that he, who marries her that is put away for adultery, commits adultery much more; though he who puts her away is no cause of it, neither chargeable with adultery for marrying again. For if the husband be chargeable with adultery, when the wife marries again, being not put away for adultery; why is he chargeable with it, that put her away for adultery? If, because he marries again, not putting his wife away for adultery; putting her away for adultery, why

---

See Bellarmine, De Matrim. Sacr., lib. i. c. 16. pp. 1619. D—1623. C; denying, as from S. Mark and S. Luke, the validity of marriage after divorce for adultery: and reporting and replying to the arguments on the opposite side of Cajetan, Catharinus, Erasmus, Bucer, &c.

is he chargeable with it? The difficulty will be—then is the
knot of wedlock tied to the one party, and loose to the other:
—which seems a knot more indissoluble than that of wedlock;
but is indeed none at all, if we distinguish between the me-
taphor of a knot tied, and the obligation signified by it. For
though the act of consent to the contract of wedlock is the
act of two parties, whereof a third (that is, God) is depositary,
discharge the innocent, and to charge the guilty; yet the
bond or obligation, which is contracted by it, is answerable
severally by each party in the judgment of God. And is
there the same reason, that God should call him to account
for adultery, who thinks himself free of that contract which
he stood to till his party transgressed it, as her that gave him
cause to think himself free by transgressing it?

§ 8. The difficulty then rests in the meaning of St. Paul, when
he chargeth "the wife not to depart from her husband;"
"if she" do, to "abide unmarried, or" to "be reconciled to
her husband;" and the husband not to put away his wife;
1 Cor. vii. 10, 11: and that, having before charged married
people not to part, even for devotion, but for a time, for fear
of temptation by concupiscence. For can it then be imagined,
that he allows them to part upon any occasion but that of
adultery? Therefore, those that are parted for adultery he
forbids to marry again.

§ 9. And these are the texts, that have moved St. Jerome
(Epist. xlvi. 7) to be of this mind. But St. Augustin further,
expounding the Sermon in the Mount upon this supposition
(as he himself professes in the beginning of his books De
Adulterinis Conjugiis, written express to maintain it*), and
desiring to shew how our Lord's law enjoins the same
with His apostles', imagines, that our Lord might mean "spiritual
fornication or adultery" (according to which the Psalm says,
"Thou hast destroyed all that commit fornication against
Thee"), when He gave it†: which sense compriseth all sin,

* See below, § 20, note z.
† "Prima quaestio est, frater dilectissime Pollenti..., quod sit apostolus, 'His autem qui sunt in conjugio prae-
cipium,' &c., 'utrum sua sit accipienda, ut eam prohibuisse nubere intel-
ligatur, quæ sine causa fornicationis diecessit a viro; id enim sentis: an, sicut ego sensi in eis libris, quos ante
plurimos annos de sermone evangelico scripti, quem secundum Mattheum habuit Salvator in monte, illas inuaptas manere praecipierit, quæ a viris suis ea causa recesserint quæ sola permissa est, id est, fornicationis." S. Aug. De
Conjug. Adulter., lib. i. c. 1. § 1; Op.,
tom. vi. p. 387, A, B.

† See above in c. xiii. § 32, notes a, b.
that carrieth with it a construction of departing from our covenant with God, both in truth, and according to St. Augustin, De Sermone Domini in Monte, i. 16*. Whereupon the Milevitan canon (xvii.*) speaks thus:—“Placuit, ut, secundum evangelicam et apostolicam disciplinam, neque dimissus ab uxore, neque dimissis a marito, alteri conjungantur; sed ita maneant, aut sibi reconcilientur: quod si contemperint, ad penitentialiam redigantur: in qua causa legem imperialem petendam promulgari”—“It seemed good, that, according to the discipline of the Gospel and the apostles, neither he that is dismissed by his wife, nor she that is dismissed by her husband, be wedded to another; but remain so, or be reconciled to one another: which if they neglect, that they be put to penance: and that request be made for an imperial law to be published in the case;”—where, alleging the Gospel and St. Paul both, it is plain the canon proceeds upon the opinion of St. Augustin; for he was at this Council, and in all probability had the penning of the canons.

§ 10. That which moved them to be of this opinion, I confess moves me to be against it. I cannot be persuaded, that St. Paul in this place, and our Lord in the Gospel, speak both to one and the same purpose. All subjects of the Roman empire, when St. Paul writ, had power to leave their wives or their husbands at pleasure, without giving the law account. But, supposing them Christians, were they not to give God account? were they not to give the Church account? Certainly, if they married again, they must give the Church account; because our Lord hath said, “He that leaveth his wife but for adultery, and marrieth again, committeth

* “Quia scilicet idololatria quam sequuntur infides, et quaelibet noxia superstitio, fornicatio est... Porro si infidelitas fornicatio est, et idololatria infidelitas et avaria idololatria, non est dubitandum et avaritiam fornicationem esse. Quis ergo jam quaelibet illicitam concupiscientiam potest recte a fornicationis genere separare, si avaritia fornicatio est? Ex quo intelligitur, quod propter illicitas concupiscientias non tantum quae in stupris cum alienis viris aut feminis committuntur, sed omnino quaelibet, quae animam corpore male utente, a deo afferat, rare faciunt, et perniciosae turpiterque corrupi, possit sine crimine et vir uxorem dimittere et uxorem virum.”
S. Aug., De Serm. Domini in Monte, lib. i. c. 16. § 45, 46; Op., tom. iii. P. ii. p. 185. A—D.


* See e.g. the Epistle of the Council to Pope Innocent I., S. Augustin being one of the writers; and that of five bishops thereof to the same pope, S. Augustin being one of them: Epist. clxvii., clxviii.; Op., tom. ii. pp. 620. D, 622. C, sq.
adultery:" for of adultery account is to be given the Church. And, truly, who parts with a wife, it is great odds, does it out of a desire to marry another: which all the Church agrees he cannot do, unless she be an adulteress; part of it says further, though she be he cannot do it. But if he marry not another, but part with his wife, he must give God account; whether he be bound to give the Church account or not. And this account St. Paul instructs how to give. He will not have Christians to part bed and board, much less to repudiate, to part families, to send one another away with that which they brought: but if they will needs try how good it is living unmarried, he would have them know, that they could not marry elsewhere, because of our Lord's law; which in case of fornication he silently excepteth. For to me it seemeth manifest, that our Lord, in case of fornication, provideth for the reparation of the party wronged, whose bed and issue is concerned; restraining the divorce, which the Law allowed, only to the transgression of marriage enacted by the institution of paradise, when two continue not "one flesh:" but St. Paul, for the conscience of particular Christians, upon what terms they may or ought to forbear cohabitation; to wit, so as they marry not again: which is exhortation enough to set aside animosities, and return to bed and board again. St. Augustin, and Venerable Bede upon the Gospel following him, confess, that according to their interpretation our Lord permits to part, not for the fornication which the other party hath done, but for that which himself may do; to wit, which by the company of an ill disposed yoke-fellow he may be moved to do. So divorce, according to this opinion, is grounded upon the precept of the Gospel, "If thine eye offend thee pluck it out:" and is that, which [Matt. v. 29, viii. 9; Mark ix. 47.] the Church of Rome at this day maintaineth by the twenty-
[fourth] session of the Council of Trent, can. viii. (and that, 47.)


b "Siigitur uxor hujusmodi ali- quid" (sc. fornication in the wider sense) "hominem cogat, qui talem di-mittit, causa fornicationis dimittit, non tantum illius, sed et suae. Illius, qui" (leg. "quia) fornicatur; suae, ne for-nicet." Bed., In Matth., c. v. vers. 32: Op., tom. v. p. 20.
as I think, according to St. Paul; only that he leaves it to the conscience of particular Christians without interesting the Church, the interest whereof I conceive cannot be excluded, though St. Paul here provide not for it): as Cardinal Bellarmine (*De Matrimonio* i. 14) disputeth. But, in case of adultery, it never was nor ever could seem questionable (so as St. Paul to decide it), whether a man might so put away his wife or no; all civil law that then was, counting him accessory to the stain of his bed and issue, that did not; and, thereupon, the ancient canons of the Church imposing penalties upon any of the clergy, who, being allowed to dwell with their wives, should endure an adulteress. And therefore I conclude, that St. Paul, though he allow not either husband or wife to part with wife or husband, as to cohabitation, without renouncing the bond of wedlock, no not for the state of continence (as St. Augustin very well argues,—if not for continence, then no other cause), yet forbids not what he allows not. But seeing such offences fall out among Christians that be married, as are not easily discernable where the fault of them lies; not allowing them to part, nor yet condemning both parties, he limits them, in case they do so, not to marry again: imposing thereby upon the innocent party the necessity of continence, which his innocence makes tolerable, and the apostle’s advice, if it proceed not to the parting of families, easily recoverable. As for the guilty, if it prove a burden or a snare, he may impute it to his fault. And as it was not necessary, that the Church should be interested in it, so long as both parties were enabled by the law to depart, and neither proceeded to marry again; so, the law not allowing it, there is no marvel that the Church should interpose.

inter conjuges quaed torum seu quaed cohabitationem ad certum incertumve tempus fieri posse decernit, anathema sit.” Conc. Trid., Sess. xxiv. (misprinted xxvi. above in the text in fol. edit.) can. 8; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 873. B. C.

d Controv., tom. ii. p. 1611. B. C.


e See Bingham, XVII. v. 27: and Selden and Grotius, *ibid.*

1 “Quid si ergo dicat, Dimitto ergo uxorem meam sine ulla causa fornicationis, sed continens permanebo; ideone dicemus eum impune fecisse quod fecit? Quis hoc dicere audebit, qui volunatem Domini haec dicentis intelligit? Quoniam nec continentia causas dimiti conjugem voluit, Qui solam caussam fornicationis excepit.” S. Aug., De Conjug. Adult., lib. i. c. 3. § 2; Op., tom. vi. p. 389. B.
§ 11. Let us then see, how the rest of the Church allows the exception of adultery to the purpose of marrying again.

§ 12. Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. ii. in fine:—“Ἀντί-
kρισις νομοθετεί (ἡ Γραφή), Οὐκ ἀπολύσεις γυναῖκα [πλὴν]
eἰ μὴ ἔπλησεν πορνείας· μοιχείαν δὲ ἤγείται τὸ ἐνυψῆμαι
ζώντος θατέρου τῶν κεχωρισμένων”—“The Scripture plainly
enacteth, Thou shalt not dismiss thy wife but upon account
of adultery; counting it adultery to marry while the one of
the parted is alive.”

§ 13. Athenagoras, De Resurrect. Mortuorum:—“Ὁ οἶος [Athena-
tος ἐκθῇ μένειν, ἢ ἐφ' ἐν γάμῳ· ὁ γὰρ δεύτερος εὐπρεπῆς
ἐστὶν μοιχεία· δὲ γὰρ ἂν ἄπωλυσης, φησὶ, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχάται”—“A Christian is to abide as
he was born, or at one marriage; for, saith He, 'he that dis-
miseth his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adul-
tery.'” This necessarily concerneth no more, than marrying
again upon that divorce, which the Roman law enabled either
party to make, without rendering a reason; and may well
bear the exception of marrying upon divorce for adultery by
the Christian law.

§ 14. And the same exception may well be understood in
the forty-eighth canon of the Apostles:—“Εἴ τις λαϊκὸς
τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκβάλλων, ἐτέραν λάβοι, ἢ ἀφ' ἐτέρου
ἀπολελυμένην, ἀφορίζῃσθω”—“If a layman, casting out his
wife, take another, or one that is put away by another,
let him stand excommunicate.” Provision is made against
taking to wife one that had been put away, for the reputa-
tion of the clergy: for it must needs be a stain to bring such
an one into a man’s house.

§ 15. If it be true that Grotius al]lēges out of several
passages of Tertullian,—that the Church in his time admitted
them to marry again, who had parted with their wives for
adultery,—we need no more. But though those allegations
(as not quoted, so) are no where to be found; yet Tertullian’s
opinion is to be seen by the plea that he makes, Contra

---

6. Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, § 28. p. 130. ed. Dechair, Oxf. 1706.—The reference in the text to his
other tract, De Mort. Resur., is a
mistake.

---

2. Tertullian, qui non uno loco os-
tendit solitos suos tempore ad matrimo-
nium aliterum admissi qui ob adul-
terium uxorem dimississet.” Grot., Ad
Matth., v. 32; but without proceeding
to quote or refer to the alleged passages.
§ 16. Lactantius plainly signifies the same, when he says,
"Adulterum esse, qui a marito dimissam duxerit; et eum,
qui praeter crimen adulterii uxorem dimiserit, ut alterum du-
cat"—"That he is an adulterer, who marries a wife put away
by her husband; and that so is he, that shall put away his
wife to marry another, excepting the crime of adultery."

§ 17. The great council of almost all the West at Arles, in
the business of the Donatists, provides, can. x. 9, that those,
who take their wives in adultery, being young Christians, be
exhorted not to marry others as long as they live: leaving
thereby hope of reconcilement. Certainly, they counted it not
adultery, which they only exhorted not to do. The council of
Elvira, can. ix. 9,—that the wife, that forsakes her husband for
adultery and marries another, shall not communicate so long
as he remains alive;—of the husband, nothing. By the eighth
and tenth, she, who leaves her husband without cause and
marries another, is not to communicate, no not at the point
of death—(at the date of this Council, before the act of Con-
stantine, man or wife parted without shewing cause; with-
out cause, then, is when that cause, which the Church allows,
viz. adultery, is not):—she, that marries him, who she knew
had put away his wife without cause, not till the point of
death. This is the difference between committing adultery,
and marrying him that commits adultery by putting away his

1 "Hoc enim responso et Moysi constitutionem protexit, ut Sui; et Cre-
atoris institutionem direxit, ut Christus Ipsius. . . Nonne et Ipsa prohibens di-
voiratum, et Patrem tamen gestans Eum Qui marem et feminam junxit, exeu-
saverit potius quam destruxerit Moysi constitutionem?" Tertull., Adv. Marc.,
lib. iv. c. 34 (32 in the text is a mis-
take); Op., p. 449. D.

2 Lactant., Divin. Instit., lib. vi. De
Vero Cultu, c. 23. p. 580.

3 "De his qui conjuges suas in adul-
terio deprehendunt, et idem sunt ado-
lescentes fideles, et prohibentur nu-
bere; placuit, ut, in quantum possit,
consilium eis detur, ne viventibus ux-
oribus suis, licet adulterias, alias acci-
diant." Conc. Arelat. I. (A.D. 314),
can. x.: ap. Labb., Conc., tom. i. p.
1428. B, C.—See Coteler., PP. Apost.,
tom. i. p. 88; and Bingham, XXII.
i. 12.

4 See it above in c. x. § 7. note h.
5 See it, ibid. § 6. note a.
6 "Si fuerit fideling, quam duoiter ab
eo qui uxorem inculpatam reliquit, et
sciret eum habere uxorem, quam sine
causa reliquit, placuit huic nec in fine
dari communionem." Conc. Eliber.
(A.D. 305), can. x.: ap. Labb., Conc.,
tom. i. p. 971. E.—See however above,
c. x. § 6. note m.
wife without adultery. And it is plain, the wife is stricter used by these canons than the husband.

§ 18. The Commentaries upon St. Paul’s Epistles under [Pseudo- Ambrose.] St. Ambrose his name, say plainly (1 Cor. vii.), that the man may marry again, having put away his wife for adultery; not the wife, having put away her husband: because “the man” is “the head of the woman.” I do not find this reason suffi- [1 Cor. xi. cient. For St. Paul maketh the interest of the wife in the husband, and that of the husband in the wife, both one and the same. Nor do I find the reason sufficient, which Cardinal Cajetan hath given for him (upon Matt. xix. 9*); to wit, because our Lord, saying, “He that putteth away his wife, unless for adultery, and marrieth again, committeth adultery,” says nothing of what the woman may do in that case. For Mark x. 11, 12, He says as much for the wife as for the husband, not expressing the exception. Why then should it not be extended to her, when He addeth it? But I conceive, that, though by God’s law the woman be restrained no more than the man, yet the law of the Church might restrain that, which God’s law restrained not; and so, though the man be only advised not to marry again by the canon of Arles, yet the woman might be put to penance, so long as her first husband remained alive, by the canon of Elvira.*

§ 19. For I see St. Basil (Ad Amphil., can. ix.*) confesses, [St. Basil the Great.] that, though St. Paul makes the case of both equal, yet custom put the woman to penance, marrying upon the adultery of her husband. Some ground of difference nature itself enforces, in that the man taints not the wife’s issue; nor brings that infamy upon her bed, as she upon his. In the

* "Et virum uxorem non dimittere—Subauditur autem, excepta fornicationis causa. Et iddeo non subjicit dicens, sicut de muliere, Quod si dixerit, manere sic: quia viro liceat ducere uxorem, si dimiserit uxorem pecemantem; quia non ita lege constringitur vir sicut mulier; caput enim mulieris vir est." Pseudo-Ambros., In 1 Cor. vii. 11; in Append. ad Op. S. Ambros. tom. ii. p. 133. E. F.

* "Nee ex his intelligas, uxorem quoque posse dimittere virum fornicantem: quoniam Jesus, Qui est verus Deus, non hoc concessit: nec est par ratio, ut patet. Nec etiam in veteri

Lege uxor poterat repudiare virum.”

Thomas de Vio, Card. Cajetan., Comment. in Matth. c. xix. v.9: Comment. tom. iv. p. 86. a: proceeding to quote the passage of the Pseudo-Ambrose cited above in note r.

1 Above in § 17. note n.
2 Ibid., note o.
BOOK III.

mean time, whatsoever we say of that, it is manifest they held it not adultery, for the party, that parted for adultery, to marry again.

§ 20. And as for Fabiola, who, having put away a notorious adulterous husband and married another, after the death of this second did voluntary penance for it; as you find in St. Jerome (Epist. xxxvii.): it may be the Church exacted it not, because during her second husband's time it is not said that she communicated not; and it may be she followed St. Jerome's opinion, which he expresseth Epist. xlvii.

§ 21. Some passages of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and Gregory Nazianzen, are alleged in vain; signifying only the insolvency of marriage: which may allow the exception which the Gospel maketh, and must allow it, when we see the custom, testified by St. Basil, to the contrary. And St. Chrysostom, when St. Paul says of the wife, "If she part," &c., understands him, If she part upon ordinary displeasures, which he calls "μικροψυχίας" or "pusillanimities," which the courage of a true Christian would neglect and oversee.


"Ergo et ista soror, quae ut dicit vnum passa est, ut alteri jungetur, si vult Corpus Christi accipere et non adultera reputari, agat pomenitiam; ita duxit, ut secundo viro, non appellatur vir sed adulter, a tempore pomenitiae non coeplectur," &c. Id., Epist. iv. apud tom. iv. (al. cxlvii.), Ad Amandum; Op., tom. iv. P. i. p. 162.

For cxlvii. in the text, and before in § 9, read cxlviii.

See above in § 19. note x.

§ 2. Op., tom. iii. p. 205. C, D; and in Bingham, XXII. v. 1.

only to penance, that marry again, having put away wives or husbands; not supposing adultery. But Epist. ix. Ad Prob-
busm:—“Statuimus, fide catholica suffragante, illud esse conju-
gium, quod primitus erat Divina gratia fundatum; conventu-
quæ secundae mulieris, priore superstite nec divorcio ejecta, nullo
pacto posse esse legitimum”—“We decree, the catholic faith
voting for it, that to be marriage, which first was founded
upon God’s grace” (that was first made according to Chris-
tianity); “and that the wedding of a second wife, living the
first, can by no means be lawful.” Which exception could
possibly signify nothing, if in no case (not of adultery) a
second could be married while the first is alive.

§ 23. And in the West Chromatius of Aquileia (In Matt. v.),
as well as in the East Asterius (Homi. An liceat dimittere
uxorem): the first damns him, that shall marry again, ex-
cepting adultery; the second would have his hearers per-
suaded, that nothing but death or adultery dissolves marriage.

§ 24. But do I therefore say, that the Church cannot for-
bid the innocent party to marry again? or is bound by God’s
law to allow it? all ecclesiastical law being nothing but the
restraining of that which God’s law hath left indefinite, and
the inconveniences being both visible and horrible. I con-
ceive I am duly informed, that George, late archbishop of
Canterbury, was satisfied in the proceeding of the High Com-
mission court, to tie them that are divorced from marrying
again, upon experience of adultery designed upon collusion
to free the parties from wedlock; having been formerly
tender in imposing that charge. The Greek Church may

Id., Epist. ix. Ad Prob.; ibid., p. 1263. D.

a Corrected from MS.; “leaving,” in orig. text.

b “Unde non ignorant, quam grave
spud Deum damnationis crimen incur-
rant, qui per effrenatum libidinis vo-
luptatem (abque fornicationis causa)
dimissis uxoribus in alia volunt trans-
ire conjugia. Quod idecirco se credunt
impune committere, quia humanis et
saculis legibus id videtur permissum...”
Sed sicuti uxorem caste ac pure viven-
tem dimittere fas non est, ita quoque
adulteram dimittere permittam est,
quia ipsa mariti consortio fecit se in-
dignam.” Chromatius, In S. Matth.,
c. v. Concio 1; ap. Bibl. PP., tom. iv.
p. 841. E, F.

k “Πεσθήτε, τῷ γένος θεράτα μο-
νῦ καὶ μοιχεία διακόστες.” Asterius
Asenius, Hom. v.; An liceat homini
dimittere uxorem, &c.; ap. Combeix.,
Bibl. Graeco-Lat. PP. Nov. Auctor.,
p. 82. B; and in the Latin version in
Bibl. PP., tom. iv. p. 707. E.—See
above, in c. xiii. § 30. note a.

1 The allusion in the last clause of this
paragraph appears to be to the conduct
of Abp. Abbot in the divorce (or, more
correctly, the decree of nullity of mar-
riage) between the Earl of Essex and
Lady Frances Howard in 1613: where-
in he, as one of the commissioners, dis-
better avoid such inconveniences; not being tied to any law of the land, but the tempering of the canons remaining in the governors of the Church. But they, that would not have the laws of the Church and the justice of the land become stales and panders to such villainies, must either make adultery death, and so take away the dispute; or revive public penance, and so take away the infamy of his bed and the taint of his issue, that shall be reconciled to an adulteress; or, lastly, bear with that inconvenience, which the casualties of the world may oblige any man to, which is to propose the chastity of single life instead of the chastity of wedlock, when the security of a man's conscience and the offence of the Church allows it not.

§ 25. But though this, in regard of the intricacies of the question and the inconveniences evident to practice, may remain in the power of the Church; yet can it never come within the power of the Church to determine, that it is prejudicial to the Christian faith to do so, as by God's law. And the Church, that errs not in prohibiting marriage upon divorce for adultery, will err in determining for matter of faith, that God's law prohibits it; so long as such reasons from the Scriptures are not silenced by any tradition of the whole Church. It is easy to see by St. Augustin (De Adulterinis Conjugiis, ii. 5—12), that public penance was the means to restore an adulterer to the same reputation among Christians, which an adulterer, that turned Christian, must

sented from the sentence actually pronounced, viz., that the marriage was null, and the parties licensed to marry again. See the Biogr. Brit., second edition, art. George Abbot. The Abp. wrote "Some Memorials" on the subject, with a speech he had intended to deliver: which were published in 1719, but the present editor has not met with the book. Thordike would seem to have had information from private sources respecting his later opinion, above alleged, in favour of the propriety of prohibiting marriage to parties divorced for adultery. The 107th canon of 1603 enacts, that, "in all cases of divorce, bond" is "to be taken for not marrying during each other's life." And so also the canons of 1597; in Wilkins, Conc. Brit., tom. iv. p. 554. And see Gibson's Codex, tit. xxii. c. xvii. pp. 446, 447: and below, § 34. note n.

"Corrected from MS.; "became" in orig. text.

"For the clause beginning, "or, lastly," the MS. substitutes—"or, lastly, think it no inconvenience, if the law shall forbid the divorced for adultery to marry again, God's law not requiring it."

"Quod autem tibi durum videtur, ut post adulterium reconcilietur conjugi conjunct, si fides adsit, non erit durum. Cur enim adhuc deputamus adulteros, quos vel baptismate ablutos vel penitentia credimus esse sanatos?"

needs recover among Christians. And that is the reason, why the canon of Arles orders, that young Christians be advised not to marry again, that their wives may be recovered of their adultery by penance, and so their marriage re-estated. I see also, that Justinian (Nov. cxvii.) hath taken order, that women excessive in incontinence be delivered to the bishop of the city, to be put into a monastery, there to do penance during life. And, supposing adultery to be death, according to Moses' law, the inconvenience ceaseth. If the civil law enable not the Church to avoid the scandal of this collusion, it is no marvel, that the Church is constrained to impose upon the innocent more than God's law requires, to avoid that scandal which God's law makes the greater inconvenience.

§ 26. And thus, having shewed you that St. Augustin's interpretation of fornication is not true, I have into the bargain shewed you, that it cannot serve to prove divorce upon other causes besides adultery. And so the insolvency of marriage, excepting our Saviour's exception, is as firmly proved as the consent of the church can prove any thing in Christianity.

§ 27. I know Origen argues, that poisoning, killing children, robbing the house, may be as destructive to the society of wedlock as adultery: and he thereupon seems to infer, that our Saviour excepts adultery only for instance, intending all cases equally destructive to wedlock; as Grotius, who follows his sense, seems to limit it. But Origen's opinion will not interrupt the tradition of the Church, unless it could appear to have come into practice sometime in some part of the Church. Neither would it serve his turn, that would have those divorces, which the secular power allows, to extend to marrying again. For Origen never intended, that his own opinion should bind; but that it is in the power of the

---

1 See above, § 17. note n.
2 διον τέμυψι," enacta, that, "εἰ διπλασία
2 τῆς τοιοῦτος διεσθας προσφεύσεις, καὶ διπλα
diαν τέμυψι τῷ ἄνδρι, πελεόμεν . . . τὴν
2 γυναῖκα, καύσασι τοῦ δικαστοῦ τοῦ τῆς
2 ἐπιλέξομεν διρροσαξάμενον, παραβίδοται
2 τῇ διπλασίᾳ τῆς πάλαι, καὶ ην κοινῆς
2 τῆς σκέπης ἐκεῖνης διότι τῇ διπλασίᾳ προ-
2 σαλε ἐν μοναστηρίῳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, δειλοῦσιν μέχρι τῆς ἱερᾶς ἡταίρας προσκαρτερίας."
3 See above, c. xiii. § 30. note g, § 31. notes x, y.
4 "Ibid.
5 Ibid., § 31. note x.
Church to void marriages upon other causes. For he saith he
"knew some governors of churches suffer a woman to marry,
her former husband living," "præter Scripturam"—"besides
the Scripture:" and that, as Moses permitted divorce, to
avoid a greater mischief. But I may question, whether they
thought that against the Scripture, which Origen thought to
be against the Scripture. And in the mean time, as I do
not see what breach his report can make upon the tradition
of the Church, so it is plain, the power of the Church, and not
the secular, did that which he reports.

§ 28. And, truly, what the testimony of St. Augustin (ex-
tending that adultery upon which our Saviour grants divorce
to all mortal sin, but confining him, that is so divorced,
not to marry another x) can avail him, that would entitle the
secular power to create causes of divorce to the effect of
marrying again; let all reason and conscience judge.

§ 29. I shall conclude my argument; "Exceptio firmat re-
gulam in non exceptis"—"An exception settles the rule in all
that is not excepted." Either our Saviour intended, that who-
ever' had put away a yoke-fellow for adultery, should marry
again, or not. If so, He hath forbid marrying again upon
other causes: if not, much more; for, though upon adultery,
He hath forbidden to marry again. And thus is the power of
the Church in matrimonial causes founded upon the law, 132
which our Lord Christ hath confined all Christians to, of
marrying one to one and indissolubly, whether without ex-
ception or excepting adultery. For seeing that of necessity
many questions must arise upon the execution of such a law;
and that civil power may as well be enemy to Christianity,
as not; and that, as well professing to maintain it, as pro-

x "Scio quosdam qui presunt eccle-
sis, extra Scripturam permisisse ali-
quam nubere, viro priori vivente: et
contra Scripturam fecerunt quidem, di-
centem, 'Mulier ligata est quarto tem-
pore vivit vir ejus.'... Non tamen om-
inono sine causa hoc permiserunt: for-
sitan enim proper propter hujiusmodi infirmitatem
incontinentium hominum, pejo-
rum comparatione, quae mala sunt per-
missurus, adversus ea quae ab initio
sunt scripta." Origen, in Matth. Hom.
vii.: as quoted (in part) from the old
Latin translation, by Selden, Ux. Ebr.,
lib. iii. c. 31. p. 880.—"Hēn de wapá
γεγραμμένα καὶ τιμός τῶν ἴθνων τῆς
ἐκκλησίας ἐπέφρεσα τινα, διὸτι ἤποτος
τοῦ ἄνδρα γαμείσθαι ἵνα πάντα τὸ
γεγραμμένον μὲν τοιοῦτος, ὅφει
ἀλλικαί, 'Γυνὴ δὲ τε φῇ δεσον, ᵊ wartime. "Ends, γὰρ τὴν κυρι-
πορφόρων τάτην αυτῇ ἐνεργεῖται, κυρίων
ἀντίπερ ταῦτα τὰ ἐν ἀρχῆς νεομο-
θεσμάτων καὶ γεγραμμένων." Orig., In
647. A, B.

x See above, § 9; and c. xiii, § 32.
y Corrected from MS.; "who," in
orig. text.

z Misprinted 123 in folio edit.
fessing to persecute it: to say, that God hath left the con-
sciences of Christians to be secured by the civil power, sub-
mitting to what it determines, is to say, that under the Gos-
pel God hath not made the observing of His laws the con-
dition of obtaining His promises.

§ 30. This is that power, which Tertullian in several places [Evidence of Tertul-
lion to that power.] expressly voucheth. De \textit{Pudicitia}, cap. iv.:—"\textit{Penes nos}" (speaking of Christians, that is, of the whole Church) "oc-
culta quoque conjunctiones, id est, non prius apud ecclesiam professe, juxta mechiam et fornicationem judicari pericli-
tantur"—"Among us, even clandestine marriages, that is, not professed before the Church, are in danger to be censured next to adultery and fornication."—And therefore, 
\textit{Ad Uxorem} ii. ult.:
\"Unde sufficiamus ad enarrandum felicitatem ejus matrimonii quod ecclesia conciliat\"—"How may we be able to declare the happiness of that marriage, which the Church interposeth to join?"—\textit{De Monogamia}, cap. xi.:—\"Quale est id matrimonium, quod eis a quibus postulas non licet habere?\"—"What manner of marriage is that," saith he (speaking of marrying a second wife), "which it is not lawful for them, of whom thou desirlest it, to have?"
Because it was not lawful for the clergy, who allowed the people to marry second wives, themselves to do the same.

§ 31. Ignatius, \textit{Epist. ad Polycarpum}:—\"\textit{Προτες δὲ τοῖς \gammaαμώσι καὶ ταῖς γαμομέναις μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἐνωσίν ποιεῖσθαι, ἵνα ὁ γάμος ἔ ποτε Κύριον, καὶ μὴ κατ’ ἐπιθυμίαν\"—"It becometh men and women that marry, to join by the consent of the bishop, that the marriage be according to the Lord, and not according to lust." (It hath been doubted indeed, whether we have the true copy of Ignatius his epistles or not; whether this be one of them or not: but, that copy being found, which Eusebius\textsuperscript{1}, St. Je-

\textsuperscript{a} Op. p. 557. B.
\textsuperscript{b} Ad \textit{Ux.}, lib. ii. c. 8; ibid., p. 171. C.
\textsuperscript{c} Ibid., p. 581. C.—Rigalt reads, "\textit{Quasis es id matrimonium postulans, quod.}" &c.
\textsuperscript{e} Ussher, Dissert. de Ignatii Martyr. Epist. &c. cc. ii., v. (publ. 1644, Works, vol. vii. pp. 96, sq., 119, sq.), maintains, not only that the existing Epistle to Polycarp is spurious, but that no Epis-
tate to him from Ignatius was written at all, and that the quotations from it (see below, notes f, g) are really from that to the Church of Smyrna: thereby singling it out not only from the older collection of so-called Ignatian letters, but also from the seven Epistles of which Vossius in 1646 published the (uninterpolated) Greek text, as being
not simply interpolated but spurious. — See R. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 49, 50.

"... ἡδὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Αἱτητῆς γενόμενος, ἀπὸ Τρείτου τοῦ εὐ προς ἰδιοκήτεις αὕτης διὰ γραφῆς ὑμελίαν, καὶ τῇ Ἰουδαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἵνα τῷ ταύτῃ προφανείᾳ Πολυκαρπῷ, διὰ τὴν ἀποστολικήν ἀκόμα εὐ μᾶλλα γνωρίζων, τὴν καὶ ἀντιδρότερον αὐτῷ τούτον (οὐ μηνίκες καὶ ἀλεθῶς τοῦτον) παρακαθήναι, τὴν τερατολογίαν διὰ σπανῆς ἥχειν αὕτην δείκνυν. 'Ὁ δὲ αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίων γράφων, οὐκ' οὖν ἀπεθάνει διὸς συγκεκριμένης τούτῳ τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ διεξεῖται.” Euseb., Hist. Eccl., lib. iii. c. 36. pp. 107. D. 108. A : proceeding to quote from the Epistle to the Smyrnæans (correctly—§ 3. pp. 402, 404. ed. Jacobson), what S. Jerome (as in note g below) seems to refer, apparently through haste in translating Eusebius, to the Epistle to Polycarp. See Voss, ad loc. Eusebius simply refers to the Epistle to Polycarp without citing any passage from it.—The "copy" mentioned above in the text, is the MS. in Bibliotheca Mediceo-Laurentiana, containing the uninterpolated Greek text of seven Epistles, and published first by Isaac Voss, 4to. Amst. 1646. It is not necessary to do more than refer to the MS. book of extracts, where Mr. Cureton recently supposed himself to have found a still shorter and purer form of the Ignatian Epistles.

§ "Inde egredient, scripstat ad Philadelphenas, et ad Smyrnæos, et proprium ad Polycarpum, commendantes illi Antiochensem ecclesiam: in qua" (i. e.,

in fact, in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans) "et de evangelio quod nuper a me translatum est" (meaning the evangel. see Hebrews), "super persona Christi posuit testimonium, dicens," &c. S. Hieron., De Script. Eccles., c. 16; Op., tom. iv. P. ii. p. 108.

—S. Jerome (see last note) does not really do more than refer to the Epistle to Polycarp. But if the whole of the Epistles published by Voss as genuine are to stand or fall together, then the quotation he does make, considered as taken from the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, is an argument for the genuineness of the Vossian text of all seven Epistles, including that to Polycarp.

h Thordike of course refers to quotations generally from the Epistles, as, e.g., those of Theodoret, Eusebius, Origen, Athanasius: for which, with some others, see Ussher, as above quoted, c. iii. pp. 102, sq.; arguing for his own shorter Latin text, which agrees in the main with the subsequently published Greek of Voss, against the previously published longer and interpolated editions. See the Preface to Jacobson's edition, pp. xxxii., sq. Of quotations from the Epistle to Polycarp, besides the references of Eusebius and Jerome, Voss produces only three, viz., from a spurious sermon attributed to S. Chrysostom, from Antiochus Monachus, and from Joan. Damascenus: see Voss., ad loc.

1 See above, c. xiii. § 16. note p.
2 See ibid., § 17. notes t, u.
3 See ibid., note x.
evidenceth the power of the Church in this point unquestionable.

§ 33. And therefore against the imperial laws I argue as against the Leviathan; that is, if any man suppose, that they pretend to secure the conscience of a Christian in marrying according to them upon divorce. Either the sovereign power effects that as sovereign, or as Christian. If as sovereign, why may not the Christians of the Turkish empire divorce themselves according to the Alcoran, which is the law of the land, and be secure in point of conscience? If as Christian, how can the conscience of a Christian in the eastern empire be secured in that case, wherein the conscience of a Christian in the West cannot be secured, because there is no such civil law there, the Christianity of both being the same? For it cannot be said, that the imperial laws alleged were in force in the West, after the division of the empire. I argue again; that they cannot secure the conscience, but under the law of our Lord, as containing the true interpretation of fornication in His sense. And can any man be so senseless as to imagine, so impudent as to affirm, that the whole Church, agreeing in taking the fornication of married people to signify adultery, hath failed; but every Christian prince, that alloweth and limiteth any other causes of divorce, all limiting several causes, attaineth the true sense of it? Will the common sense of men allow, that homicide, treason, poisoning, forgery, sacrilege, robbery, man-stealing, cattle-driving, or any of them, is contained in the true meaning of "fornication" in our Lord's words? that consent of parties, that a reasonable cause, when pagans divorced "per bonam gratiam," without disparagement to either of the parties, can be understood by that name? For these you shall find to be legal causes of divorce by those acts of the emperors.

* See above, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. iii. § 33—37.
* Corrected from MS.; "is," in orig. text.
* "In our Lord's saying, 'But for fornication,' should mean, But for some of those crimes." Added in margin in MS.
* That is to say, where the marriage was dissolved, "non ex animi impetu, aut contumeliosae, aut culpae causa, sed 
* Corrected from MS.; "cause," in orig. text.
* See above, c. xiii. § 20: and Selden, ibid., pp. 839, sq.
Lastly, I argue; if these causes secure the conscience in the empire by virtue of those laws, why shall not those causes, for which divorce was allowed or practised amongst the ancient French, the Irish, the Welch, the Russes, do the like? For that which was done by virtue of their laws, reported there (capp. xxvi., xxx.\*), is no less the effect of Christian power that is sovereign. He that could find in his heart to tell Baronius (reproving the law of Justin, that allowed divorce upon consent\*), that Christian princes, who knew their own power, were not so easily to be ruled by the clergy (p. 611\*); can he find fault with the Irish, marrying for a year and a day\*, or the Welch, divorcing for a stinking breath? Had he not more reason to say, that, knowing their power, they might choose whether they would be Christians or not? the dispute being, what they should do, supposing that they are Christians. And, therefore, it is to be maintained, that those emperors, in limiting the infinite liberty of divorces by the Roman law to those causes, upon which dowers should be recoverable or not (being made for pagans as well as for Christians), did as it were rough-hew their empire to admit the strict law of Christianity in this point.

§ 34. And that this was the intent and effect of their acts, appears by the canons which have been alleged\*, as well in the East, as in the West, made during the time when those laws were in force. For shall we think the Church quite out

---

\* Selden, ibid., c. 26. pp. 810, sq., which is "des Moscorum seu Ruthenorum, et Aethiopum qui Habasseni dicuntur, divertendi jure liberrimo:" describing divorces as taking place in those nations "pro libitu ferme." For c. 30, see above in c. xiii. § 20. note f.


\* Selden, ibid., c. 32. p. 854 (p. 611. ed. 1646), after quoting Baronius as in last note, adds, that "pontifices utroque summos, orientis scilicet ac occidentis, Joannes dictos, perstringit ille" (Baronius), "quia id non fecerant. Quasi tunc temporis, cum jus suum cordatus agnoscerent tuerenturque principes Christiani, adeo facile fuisset generi hieratico refragari."

\* Selden, ibid., c. 30. p. 84, speaks of the facility and frequency of divorce among the Irish: but neither he nor his authorities mention the precise custom alluded to in the text.


\* Above, § 17.
of their senses, to procure such canons to be made, knowing that they could not take place in the lives and conversations of Christians to the effect of hindering to marry again? If we could so think, it would not serve the turn; unless we could say, how St. Basil\(^a\) should testify, that indeed they did take place to that effect, and yet the civil law not suffer them to take effect. From our Lord Christ to that time, it is clear, that no Christian could marry again after divorce, unless for adultery; some not excepting adultery\(^b\). In the baser times of that empire, it appears by the canons of Alexius, Patriarch of Constantinople\(^c\), and by Matthæus Blastares alleged by Arcudius, p. 517\(^d\), that those causes, which the imperial laws allowed, but God’s law did not, took place to the effect of marrying again. But that so it was always from Constantine, who first taxed legal causes\(^e\) of divorce, nothing obliges a man to suppose. For though the emperors’ law, being made for pagans as well as for Christians, might enable either party to hold the dowry; yet the Christian law might, and did, oblige Christians not to marry again. The Milevitan canon\(^f\) shews it; which provideth, that the emperor be requested to enact, that no Christian might marry after divorce. For this might be done, saving the imperial laws. But when we see the civil law enforce the ministers of the Church to bless those marriages, which the civil law allows but God’s law makes adulteries, the party that is put away (and not for adultery) remaining alive; then we see, what a horrible breach the civil power hath made upon Christianity by hindering the power of the Church to take place. For, on the one side, the blessing of the Church seems to concur to the securing of the consciences of particular Christians, that they forfeit not their interest in the promises of the Gospel by doing that, to which the Church, for avoiding greater mischief, is constrained to concur: on the other side, that which is done, is, not only by the consent of the whole Church, in the sense of our Lord’s

---

\(^a\) See above, § 19. note x.

\(^b\) See above, c. xiii. § 29, sq.

\(^c\) See above, c. xiii. § 20. note y.


\(^e\) § 20. note b.

\(^f\) Corrected from MS.; “cause,” in orig. text.

\(^f\) See above, c. xiii. § 20.

\(^g\) See above, § 9. note x.
law, but by those divines of the Eastern Church, which writ
during [the] time that this corruption is pretended (as Eu-
thymius\(^a\) and Theophylact\(^b\) upon Matt. v.), condemned for
adultery. Now, supposing the law to part wedlock, the canon
not suffering to marry again, St. Paul's alternative is whole;
either not to part, or, parting, to be reconciled, but not to
marry again. And therefore the Church had no more reason
to interpose in that case, than to censure [the one party in
every case\(^b\)], who does wrong in going to suit. For wrong is
always done; but because it is between two, it is not cen-
surable: only St. Paul's aim of reconciling them is harder to
be attained, when the dowry is recovered, than when cohabi-
tation only is parted. And therefore, as that licentiousness
in divorcing, which the ancient French, the Irish, the Welch,
the Russes, and Abyssines, did or do use, is an evidence that
Christianity was not so fully received or did not totally pre-
vail amongst them; so, when the Greek Church yielded to
allow those divorces which the civil law allowed, which at
the first it did not do, then was their Christianity imbibed
and corrupted. Which though it cannot have come to pass
without the fault of the clergy, yet it is most to be charged
upon the secular power, the interest whereof it enlargeth to
the prejudice of Christianity. For as, in times of apostasy
and factions in the Church, it hath been many times con-
strained to receive or retain those, of whose salvation it can-
not presume, at the peril of their own souls; so, when it
seems less evil to yield to that violence which the secular
power offers than to abandon the protection thereof, those
that impose violence are far more chargeable with the souls
that perish by the means thereof, than those that yield to it
for the best. And that this may serve for a great part of

\(^a\) "Ο δὲ Χριστὸς τῷ ἡμεροτήροις ἄντι διὰ τῶν προλαβόντων λόγων κα-
tαστάτησας, κελεύει μὴ ἀπολογεῖν τὴν γυ-
ναῖκα παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, το-
τέστι, δίχα αὐτάς πορνείας: πορνείας εὐτάρεια τὴν μοιχείαν ἀνομίας: ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀπολογεῖν ὁπ' ἐτέρῳ λάθος γυμεῖν. δίχα τὰ λόγια πορνείας ὅ 
μὲν ἀπολογεῖν τὴν λάθος, τοιαῦ ἀνθη 
μοιχείας, συμπλεκόμενην ἐτέρῃ λάθῳ: ὃ 
δὲ γαμήσας ἀπολογεῖν ὁπ' ἐτέρῳ, 
μοιχείαν τὴν ἀλλοτριαν." Euthym. Zì-
gab., In Matt. c. v. vers. 91, 32: Com-
ment. in Evang., tom. i. pp. 188, 189.
Lips. 1792.

\(^b\) "Οὐ λέει τὰ Ματθαία, ἀλλὰ διορ-
θοῦσαι (ὅ Χριστὸς), ἐκφθαῖν τὸν ἄνδρα,
ὑπὸ μὴ ἀπολογεῖν μοιχᾶς τὴν γυναῖκα. ἐν 
τὸ γαμήσας ἀπολογέεσθαι ὁπ' ἐτέρῳ ἀνθη 
μοιχείας, συμπλεκόμενην ἐτέρῃ λάθῳ: ὃ 
δὲ γαμήσας ἀπολογεῖν ὁπ' ἐτέρῳ, 
μοιχείας τὴν ἀλλοτριαν." Theo-
phylact., In Matt. Comment. c. v.;
Op., tom. i. p. 28. E.

\(^a\) Added from MS.
excuse for the Greek Church, we have great argument to believe; because, since the taking of Constantinople, being no more tied by the civil laws of the supreme power, they allow no divorce but for adultery: neither is there any further difference between them and the Latin Church, but whether God’s law, upon divorce for adultery, allow marrying again or not. Which the Council of Trent hath no further impeached, than in case it be maintained, that the Church ereth in saying, that the bond of marriage remains insoluble notwithstanding adultery on either side (Conc. Trid. Sess. xxiv. cap. vii. ἀπ.) lest the subjects of the state of Venice should be condemned unheard, who had always married after divorce for adultery; as the history relateth.

1 Equum satis est igitur, ut existimemus ante eversum Christianum orientis imperium leges hic Caesaris obtinuiisse: postea vero, legibus illis cum imperio sublatis, ex canonicis et theologorum tyrannidi Mahumadumam subjectoriorum sententias, quales osten- dimus, rem deciscam; ita tamen ut con- sugi adulterii causa dimitto secundum inire matrimonium liceret. Nopodere vero pro adulterio sumi, etiam in ex- ceptione de divorciis evanglica, apud Gracos tum theologos tum juriscon- sultos, tralatitum est.” Selden, Ux. Ebr., lib. iii. c. 32. p. 856.—“Postu- larunt autem in Synodo Tridentina Veneti, quando quidem ipsorum res- publica habebat in postestate regna Cypri, Cretae, Coreiae, Zacynthi, Cephalon- niae, a Gracia habitata, quibus ab an- tiquissimo tempore in more positum est, uxorum adulteram repudiare al- amque ducere (de quo ritu toti ecclesiae notissimo nunquam ab aliquo concilio damni aut reprehensi sunt), iniquum esse illos absentes nec ad hoc concilium vocatos condemnaire.” Id., ibid., c. 33. p. 858; from Father Paul’s Hist. of the Conue. of Trent, Bk. viiit. (p. 755. Brent’s transl. Lond. 1620): proceeding to allege on the same authority, that, to comply with the Venetians, “non anathemate ibi” (acil. by the Trid. council) “damni qui aut sic nuptias iniret secundas, aut qui id nec illicitum esse proferrentur, sed tantum qui dixerint ecclesiam errare,” &c. (as in next note).

m “Si quis dixerit, ecclesiam errare, curn docuit et docet, juxta evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam, propter adul- terium alterius conjunquum matrimonii vinculum non posse dissolvi, et utrum- que, vel etiam innocen tem, qui causan adulterio non dedit, non posse, altero conjugé vivente, aliud matrimonium contrahere, nemoque eum qui di- missa adultera aliam duxerit, et eam quem dimissum adultero aliui nuperis; anathema sit.” Conc. Trid., Sess. xxiv. can. 7: ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 875. A, B.

Vix. the Hist. of the Council of Trent by Father Paul, as cited above in note l.—See also upon this whole subject, and in answer to Selden, Hammond, Letter of Resolution to Six Ques. Quer. iii. c. ii. § 52—118; Works, vol. i. pp. 599—607. In Cosin’s Works, vol. iv. pp. 489, sq., Anglo- Cath. edit., is a speech of Cosin, “proving, that adultery works a dissolu- tion of the marriage,” delivered by him in Lord Rosse’s case in 1669: but he stood in opposition to the other bishops (with but one exception) upon the point.
CHAPTER XV.

ANOTHER OPINION, ADMITTING THE GROUND OF LAWFUL IMPEDIMENTS.


I AM NOW to propose another opinion, pretending to justify the imperial laws examined concerning divorce; the moderation whereof I do much esteem above these novelties, tending to cast one article, concerning the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, out of the common faith of all Christians. It saith, that the secular power is able to limit the conditions upon which marriage is contracted (as being indeed a civil contract); so that marriage, contracted contrary to the conditions limited by the secular power, shall be ipso facto void, the persons being by the law rendered uncapable of contracting the same: and that, by the same reason, the same power is able to prescribe such conditions, as, coming to pass after marriage, are of force to void it by virtue of the provision going before, declaring it void whencesoever such conditions should come to pass; as in case of murder, poisoning, treason, forgery, robbery, sacrilege, in case of impotence, ab-
sense of long time, and the like; for in case of mutual consent, or upon reasonable cause without disparagement, themselves dare not take upon them to say, that the secular power can make any lawful divorce'. This opinion is indeed considerable; in regard of those impediments, which canonists and casuists declare to have the force of avoiding marriage consummate by carnal knowledge. For if they, or some of them, may appear to be well grounded, there can be nothing more effectual to clear my first intent; to wit, what is the true interests and right of the Church in determining matrimonial causes.

§ 2. I say then, that, upon the suppositions premised,—that the Church is a society founded by God, and that there is a peculiar law of our Lord concerning the marriages of Christians,—it necessarily followeth, that, as there are divers things which make marriages void or unlawful, so the Church is to be satisfied, that there is none of them to be found in those marriages which it alloweth. If we consider the Church generally as a society of reasonable people, certainly those things, which render the contracts of all reasonable people either void or unlawful, in what society soever they live, must needs be thought to render either void or unlawful those marriages, that are so contracted in the Church. As, for the purpose; whatsoever is contracted either by fraud or by force, is of itself originally void, supposing that fraud or that force to have been the cause why it was contracted: the reason being the same, that ties a man to any thing which ever he contracted; which is his own free consent, in what he is not limited to by the law of God and nature. For if this be the reason that obliges; where this reason fails, the obligation of necessity ceaseth. And shall it then be thought, that any solemnity, which the Church may celebrate a marriage contracted by force with, can avail to make that contract binding? or that a cheat, which had it not been be-

* The same Sanchez, lib. ii. Disp. xiii. num. 10. p. 153. b, and Disp. xvi. num. 9. p. 158. b, denies, that the "mutus conjugum consensus," is a just cause, upon which the pope may dispense even with a "matrimonium ratum;" much less with one "consummatum;" quoting, however, in Disp. xv. num. 1. p. 158, certain doctors who think the contrary.—H. Cocceius (in H. Grot. De Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. ii. c. v. § 8. tom. ii. pp. 253. sq.) maintains, that Justin's law is good, and that mutual consent is an adequate cause of divorce.
lieved, a man would not have married, nor the marriage have been solemnized, when it is solemnized, shall have force to oblige? This to those, who, believing that marriage is a sacrament, do think it consequent, that the solemnizing of marriage renders those marriages of force to bind the parties, which otherwise are not only unlawful but also void. For though I cannot here baulk my order, and resolve how many sacraments there are, and whether marriage be one of them or not; yet, since I can say, that, supposing it were, this would not follow for the reason which I have said, nothing hinders our discourse to proceed, as supposing it were, not granting that it is.

§ 3. In particular, seeing that by the law of Christianity none can marry with one that is bound to another already, the innocent party so married by cozenage is so far from being obliged by it as to be obliged not to use it upon notice. Again, in particular, seeing that Christianity declareth marriage to intend procreation and the remedy of concupiscence, the ugliness whereof was never discovered by idolaters and pagans: wheresoever is discovered a natural impotence to perform the act of marriage, there appeareth an error, which had it not been, the marriage had not been made; and therefore, adding the general to the particular, the contract must appear void. The same is much more to be said, if by any deceit there hath been an error in the sex of one of the parties. Difference in religion between Christians and pagans, between Christians and Jews, renders marriage void by virtue of the premisses; though it oblige not Christians to make use of their right by renouncing it, as Jews were obliged to desert idolaters. But that there may some new religion spring up in the world upon the divisions of the Church (which, we see, are possible), which, question may be made, whether it be lawful, or whether expedient for Christians, either to marry or to continue married with (suppose for the present that of the Gnostics, that of the Priscillianists, that of our Ranters, or Quakers); who can deny? And supposing such a question made, and supposing the Church to be a society trusted

* Sanchez (as before quoted, lib. vii. Disp. iii. num. 7. p. 7. b) does not hold this position, but declares such marriages null, notwithstanding the sacramental character.

† See below, c. xxix. § 9, sq.
with the guard of God's law concerning marriage, what determination can secure the conscience of a Christian but the determination of the Church, in a cause grounded on matter of Christianity, for the guard whereof the Church standeth? Doth not all the world acknowledge a public reputation of that honesty which Christianity pretendeth, and challengeth to be performed, in the marriage of Christians as they are Christians? Do not all Christians acknowledge, that there is a nearness both of blood and alliance, within which Christians are forbidden to marry?

§ 4. You will say to me, that these degrees are limited by the law of God in the eighteenth of Leviticus; and that the Church hath no more to do in prohibiting that which is not there prohibited, than in licensing that which is. But that will not serve my turn; having proved 

By what law some degrees are prohibited Christians.

in the first instance was given for the civil law of one people of the Jews, and for their civil happiness in the land of promise, given them on condition of living according to it, with a promise of freedom over themselves so doing: the Church, on the contrary, a society of all Christendom, founded upon undertaking the law of Christ, with promise of everlasting happiness. For what appearance is there, that the same law should contain the condition of temporal and eternal happiness in any part of human life and conversation? Indeed, he that should argue, that, seeing God prohibited to many degrees of affinity and consanguinity in the marriages of His ancient people, whom He treated expressly with upon only temporal promises, all the same degrees therefore are prohibited Christians, whom God deals with upon the promise of the world to come; I cannot see how his argument could find an answer. But having shewed *, that Christians are bound to straiter terms of godliness by the law of Christ, than the ancient people of God, whom God obliged Himself to for the world to come but by intimations, which needed stronger inclinations to virtue to embrace; will it not follow, that the provision of the Levitical law is no exception to this general in matter of marriage? Indeed, it is not the

*: Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. viii. § 12, sq.; c. xii. § 1, sq. 
*: Ibid., c. xiii. § 1, sq.: and Bk. II.
power of the Church, that brings in this ground of restrain-
ing more than is restrained by the Levitical law; but the na-
ture of Christianity, which I shewed from the beginning? to
be in order of nature before the constitution of the Church,
and ancient to it. But having shewed *, that there is no
presumption in Christianity to hinder that to belong to the
law of the Church, which is not recorded in the Scripture;
by consequence I have shewed, that the practice of the Church
may be sufficient evidence for it, and that the power of the
Church is not only sufficient, but necessary, to the determin-
ing of that which is not determined by it.

§ 5. I confess, I have a difficult objection to answer, when
I read Levit. xviii. 24, 25:—"Be not polluted with any of
these; for with these were the nations polluted, which I
drive out before your face: and the earth is polluted, and I
will visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and she spueth out her
inhabitants." For by this it should seem, that all the pro-
hibitions of that chapter contained in the general term of
"these things" stood by the perpetual law of God and na-
ture, so that they were never dispensed with before the Law;
and that, therefore, there can be no reason to understand
any degree to be prohibited Christians, which was not pro-
hibited Jews. The objection were difficult enough, had we
not peremptory instances to choke them with, that argue
thus. For is it possible for any reasonable man to imagine,
that God should call those things, which the fathers practised
till now, those "abominations," for which He drives out the
seven nations from before His people? Is it not manifest,

[Gen.xxix. 16—28.]

[Gen. xx. 12.]

Of the polygamy

§ 6. Of the polygamy of the fathers before the Law, I

v Bk. i. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. iv. § 1, sq.
* Ibid., cc. v., vii.
* Whether Sarah was Haran’s daugh-
ter or Terah’s, i.e. Abraham’s niece
or sister; see Selden, De Jur. Nat., &c., lib. v. c. 2. p. 504.
said enough afore, to shew that it was dispensed with. How it was dispensed with, I said not; which seems to make men difficult of belief in the point. And truly, that which the fathers say sometimes,—that they were taught by God's Spirit that they might do it for the maintenance of the righteous seed,—seems somewhat strange: if we understood it, as if the world did acknowledge it to be prohibited, till the chief friends of God had particular revelation from Him, that it was allowed them, being forbidden all the world besides. Now we have good information from the Jews (which all men of learning do now accept for historical truth), that after the flood there were certain precepts delivered to Noe and his sons (which therefore they call the seven precepts of the sons of Noe) with an intent to oblige all nations: among which there was one, that prohibited the uncovering of nakedness, signifying thereby the forbearance of all that was then to be counted uncleanliness; which what it was, and what it was to contain afore the Law, though it be not recorded in Scripture, yet we are to stand assured, that nothing, that we find practised by the fathers, was any part of it; because, being so highly favoured by God as we find they were, we are not to think, that they lived in rebellion against any part of His law. The Jews indeed say, that the same precepts were all delivered to Adam and to his posterity, saving one concerning the eating of blood; which was added, when the rest were renewed to the sons of Noah after the flood: which I think myself at liberty

b Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxi. § 35.

a See above in Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iii. § 7. note g.
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not to believe. For then, whatsoever is not contained in these precepts, must be understood to be allowed all the sons of Adam before the flood; whereas the polygamy of Lamech seems to be recorded by Moses for the first transgression of the original institution of paradise. And when we read, after the world had stood fifteen hundred years, that men began to multiply upon earth, there is appearance, that thitherto polygamy was not in use among the children of God; supposing them to be the posterity of Seth, which continued in the service of God, as the most received interpretation hath it.

For, had polygamy been then in use, they would have multiplied faster; as after the flood, and as the Israelites in Egypt. Not that it was not then in use among the children of men, after Lamech had begun it; but because, being not entertained by the children of God (one half of mankind at that time), it took not the like force, even among the children of men, as after the flood. This is the reason why, believing that the institution of paradise was in force, at least among the children of God, I admit the tradition of the Jews concerning the precepts of Noah’s children after the flood, according to St. Jerome again[st] Jovinianus, where he saith, that neither divorce nor eating flesh was licensed until the flood: polygamy and divorce being matters of so near kin, that the one cannot be imagined to have been allowed when the other was not. For if God gave the sons of Noah these precepts, He gave them assurance of His favour, living within the compass of them; which is to dispense with the primitive institution of paradise.

§ 7. But I do not therefore think myself tied to those bounds, which the Jews limit the meaning and intent of this prohibition of uncovering nakedness with (namely in the point of simple fornication, which they no where allow to have been prohibited by it): as the laws of Moses (they say well) extend not to them, being made for free denizens of God’s people, unless it be otherwise expressed; as in the prohibition of
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eating that which is torn, which they are commanded to give
to "the stranger within their gates" (Deut. xiv. 21). For
seeing that they were utterly prohibited to suffer idolaters
to live within the land of promise, but that it is supposed
strangers should live in it, which, being not tied to their laws,
were not circumcised, and that they might have slaves of this
rank; we have certain evidence for the truth of the tradition
concerning certain precepts given all mankind after the
flood. But if, because there is no punishment assigned for
the fornication of strangers, it should therefore be thought, it
was then no sin by God's law to all nations; I should deny
the consequence. The fornication of Judah with Tamar, whom
he took for a prostitute, we see he avowed not. And that of
Samson with Dalilah, I may as easily say, was under pretence
of marriage; as the Jews, that she was a proselyte of the
children of Noah. For it is agreed upon, that by the Law an
Israelite might neither commit fornication with an Israelitess
nor with a gentile; the one by the law of Deut. xxiii. 18, and
Lev. xix. 20, the other by that which you read in the book De
Wherefore, seeing the Law supposes harlots when it forbids
the hire of them to be consecrated to God (Deut. xxiii. 18), it seems
to follow, that the Law allows that trade only to strangers of
the sons of Noah, that is to say, not idolaters, in the land of
promise. For though the Jews will have this law to take
hold of him that lies with a gentile or slave or Jewess, that
is forbidden him, whether by the law of uncleanness (Levit.
 xviii.) or any other; yet we find it not punishable by the
Law, unless it be with a gentile slave, who, having partly ob-
tained her freedom, is espoused to an Israelite (Lev. xix. 20);
as the Jews limit it: because otherwise they were forbidden

b "Inde etiam de Timnathae illa
atque Dalila Palestina puella aiunt!" (Judaei), "cas prosectas esse factas," quia Sampsoni nuptae." Seld., as above quoted, c. 15. p. 573; from Ger-
somides and Moses Mitkoti.

1 "Jam vero tam liberae quam servili
vis conditionis hominum universo-
rum, gentilium nondum exuto, coitus
et matrimonium Ebreeis Judaeisque
nuncius intreictus habeatur, admissa
interes juxta aliquo exceptione illa de
captiva." Id., ibid., c. 12. p. 563:

proceeding in c. 13. pp. 566—568, to
discuss and limit the disputed excep-
tional case.

b "Eadem hic est ratio τος ἦν
seu actui, sive ea fuerit pagana sive
ancilla sive Israelitis, quacum matri-
monium sive nomine irregulariter prohi-
beretur, sive alio interdicto
sacro." Maimonides, commenting on
the passage from Deuteronomy; ap.
Seld., ibid., c. 4. p. 515.
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[Gen. xxxiv.]

to marry slaves, according to Josephus, Antiq. iv. 8m. For they, that counted the dishonour of Dinah such a reproach to them, that notwithstanding all possible reparation tendered they were to revenge it so deeply in blood; shall we imagine, that they counted it indifferent in the rest of mankind, even those who were retired from idolatry to profess the true God, as the Jews their successors seem to do? Rather are we to attribute this opinion of the indifference of it to the coming in of idolatry, which was the apostacy of the gentiles from the law given the sons of Noah (St. Paul, Rom. i. 24—27); according to the author of the Book of Wisdom (iii. 12, 16, 19; vi. 3—6), ascribing that inundation of uncleanesses, which overflowed all the world but God’s people, to the coming in of idols. And therefore fornication, though forbidden by the decalogue, is not always punished in the Israelites themselves: because the Law (which, St. Paul saith, came in “because of transgressions,” Gal. iii. 19; and was not given the righteous, but the unrighteous, 1 Tim. i. 9—11), intending to prohibit the grosser sins, which civil society is chiefly offended with, expected spiritual obedience upon the belief of God and His providence in taking account for our actions here, together with the promise of deliverance by the Messias to come; and not from the constraint of temporal punishment, which the Law was armed with. For if this were the means of grace provided for the seed of Abraham; well might it serve those strangers, who, renouncing the service of idols, should join themselves to God’s people, and so become partakers of the same means with them, to induce a resolution of spiritual obedience.

§ 8. We have further, to persuade us to admit of this dispensation in the primitive institution of paradise, the tradition of the Jews⁴; affirming the prohibition of Levit. xviii. to have


⁵ “Receptissima est, quantum video, peñes Talmudicos sententia; gentiles in legibus illis de incestu” (scil. in Levit. xviii.) “sic tantum contineri, ut, quoniam fuere ex jure naturali sex incestus genera ipsa, id est, universo generi humano, ante interdicta, ut octensum est” (scil. in Seld., lib. v. c. 1. pp. 498, 499), “quæ simul cum allia jam Israelitarum gratia introductiæ enumerantur, ideo continenter qui-dem, ratione jam memorata, gentiles in legum proced, sed non ut inde ad singulorum quæ sequuntur incestus interdictorum observationem tenerentur, sed ad eorum tantum quæ ex jure suo seu naturali etiam ante observanda: adeo ut quemadmodum Israelita quili-
belonged in part to the stranger within their gates, in part not: which tradition, being committed to writing so [soon°] after the dissolution of the government, and having still the force of law, where strangers should make themselves Jews (which certainly at the writing of their traditions fell out many times), we must needs allow for the interpretation of that law, which was in force while their state stood; though we question, whether it contain the due bounds of this prohibition, as it was first delivered to mankind after the flood. And hereupon well may we answer with them, that, when Moses saith, that for these abominations the seven nations were driven out before the children of Israel, he is to be understood respectively to those abominations, which were committed against the true intent of the prohibition of uncleanness, enjoined on all mankind; but not to those things, which we see were in use among the fathers before the Law, nor to whatsoever was committed against the first institution of paradise: which if it be admitted, then all, that is established by the law of Levit. xviii., will oblige the whole Church, without dispensation by any power of it; though not because by the act of giving the Law to the Israelites the Church is obliged, but because there is more reason why Christianity should restrain that which was allowed by the Law, than that the Law should restrain that which was allowed by the patriarchs.

§ 9. And, upon this principle, we shall not need to run upon any inconvenience, to obtain one degree of affinity and one of consanguinity to be unlawful for Christians, though not expressed in the letter of the Scripture; to wit, the marriage of the sister to a man's deceased wife, and that of cousin-germans.

§ 10. The former is thought to be secured by the text of Marriage Levit. [xviii. 16]; "Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife, it is thy brother's nakedness." For, the

---

bet universia tenebatur, ita gentilem quemlibet ditionis Israeliticæ seu pro-selytum quemlibet domiciliis sex illis vetustioribus. Sic reddendo singula singulis rem capiunt." Seld, De Jure Nat. &c., lib. v. c. 11. p. 560.—The six kinds referred to are those mentioned in Levit. xviii. verses 7, 8, 9, 20, 22, 23.—See also, on the same side, Grot., De Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. II. c. v. § 14. tom. ii. p. 215. ed. Cocceius, Laus. 1751: and against him, Ham-monnd, Letter of Resolution to Six Quæres, &c., Quære ii. Of Marrying the Wife's Sister, § 38; Works, vol. i. p. 688.

* Corrected from MS.; "late," in orig. text.
wife's sister being as near as the brother's wife, the one being
prohibited and nearness the only reason of the prohibition,
the other cannot be licensed, saving the reason of the Law.
Therefore the provision of Deut. xxi. 5—10, that the next of
kin, though a brother, should marry the wife of the brother
deceased, so that the children should be in account of law the
children of the deceased; all this signifies no more, but that,
the law being positive, this exception is made to it by Him
that made it. So that, when it follows (Levit. xviii. 18),
"Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover
her nakedness, beside her in her life-time;" it is observed,
that, in the Hebrew, to "take a wife to her sister" is to take
a wife to another wife: and, therefore, that this law is a
prohibition of polygamy, at least when the taking of another
wife may be an occasion to vex the former wife; not that a
Jew was licensed hereby to marry his wife's sister after her
death.

§ 11. This indeed was the interpretation of the Saddu-
cees, and of those Jews that admit no interpretation of the
law by tradition, but only by the letter of it; for which
they are reproved by the Talmudists, the off-spring of the
Pharisees, in the book called Pesikta. Though it is to me
difficult to believe, that the Sadducees of old, or their suc-
cessors, the scriptury Jews, did thereupon tie themselves
to one wife. It is indeed difficult enough to give an evident
reason of difference in nearness of blood, wherefore the bro-
ther should be prohibited his brother's wife, and the sister
allowed her husband's brother. But it is one thing to
allege an inconvenience, another thing to answer an argu-
ment; nor are we to presume, that God doth nothing by
His law without acquainting them whom He imposed it upon
with the reason of it.

§ 12. Now this interpretation cannot subsist without over-

[But this interpretation cannot stand.]

* See Hammond, as quoted in § 8.

See Hammond, as quoted in § 8. note n, § 17, sq.; Works, vol. i. pp. 583, 584: and see also note r below.

* Corrected from MS.; "of," in orig. text.

+ "Reprehendit hic Pesitha non immorito Caraliturum sententiam, qui volebant vetari hic (Lev. xviii. 18) duas habere eodem tempore uxores, quia soror sumpsit Hebraeos alterum ad

§ 1, 15, 16, pp. 581, 583.
throwing all that hath been said to shew that polygamy after
the flood was first prohibited by Christianity. For when thy
brother's wife is generally prohibited in Leviticus, and after-
wards licensed or commanded in case he die childless, it is but
a particular exception to a general. But if in Exod. xxi. 10.
a man is supposed to have power of having more wives than
one, and by Lev. xviii. 18. enjoined to have no more than
one, in Deut. xxi. 10—17. supposed to have more than one;
can these be thought reconcilable? Certainly the tenor of
these laws imports no such thing as dispensing, but a liberty
already in use, which the law restrains not; but this law
would restrain, if it had been thus meant. And why should
the law say, "in her life-time," if the intent of it were, that
a man should not have two wives at once? Could there be
any question, whether a man might marry a second wife or
not?

§ 13. Therefore that clause must be thought to be added
to signify, that after death this law forbids not to take the
wife's sister to wife. And so, that which Jacob had done
before, is by this law forbidden to be done for the future.
For Jacob, when first he found that he had bedded his wife's
sister, was innocent for all that was done, but had been ut-
terly disabled to have companied with any other for the fu-
ture without dispensation in this law: which we must ima-
gine either to have come between Laban's proposition of
marrying both and Jacob's assent, or else to have gone be-
fore all the actions of like nature, which the Scripture testi-
fies: whereof whether is the more reasonable, let any man of
reason choose. As for the limitation added to the right of
having more wives than one under the Law, Exod. xxi. 10;
whereby he, that hath an inferior wife, bought with his silver
of God's people, is bound to pay her the benevolence due to
a wife, though it make the marriage void by abuse of his
right (for it is said, "he shall let her go free," which implies
the dissolution of the marriage): yet it no way signifies, that
he was not able to marry her afore. And when the prophet,
Mal. ii. 14—16, blames the Jews for oppressing their wives
out of love to strange wives, which by the Law they might
not have: be this adultery, if you please (because such a

1 Above, c. xiii. § 7, 8. * Corrected from MS.; "if, had it," in orig. text.
marriage, as I have shewed*, was ipso facto void), be it
treachery in transgressing his covenant with the first wife;
yet did not he, that took a second wife so as to oppress the
first, violate this law of Levit. xviii. 18. For how can a mar-
riage, that is good and valid, become void by oppressing,
but as an Hebrew slave that one marries is made free by the
Law, if she be not used as a wife (and so, no longer his wife)?
that relief being only provided by the Law in that case.
Therefore, when the Law saith, "to vex her," it is not [a*]
limitation, but a reason; which the Law follows in sisters,
because in them, as it is more likely to come to pass, so it is
more unreasonable, as in Jacob's example: whereas, being a
perpetual attendant of polygamy, as in the wives of Elkanah,
it was not nevertheless admitted for a reason totally to pro-
hibit it.

§ 14. And therefore I say, that I am no ways tied to give
a reason, why God, Who prohibited two brothers to have the
same wife, should allow two sisters to have the same hus-
band, after death. For, the law being positive (as it is con-
fessed by the dispensation introduced by the law, on the one
side), the will of the Lawgiver is the reason of those bounds
which He limits; and therefore He is not obliged to enact
those bounds, whereof there is no reason to be seen: His
own knowledge of what was fitting for His design, of hus-
banding the restraints of the Law so as to make way for the
necessity of the Gospel, being the only reason that remains
undisputable. And is not the instance manifest, in that,
the father's sisters being prohibited by the Law, the sister's
daughter is not? whereupon Herod married his niece and
espoused his daughter to his brother Pheroras (Joseph., Antiq.
xii. xvi.7).

§ 15. Which he that considers, will not despise a probable
reason evident to the Jews*, though he acknowledge that it
enforces nothing, setting the will of the Lawgiver aside; to
wit, that the young are wont to frequent their grandparents'

---

* Above, in c. xiii. § 12.
* Added from MS.
* For the betrothal of Pheroras to
Herod's daughter, see Joseph., Antiq.
Jud., lib. xvi. c. 7. § 3; tom. ii. p. 726.
For Herod's marriage with two of his
nieces, children respectively of a brother
and of a sister, ibid., lib. xvii. c. 1. § 3.
p. 751.—xii. in the text appears to be
a mistake.
* See Selden, De Jure Nat. &c., lib.
v. c. 10. pp. 546, 547; from Maimo-
nides and others.
and grandmothers' houses, and there to have conversation with their father's sisters, having less interest in brothers' houses, and so frequenting them less. Which holds also in the brother's house more than the wife's sister's. And so, the reasons of the prohibitions of Leviticus xviii. being two, nearness of blood, occasion of uncleanness, if the Law had not made the marriages of such persons unclean, this reason may weigh where the other does not appear.

§ 16. As for the inconvenience that is feared, that Christian people should license themselves to do that under the Gospel, which it is confessed that God's people under the Law were not prohibited to do (for it is manifest, that some which count themselves great saints have done it):—either people do believe the Holy Catholic Church, or not: if they believe it, they must believe the power of the Church in limiting that, which our Lord Christ hath not limited, in testifying where our Lord Christ and His apostles have limited, though not recorded to us by the Scriptures; according as I have deduced it in the premisses*: if not, it is no marvel to see, that apostacy from the belief and unity of God's Church should now and then draw after it licentiousness in such a point as this is. If the canons and customsb, hitherto reverenced by all Christians as the remains and evidence of the conversation delivered over by the successors of our Lord to His Church, cannot prevail with men, to forbear that which no example but their own warrants; the Scripture cannot stand long, standing only upon motives of conscience. It is as ordinary to hear it said, that the Scripture which is contained in the Bible, is not the Scripture, but that which is written in the heart; that the Man that was crucified at Jerusalem is not Christ, but He that dwells in the heartc: as it is to see a man marry the sister of his deceased wife. Temporal punishments may deter men from publishing such blasphemiesd: but if the unity of the

* Above, c. xiv. § 14—33.
* See below, § 18—20: Bingham, XVI. xi. 3: Hammond, as above quoted, § 46, 47. p. 590: Dr. Pusey, On Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister, 8vo. Lond. 1849.
* See the sayings of Quakers to the effect of the blasphemies above mentioned, in Leslie's Snake in the Grass, sect. vii., and Satan disrobed from his Disguise of Light, § i. xi.; Works, vol. iv. pp. 95, sq.; 363, 379.
* A list of punishments inflicted on the Quakers may be found in the True Relation of the Quakers' Sufferings, in the Somers' Tracts, third Collection,
Church come not in, to evidence the motives of faith, and by consequence to procure the reverence of those laws, whereby only it may be maintained; it will be as easy and obvious to despise Christianity and the Scriptures, as the Church, and those rules and* rulers whereby the service of God is maintained in the unity of it.

§ 17. As concerning the marriage of cousin-germans, the premisses being supposed, I am not a whit troubled, that I cannot produce such canons in writing, as may evidence, that all Christians from the beginning forbore it. For having shewed, that all the canons of the Church were in effect and force before they were written and enacted by councils; and that the enacting of them was but the limiting of some circumstances, abating the rigour of primitive customs, because the number of Christians multiplying could not so easily be held to it: I cannot see, how St. Augustin can be refused, when he tells us (De Civ. Dei., xv. 16b); "Raro per mores fiebat, quod fieri per leges licebat, quia id nec Divina prohibeat, et nondum prohibuerat lex humana; veruntamen, factum etiam licitum, propter vicinitatem horrebatur illiciti"—"Seldom was that done by reason of custom, which by reason of law might have been done, because neither did God's law prohibit it, nor as yet had man's law prohibited it; notwithstanding, being lawful to be done, it was abhorred for the neighbourhood of that which was unlawful." God's law in Leviticus had not forbidden it: nor the laws of the empire as yet. How then came Christians to abhor that, which the law of God and man, saith St. Au-141 gustin (that is to say, the law of Moses, and of the empire), licensed? Is it possible, that Christendom of its own free motion should conjure to impose upon itself such a restraint, having no share in Christianity? It is still as easy to maintain, that the world was made by the casual meeting of atoms,
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according to Epicurus\(^1\), denying providence. But suppose the apostles and their successors to have received for a necessary point of Christianity, that, "unless our righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, we shall by no means enter into the kingdom of heaven;" and suppose them to have the allowance of all marriages, that is, the discerning of what is agreeable to Christianity from what not; and you render a sufficient reason, how such a custom should prevail in the Church: which otherwise is not to be rendered. And, supposing such a custom, you grant, that that which Christians abhorred only because it was near that which the law of Moses or the law of the empire made unlawful, was become itself unlawful, by virtue of that custom, which no Christian, that would not offend the unity of the Church, could lawfully transgress\(^1\). The saying of Justin the Martyr, Epist. ad Zenam et Serenum, is truly apostolical, and takes place here again\(^m\); "Πιστωταί τοῖς κειμένοις νόμοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐδόθαι βίοις νικῶσι τοὺς νόμους"—"They obey the laws that are, and in their lives go beyond the laws:" speaking of the Christians. But if it were the character of Christians to "go beyond the laws," shall we count it a thing lawful for a Christian to efface in himself the common character of Christians?

§ 18. When the great Theodosius made it a law to the empire not to marry cousin-germans\(^a\) (which is the law that St. Augustin intimates\(^b\), for which he is so much commended, not only by St. Ambrose, Ep. lxvi.\(^7\), but by the heathen his-

---


\(^{1}\) "If those times of the Church which we pretend to hold with, made it a law to the whole, even against Justinian's law, can we be one with them, and not do the like? unless we could say, that the law of Leviticus was intended for the Church which is taken away before." Added in margin in MS.

\(^{m}\) See above, c. xiii. § 19. note e. The passage is from the Epist. ad Diog.-meium.

\(^{n}\) This law is not extant, but is referred to both by subsequent laws and by various writers. The penalty as-signed was death: but a dispensing power was reserved to the emperor. See Bingham, XVI. xi. 4; Selden, De Jure Nat. &c., lib. v. c. 11. pp. 557: Gothofred., ad Cod. Theodos., lib. iii. tit. x. tom. i. pp. 330—333: and below, notes p, q, r. —See also upon this subject, Ducard, Marriages of Cousin Germans vindicated from the censures of unlawfulness and inexpediency, Oxf. 1673; and Jer. Taylor, Duct. Dubiti., Bk. ii. c. ii. Rule 3. § 34—39; Works, vol. ix. pp. 382—404. ed. Eden.

\(^{a}\) As above, in § 17.

\(^{7}\) "Nam Theodosius imperator etiam patruelles fratres et consobrinos vetuit inter se conjugii convenire nomine, et severissimam ponam statuit, si quis tenerere ausus esset fratrum pia pignora." S. Ambros., Epist. Class. i.
tonian Sextus Aurelius Victor, in Theodosio); did he do this
for a frolic (all reason of state dissuading the imposing of un-
necessary burdens, where the necessary were so great), or did
he do it, because he would promote Christianity, by imposing
upon the empire, before it was all Christian, the custom of
Christianity?

§ 19. I know this act was repealed by Justinian, and
perhaps upon advice of some bishops; who always frequented
him, as we understand by Procopius. But neither is the
authority of Justinian of weight in the question of Christi-
anity: neither did those bishops, that might give this advice,
act in the quality of bishops, but of his friends and coun-
sellers; their opinion as bishops would not have served to
change the customs of the Church.

§ 20. Therefore this repeal never took place in the west.

For, first, the Goths retained Theodosius his law; as Cassi-
dore, vii. 46, testifieth (which Covarruvias saith is the reason,

Ep. lx. (in edd. Erasmi, &c., lxvi.),
1019. D.—written circ. 393.

"Tantum pudori tribuens" (The-
odosius) "et continentiam, ut conso-
Brinarum nuptias vetuerit tanquam so-
Compend., in vita Theodosii.

"Et autem frater illum vel so-
rorum liberi, vel fratris et sororis, con- 
jungi possunt." Justinian, Instit., lib.
Gotthofredi.—The law of Theodosius had
been confirmed by Honorius (Cod. Theo-
odos., lib. iii. tit. x. leg. i. tom. i. p.
329), and by Arcadius (ibid., tit. xii.
leg. 3. ibid., p. 339):—assuming the
law to be genuine; for which see Sir-
monti, De Lege Celebrandis, &c., Op.,
tom. iv. pp. 386, sq., against it, and Go-
thofredi, ad Cod. Theod., lib. iii. tit. xii.
leg. 3. pp. 341, 342, for it, quoted by Dr.
Pusey, Pref., p. liv. note b), but with a
gradual diminution of penalties. The
same Arcadius afterwards repealed it;
and his abrogation of it was adopted by
Justinian into his Code (Justiniani
Cod., lib. v. tit. iv. leg. 19. Celebrandia
p. 149.).—For the reading "conjugi
non possunt," in the Institutes, con-
clusively proved to be erroneous by the
parallel passage just quoted from the
Code, see below, note y.

Justinian is accused by Arsnaces of
sitting "διφαίνετο ἑαυτὶ ἐκλεκτός

1 Cassiod., Varvar., lib. vii. c. 46.
"Formula qua consobrina legitima fiat
uxor." scil. under Theodoric and the
Ostrogoths. The prohibition is de-
scribed as one enacted by "prudentes
viri," throwing a protection round Di-
vine laws on the subject by forbidding
also the next degree outside those for-
bidden by God, and "reservantes prin-
cipi tantum beneficium consobrinis
nuptiali copulatione jungendis."—Go-
thofredi (ad Cod. Theodios., lib. iii. tit.
xiii. leg. 3. tom. ii. pp. 341, 342) con-
cludes also, that the law was not re-
pealed in the west.

This remark does not seem to be in
Covarruvias' Commentary in Lib.
iv. Decret., which is the work in
which he treats of marriage: Op., tom.
ii. pp. 108, sq. Lugd. 1606: although
he mentions the subject in P. ii. c. iii.
parag. 6. num. 9. p. 166 a, and parag.
10. num. 9. p. 166 b. Something of
the kind occurs in Continus, Lectt. Sub-
why in Gaius—out of whom Justinian took his Institutes for the most part—it is at this day read, "Duorum fratrum vel sororum liberi vel fratris et sororis jungi non possunt”—"The children of two brothers or sisters or of a brother and sister may not marry together"; contrary to that which Justinian is known to have enacted). Then the later emperors revived the law of Theodosius: upon which occasion it is still read in many copies of the Institutes, De Nupt. x. 4, "non possunt" expressly against many parts of Justinian’s law. And, for the east, how shall we say that Justinian’s law was repealed, or upon what ground, but that the custom of the Church prevailed to move Christian emperors to repeal it, seeing Christendom scandalized at the licence introduced by it? He therefore, that alleges Justinian in these cases, or even Moses, let him allege Herod’s marrying his brother’s daughter, and espousing his daughter to his brother Pheroras, in Josephus, Antiq. xii. and xvi.; and so allowing the same: when Claudius for his own lust licensed, there was scarce found a gentleman in Rome that would do the like, as Tacitus reporteth. Indeed, when St. Augustin says this was rarely done afore Theodosius, signifying that sometimes

---

1. secive, lib. ii. c. 1. (ap. Novæ Declar. Juris, &c., p. 381. Venet. 1585). The name was abbreviated "Cvias," in the folio edit. of Thordike, but is written at length—"Covarvias"—in marg. in the MS.


3. "Frates etiam amitinas vel consoberinos in matrimonium jungi nulla ratione permititur." Gaius, Instit., lib. i. tit. iv. § 6, p. 567; ap. Leewium De Orig. et Progr. Juris Civ. Rom., Lug. Íst. 1671. Theophilus also in his Greek version of the Institutes, lib. i. tit. x. § 4. (p. 52. ed. Gothofred. 1587), reads "οὐ δὲ ἴδενν." And Ivo Carnot, Decret., P. ix. c. 1. Op., P. i. p. 295. b. Paris. 1647, likewise has the negative. There is neither permission nor prohibition on the subject in the newly discovered Gaius: see Inst. Gali, lib. i. § 62, 63, pp. 27, 28. ed. secunda Gœschen, Berolini, 1824. The words in the text above (the negative of course excepted) are from Justinian. Sirmond (as quoted above in note r) argues for its insertion: but the affirmative reading appears to be that generally received; and is indeed almost proved by the passage in the Code.

4. See above in note r.

5. See above in note r.

6. See above in note y.

7. See above, § 14. note y.

8. "Neque tamen repertus est nisi unus talis matrimonii (sc. "inter patruos fratrumque filias") "cupitor, T. Alledius Severus, eques Romanus." Tacit., Ann., xii. 7.—Suetonius (in Vita Claudii, 26) mentions another, a freedman, who did the same thing.—Such marriages had been before unknown at Rome, and were regarded as incestuous (Tacit., ibid.; Sueton., ibid.). And the permission of them, granted under Claudius, and acted upon under Domitian (Sueton. in Vita Domit. 22), was abrogated by Nerva (Dio Cass., lib. lxviii. p. 77. C. ed. Leunclav. Hanov. 1606).

9. See above, § 17, 18. notes h, o.
it was done: we must acknowledge, not only that the marriage was not void, that was so made from the beginning (for neither is the marriage of the deceased wife’s sister, or of the niece, void by the canons of the apostles); and the Elberine canons enjoin, upon marrying the wife’s sister, five years’ penance, signifying that it was not void); but also we remain uncertain, whether it were censured by the Church or how.

§ 21. But when St. Gregory allows Augustin the monk to allow the first Christian Saxons to marry in the fourth degree, we are not certified, whether according to the account of the Roman law, or according to that account which the popes afterwards brought in use. For the Roman law, counting the stock for one, made no first degree in the cross line, but reckoned brothers the second, and by consequence cousin-germans the fourth: determining both legal successions and affinities within seven degrees; which are sometime called six, as you include both terms, or exclude the one: l. x. ff. De Gradibus et Affinitibus; Paulus, Sent. iv. 11; ubi Anianus;

have taken the quotation from Gratian, who stops at the sentence here ending with “debeat.” In the original text no question can be made what degrees S. Gregory intended by his numbers. In another and later Epistle, lib. xiv. Indict. vii. Ep. xvii. Ad Felicem Messan. Episc. (ibid., p. 1277. C, D), S. Gregory says—“Quod autem scrispsi Augustinio, Anglorum gentis episcopo... de consanguinitatis conjunctione: ipsae et Anglorum genti, quae super ad fidem venerat, ne a bono quod cooperat, metuendo auctoriora recedere, specialiter et non generaliter ceteris me scrispiisse cognoscas. Unde et mihi omnis Romana civitas exstitit testia, nec ea intentione hec illis scriptis mandavi, ut postquam firma radice in fide fuerint solidati, si infra propriam fuerint consanguinitatem inventi, non separantur, aut infra affinitatis lineam, id est, usque ad septimum generationem, conjungantur; sed adeque illis neophyti existentes,” &c. The question of Felix was, whether Gregory’s direction to Augustin was not “ut quarta progenit conjuncti non separentur” (Ep. Felixii, ap. S. Greg. Epist., ibid., Epist. xvi. p. 1275. B): which however does not conclusively settle the doubtful reading in the original letter of Gregory.
et Modest. l. xlv. ff. De Gradibus et Affinibus. Whereupon marriage was first forbidden in the west as far as the seventh degree inclusive: Caus. [x]xxv. qu. 2. et 3k; et cap. 20. ib.,

1 Digest., lib. xxxvii. tit. x. De Gradibus et Affinibus, cc. 1—9: in Corp. Jur. Civ. pp. 551—553; from Gaius, Ulpian, Modestinus, Paulus, &c.; Julius Paulus, Sentent. Recept., lib. iv. tit. 11. p. 87. in fin. Cod. Justinian. ed. Gothofred.—Anianus, Interpretat. ad Pauli locum, pp. 181, 184. in edit. Pauli a Ritterhusio, Norib. 1594.—Modestinus, lib. xii. Pandectarum; & ap. Digest. lib. xxxvii. tit. x. De Grad., &c., c. 4. p. 551. b: xlv. in the text above is a mistake.—These quotations are from Selden, De Jure Nat. &c., lib. v. c. 11. p. 558.—Pontifici... occidentis vetustus Christiani seculi..." (interpreting Lec. xviii. &c. "Nam...proprionum casus utrum se cedat," &c.)..."ad civilia in jure Cassareo cognitionem nomina...se contulere; extra quo limites quo...nominia specialia consanguinitatis vocabula jurisconsultus Romanis non habebantur, nec consanguinitatem hic præpediente agnoscerunt. Civilia illa nominis septem conclusa sunt gradibus; ut videre est in Pandecta. Et Paulus, "Successiones," inquit, "gradus septem constituti sunt, quia ulterior per rerum naturam nec nominis inveniri nec vita succedentibus gradus potest." Ubi vetus interpre Anianus, "In his septem gradibus omnia proinquitatu...nomina continuerunt, utra, qua repetitione...affinitas inveniri nec successio potest amplius potest," Hinc interdicta...ilm optimum in occidenti usque ad septimum gradum inclusive...qui et pro sexto"—so Gratian, Decret. Caus. xxxv. Qu. 2, 3. c. 21, as quoted below in note p—"variant in personis calculo, interdum matrimoni) rationibus redditis," &c. "Perinde ac si post septimum gradum omnimoda sanguinis relation proinquitatisque, etiam ad sensum quo ipsa leges de nuptiis Mosiacum verba pravizia sa generalia intellegenter, prorsus deleta fuisset. Cum interea certo scimus, non solum qui longius sive recta sive ex transverso, etiam in infinitum, distarent, vetustus jurisconsultis consanguineos nuncupari, sed etiam usque ad decimum gradum, jure Cassareo, consanguinitatis nomina, sublata agnatorum et cognatorum differentia, succedere, atque exclusere fiscum. Sed vero, quod et magis mirere, petita, ut dixi, jure Cassareo gradum, extra quos...consanguinitatem non agnosci volebant, enumeratione generali, ita sibi nihilominus, et jure Cassareo plane incognitum, jurisconsultisque nonnullis haud parum in visaum" (sc. Alberic. Gentilis, De Nupt., lib. v. c. 6.—p. 407—412. Hanov. 1614—et alii ibi citati), gradus ex transverso supplementi inibant rationem, ut tamen septimi gradus nomen quidem retinerent, decimum quantum tamen, ad Cassareorum calculum, non raro inuenierent. Nam ubi jure Cassareo generatio cujuslibet personæ ex transverso gradu facieb uni cum, adeo ut frater et soror binis ita distant gradibus (nam in transversa linea primus gradus Cassarei non habebat—Gaius, lib. i. ff. tit. de Gradibus—), et consobrini quatuor, horum liberi sex, atque horum demique liberi octo, scièret proponentes fratris et sororis; pontifici illi quarto duxerat gradu hosce distari volunt, ita putatis consanguineorum gradibus, ut quot a communi parente, in specie inde distinctioni, alter distet, tot solum inter se distant; in intra, quot a communi parente distet remotior: adeoque ut ipsae Cassareorum proximitates, intra quas consanguineorum nomen cohiberi putabant (unde et leges stabiliebant nuptiis) ipsi duplicando ita excederent. Et demum de gradibus ita numeratis pronunciabant" (sc. Alexander PP. c. 2. &c. as below in note q), "'Ulta hos nec consanguinitatis invenitur,' &c.; "cum interim decimus ad juri Cassarei calculum...vicesimus ita esset ad pontifici."—Selden, De Jure Nat. &c., lib. v. c. 11. pp. 557—559: from the Pandecta, &c., as quoted in the beginning of this note.—Judge Blackstone, in an Essay on Collateral Consanguinity (Lond. 1769), with reference to founder's kin fellowships, argues for a limit to such consanguinity at the seventh degree as reckoned by the canon law,
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BOOK III.

Greg. PP. I.; Nic. PP. II. c. 17. ib. m; et Sentent. iv. dist. xl. n; Isid., Orig. ix., et c. 6. Caus. xxxv. qu. 5; Grat. c. 21 p; whereby it should seem, that this degree was dispensed with by St. Gregory, being otherwise then prohibited. But the pope afterwards, introducing a contrary way, of counting brothers for one degree and cousin-germans the second (which before were the second and the fourth), determined kindred by seven of these degrees, which were before just half so many; Alex. PP. II. c. 2. Caus. xxxv. qu. 5 q; and

"usque ad post septimum generationem:" see below, note m. Other chapters either refer to the imperial law, as c. 2; or specify the fifth generation as permitted, the third as prohibited, the fourth as forbidden, but, "si inventi fuerint, non separantur," as Fabian in c. 3, and Gregory I. in c. 20; for which see above in note h. For c. 21, see below, note p.—These quotations are all from Selden as in last note.

1 Scil. the quotations from Gregory the Great, for which see above in note h.

2 "De consanguinitate sua uxorem nullus ducat usque ad post generationem septimam, vel quosque parentela cognosci potuerit." Nicolaus II. Paps, ap. Gratian, as just quoted, c. 17.


6 In Gratian (Decret., P. ii. Caus. xxxiv. Qu. 5. c. 6. p. 435. b.), the greater portion of Paulus lib. iv. tit. 11. as above cited, with the interpretation of Anianus, is quoted at length as from Isidore. See Continus, Lect. Subsec., as quoted a b 20. note u, lib. i.

10, pp. 365. b—368. b.—In Isidore, Origin. sive Etymolog., lib. ix. c. 5. Op. p. 80. Col. Agrip. 1617, there is a chapter De Affinitibus et Gradibus, giving the names of the several generations, but not numbering them at all upon any principle of reckoning. At the end of c. 6, ibid. p. 81. D., "in quibusdam exemplaribus hae adiciuntur"—"Hae consanguinitas dunn se paulatim propaginum ordinibus dirimens, usque ad ultimum gradum subtraxerit, et propinquitias esse desierit; eam rursus lex matrimonii vinculo repetit, et quodammodo revocat fugientem. Ideo autem usque ad sextum generis gradum consanguinitatis constituta est, ut sicut sex monitii mundi generatio et hominis status finitum, ita propinquitias generis tot gradibus terminatur.

p Scil. Decret., P. ii. Caus. xxxiv. Qu. 2 et 3. c. 21. as quoted by Selden. This c. 21 is quoted as from Concil. Cabillon. (Chalon sur Saone), but is really from Concil. Mogunt. (scil. of Mentz, A.D. 813)—"Contradicimus, ut in quaera vel in quinta sextaqua generatione nullus amplius conjugio copulatur. Ubi autem post interdictum factum fuerit inventum, seperatur." Which is explained by Gratian ad loc. by the various modes of reckoning generations mentioned above in notes i. n. See it in Labb., Conc., tom. vii. p. 1252. B. C. There was also a council in the same year at Chalon sur Saone, which enjoined in general terms observation of the canons on the subject of prohibited degrees (can. 28, ap. Labb., ibid., p. 1278. B.).

q "Ad sedem Apostolicam perita est quiesco noviter exorta de gradibus consanguinitatis: quam quidam," &c., "gradus contra sacros canones et ecclesiasticum morem numerare nitentur; novo et inauditum errore affirmantes, quod germani frates vel sorores inter
all these prohibited, c. 14. Caus. xxxv. qu. 2 et 3: till reduced to the fourth by the Lateran Council under Innocent III. for the difficulty and burden of it (which fourth is just the eighth by the former account); which is now the law of the west under the Pope. A thing which I cannot admire at enough, either how proposed, or how admitted. Whereas, in the east, the seventh degree (according to the Roman account) is neither permitted, nor the marriage dissolved if consummate: Jus Greecorum, lib. iii. p. 204, lib. iv. p. 266. Afterwards, under Michael Patriarch of Constantin-

se sint in secunda generatione, filii eorum vel filiae in quarta, nepotes vel nepotes eorum in sexta. Talique modo pro-
genemi computantes, et in hujusmodi sextam gradum terminantes, dicunt deinceps, "et unum inter se post nuptialia jura contrahere. . . .

Invenimus . . . alteram legum, alteram canonum computacionem"—(and this arising from the different objects of the two, the one providing for lawful inheritance, the other for rightful marriage).

"In legibus distincte non numerantur gradus nisi usque ad sextum: in canonibus autem usque ad septimum distinguuntur generationes. Hac itigur de causa . . . curavit secularis imperator in singulis personis singulas praesagere gradus. Quia vero nuptiae sine dubius non valent fieri personis, ideo sacer canones duas in unum gradum constitue personas." And accordingly, "duo gradus legales unum gradum canonicum constituant. Fratres itaque, qui secum secundae leges dicuntur in secundo gradu, justa canones numerantur in primo. Filii fratrum, qui illis numerantur in quarto, hic computantur in secundo," &c.

"Illa quoque sacrarum preceptorum canonum quae jubes a propria abstineri consanguinitatis, quamdiu generatius recordatur aut memoria retinetur, nec a predicta parentele discrepet computatione. Nam in septimo gradibus, si canonicet et usualiter enumeretur, omnia propinquitatis nomina continuntur. Ultra quoque nec consanguinitas inventur, nec nomina graduum reperiantur, nec successus potest amplius prorogari, nec memoriter ab aliquo generatio recordari." But there is also another mode of reckoning. "Sunt enim quidam, qui non a fratribus sed a filiis eorum, id est, patres et consobrini, genealogiam numerare incipient," but who, also, "non progre-
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καρ, μεν enthētēsai, muta tō tē ge
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Rom., lib. iii. p. 204: adding a σχήμα

of the degrees intended, whence it appears that Theodote was daughter of Basil's second cousin.

Joannis, Patriarch. Constant., De-


266, 267: confirming the degree of

THORDIKHE.
nople (ibid., lib. iii. p. 206¹), the seventh was forbidden, the eighth always licensed. See further, Harmenop., lib. iv. tit. 57; Arcadius, vii. 30⁴. Which I allege all to no purpose but this, that the consent of Christendom, submitting to be restrained beyond all degrees any way pretended to be expressed by God's law, is an evidence of the two principles alleged, that they were from the beginning admitted by all Christendom.

§ 22. Indeed, when it is said, that which the Church censured not, which St. Gregory dispensed with, which the Roman emperors and Gothish kings reserved themselves a power of dispensing in (as appears by a law of Honorius and Theodosius, in Cod. Theod., "Si nuptiae ex rescripto petantur"), and by Cassiod. vii. 46⁴), it is no marvel, if it be permitted by the statute of Henry VIII. [an.] xxxii. [c.] 38⁵: we may see the case hath been not much otherwise with us since that statute, than with Christendom before the act of Theodosius. For, as then the known custom of the Church, so since, with

Alexius, and forbidding a marriage between the niece and the aunt's husband's brother.⁶


Constant. Harmen., Πραξειωον ἁμαρτὸν, lib. iv. tit. 6. (5 in the text is a mistake), pp. 289—300; "Per βαβηλόν ἡ Μητροπόλεως καὶ Γαμης Ἐκκλησιακῶν:" "Οἱ τρείς ἀδελφοί" (scil. the great-grandsons of brothers) "βυβοῦ βαβηλῶν εἰς καὶ συνάπτων εἰς γάμου ἀπωλῆσαι."⁷

Arcaud., De Concord. Eccles. Occid. et Orient. &c., lib. vii. c. 30. pp. 551, sq. "De discrimine graduum consanguinitatis et affinitatis, quod est inter Graecos et Latinos." "A tempore.. Michaelis Patriarchae... anno Domino 1050 ac deinceps usque ad nostra tempora Graeci prohibuerunt fieri matrimonium usque ad septimum personam inclusive. Nam antea tempore Alexii Patriarchae... vetabant usque ad sextam inclusive... Foro septima persona, quam Graeci prohibent, continent in quarto gradu Juris Canonici, et in Graecis congruent cum Latinis prohibent quidem usque ad quartum gradum, non tamen perfecte. Cum enim quartus gradus comprehen-

dat eos octavam personam, Graeci eamus permittent nisi matrimonium. Venio ad affinitatem, in qua quidem adhibui amplius unum gradum civilum Graeci remittunt. Non enim usus et idem duas secundas consorbinas ordine accipere potest, cum non constituent septimum gradum, quem Graeci permittunt, sed sextum. Sextum solum dico, quod nimium vir et prima uxor locum unius gradus teneant, et pro uno gradu reputentur."⁸

Sci. the law of Honorius in Cod. Theod., lib. iii. tit. x., referred to above in § 19. note 7.⁹

32 Hen. VIII. c. 38, among other things relating to marriage, stating, that "by reason of other prohibitions than God's law admitted, for their lucre by that court" (ac. of Rome) "invented, the dispensations whereof they always reserved to themselves, as in kindness or affinity between cousin-germans, and so to fourth and fourth" (sic) "degree, carnal knowledge of any of the same kin, or affinity before in such outward degrees, which else were lawful, and be not prohibited by God's law," enacts, "that no reservation or prohibition, God's law except, shall trouble or impeach any marriage without the Levitical degrees."
us, the remains of the opinion of that public honesty, which Christianity first introduced, hath been the cause, that few have used the known liberty of the temporal law; and that, with such reluctance of judgment, as hath been thought the occasion of evil consequences.

§ 23. As for those degrees, which, being prohibited by the Popes, are of course dispensed in for paying the fees, without any notice of particular reason in the case: as it is not for me either to maintain the abuse of ecclesiastical power, or because of the abuse to yield the Church to have no power in those causes, which it could have no power in, if that power might not be abused; so I am able to conclude, that it were more Christian for any Christian state to undergo a burden altogether unreasonable, than to shake off a burden, for which there is so much reason in Christianity as I have shewed for prohibiting the marriage of cousin-germans.

§ 24. Another impediment, of force to void marriage, whether only contracted or consummated also by carnal knowledge, pretended by the Church of Rome, and practised in the eastern Church, is that of profession of single life, to attend upon the service of God alone. For whether Christians under wedlock, upon consent, may part from bed and board for this purpose, there is no reason for any Christian to make difficulty: the wish of St. Paul, "that all were as he" (1 Cor. vii. 7), taking place in them as well as in all others; that, "to avoid fornication, one man should marry one wife" (1 Cor. vii. 2), not taking place but in them in whom no such resolution is supposed; upon which supposition they are commanded to return to the use of wedlock, after having retired for "prayer and fasting," lest "Satan tempt" them through their "incontinence." But this is disputable, whether it be a dissolution of the bond, or only a suspension of the exercise of marriage. It is further pre-

---

tended, that the one party may, by publishing such a profession, make void the marriage that is not yet consummated by carnal knowledge, leaving the other free to marry elsewhere. This in the Church of Rome. For, in the eastern Church, I doubt not that those imperial laws took place, which made this profession a lawful cause of dissolving marriage in being "per bonam gratiam," as the Roman law called it; whether the party so deserted were allowed to marry elsewhere or not.

§ 25. And indeed we find St. Basil (Quest. Fusius Expli-
cat., xii. 8), and St. Chrysostom (in Matt. Hom. lxix. 1, Ad Pop. Ant. 1, et in 1 Tim. Hom. xiv. k), together with Cassian in the example of Theonas (Collat. xxi. 9, 10), in their zeal to monastic life, advising married persons not to stay for the consent of their parties in making such a profession as this: at such time as the west, where monastic life was not yet

...
SO generally\(^{n}\) spread, St. Hierome (Epist. xiv.) and St. Augustin (Epist. xlv.\(^{o}\), et cxxix.\(^{p}\), et De Adult. Conjugiis\(^{q}\)) maintain the contrary opinion; which to me, I confess, seems far more probable. For, granting single life duly ordered to be the ordinary way and means of attaining perfection in Christianity, according to the premisses\(^{t}\), this state of eminence necessarily supposeth that which is necessary to the being of Christianity. Therefore the way to perfection must be grounded upon justice. Now, in justice, the contract of marriage among Christians gives each party that interest in the other's body which marriage exerciseth: which interest nothing but consent seems to dissolve. And, therefore, seeing there is no tradition of the whole Church to enforce this right: not only particular Churches, not allowing it, shall not seem to me to depart from the unity of the whole in so doing; but also sovereign powers, through their several dominions, in regard of the interest which all states have in the marriage or single life of their subjects, shall lawfully use their power to limit the force of it. But as for marriage consummate and used, I cannot see, how the party deserting upon such pretence is excused from the guilt of adultery, which the deserted may commit, either single or married again. As for the question that may be made, whether the marriage of one that hath professed single life be void or valid; supposing the profession of single life to be agreeable to Christianity (as I

\(^{n}\) Corrected from MS.; "originally," in folio edit.

\(^{o}\) " Sed illud quoque simul didici, quod me non mediocrer angit ac stimulat, te videlicet tantum hoc bonum absque consensu et pacto viri servare cepissem, cum hoc apostolica omnino interdicat autoritas, quae in hac duntaxat causa, non modo uxorem viro, sed etiam virum uxoris subject potestat. ... Tu vero quasi obita fœderis nuptialis, pactique hujus ac juris immemor, inconsulto viro vobis Domino castitatem. Sed periculose prumittelur quod ab hinc in alterius potestate est," &c. Paulinus Nolani, inter Epist. S. Hieron., Epist. cix. (al. xiv.), Ad Celantiam de ratione pie vivendi; Op., tom. iv. P. ii. p. 820. See also S.Jerom himself, Epist. xc. Ad Rusticum; ibid., p. 739.


\(^{q}\) "Neque enim corporis sui debito fraudandus fuit (vir tuus), prius quam ad illud bonum, quod superat pudicitiam conjugalem, tua voluntas voluntas quoque ejus accederet." Id., Epist. cclxxii. (al. cxxix.), Ad Ecdiciam, § 2; ibid., p. 889. B. S. Augustin, in this letter, "Ecdiciam, quæ nesciente viro sua bona sua in eleemosynam distribuierat et vidualem habitum induerat, correctionem adhibet quam acerrimam, injuçens ut super his faciat satis viro suo."

\(^{t}\) See above in c. xiv. § 10. note f.

\(^{u}\) Corrected from MS.; "promises," in orig. text. See above, ßk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xxxii. § 35—38.
conceive I have shewed sufficient reason to believe), there is no consideration sufficient to make marriage after it valid, but the abuse of the profession itself, amounting to such a height, as may serve to satisfy a Christian, that in consideration thereof it is itself in the first place become void.

§ 26. Another impediment yet remains questionable; whether it be of force to dissolve those marriages, which are called clandestine, whether for want of consent in the parents or the solemnities of the Church. Some think, that want of consent of parents not only makes the act unlawful, which all agree in, but the marriage void. As if the reverence due to parents by God’s law did make a man’s contract with a third person void, who is no ways bound to enquire, whether his free consent be lawfully exercised or not. In the Scriptures we see God’s people proceed by consent of parents: and daughters especially St. Paul supposes to refer themselves to their fathers; 1 Cor. vii. 36. But neither was Esau’s marriage taken to be void, because it was made without such consent; Gen. xxvi. 35: nor was there any particular consent of Jacob’s parents to his marriages, Gen. xxix: nor were the fathers of Judah or of Tobias made acquainted with their marriages. And as for the Roman laws, which void marriages for want of this consent in some cases: it is no more an argument of the law of nature, than the power of the father by the same laws, which nevertheless allow the mother none; wheras God’s law always, as well as the law of Moses, gives them equal interesse. It is therefore manifest, that there is

---

* See note r.

1 So Erasmus, Luther, Bucer, Brennus, Kemnitz, Calvin, according to Bellarm., De Matr. Sacr., lib. i. c. 19; Controv., tom. ii. pp. 1650. C, 1651. B: maintaining such marriages to be either actually void, or voidable by the parent or by the civil magistrate. So also Duarenus and Oldendorp, quoted by D. Covarruvias, in lib. iv. Decret. Epitome, P. ii. c. iii. Paragr. 8. num. 1: Op., tom. ii. p. 159. a. Lugd. 1606: who himself, with all Romanists since the council of Trent, maintains the validity of such marriages. See also Conc. Trid., Sess. xxiv. as quoted below, in note u.

* See Bingham, XVI. ix. 2, XXII. ii. 4; as from Constantine, Constans, Valentian, and others, both in the Theodosian code and in that of Justinian.—The council of Trent decrees, “clandestina matrimonia, libera contrahentium consensu facta, rata et vera esse matrimonii, quaedam ecclesiae ea irrita non fect;” condemning those, “qui falsi affirmant matrimonia a filiis familias sine consensu parentum contracta irrita esse, et parentes ea rata vel irrita facere posse,” but adding that “sancta ecclesia... illa semper detesta est atque prohibita.” Conc. Trid., Sess. xxiv. Decret. de Reform. Matrim., c. 1; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. xiv. p. 876. A, B.

* Liv. ii. 41, viii. 7: Cic., De Legg., iii. 8: and see the article Patria Testas in Smith’s Dict. of Antiq.
ground in God's law to make this impediment of force to dissolve marriage contracted without it: and that, either for the Church, as the reverence of parents is a part of God's law now in being, which the power of the Church pretendeth to preserve; or for the secular power, as the interest of parents in the marriages of their children is of consequence to the public peace and wealth.

§ 27. The same may be said of those marriages that are made without witness, or without solemnities of the Church: saving that, those solemnities, which contain the approbation of the Church, arising upon the account of the Church, it is evidently more proper for the Church, to make this impediment of force to dissolve marriage; for the secular power, to enact the law of the Church by force of arms and temporal penalties.

§ 28. There remains one cause more to hinder marriage, so as to dissolve it when consummated, being made notwithstanding it; the condition of slavery in either of the parties, at such time whenas the rights of bondage subsisted. This cause stands now by the canon law, and is enforced and limited by the casuists. But it was not the canon law, that first voided the marriage of a slave taken for free, but the laws of the empire; as Ivo, himself a collector of the canons, witnesseth, Epist. cxvii. where, having produced the law of Justinian, he thus proceedeth;—"In tali ergo contractu,

\[or 2.\]

where witness, or the due solemnities of the Church, are wanting.

\[Of marriage between slaves.\]


Ivo Carnot., Epist. cxxiii. (cxxxiii. above in the text is a mistake); Op., P. ii. p. 105. a: after citing the substance of the Novel of Justinian given in the next note. See also Epist. cxxii.; ibid., pp. 94. a, 95. b.

"Εἰ δὲ ἔστω ἐς ἄρχης ὁμοθεία τις ἑλευθερω ὑπάρχοντας προσέχειν, εἰσ"
B O O K III.

["" dissolvi""]

§ 29. Which reason takes place also in legal kindred, according to the imperial laws; whereby an adopted brother is disabled to marry his sister by adoption.

§ 30. In imitation whereof, an opinion of the public honesty of Christianity so prevailed in the Church afterwards, that being once gossips came to be a hindrance of marriage; which opinion, howsoever grounded, notwithstanding introduced the same kind of burden and no other, than that of legal kindred by adoptions.

§ 31. These reasons, though not admitted by all professions in religion that shall meet with this, yet, seeing they proceed upon one and the same common ground, the effect and consequence whereof cannot be admitted in some and refused [in] the rest, and seeing that some of them are admitted on all sides, there being no other reason sufficient why they should be admitted, may serve to evidence the
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intereste of the Church in matrimonial causes. And that evidence may serve to infer, that, though the secular power hath also an interest in the same, yet, in regard of the trouble which concurrence may cause in civil government, Christian princes and states have done wisely (as well as, in regard to the interest of the Church, they have done Christianly) in referring the conduct of matrimonial causes, almost wholly, to the Church. Especially, supposing that they take good heed, that the laws thereof neither trench upon the interest of their crown, nor the wealth of their subjects. But whether secular power can make laws, by virtue whereof that, which a man voluntarily acts afterwards, shall be of force to void marriage contracted afore (upon which ground the opinion, which I propounded last, would justify the divorces which the imperial laws make, to the effect of marrying again), will be a new question: seeing that, if any thing be to be excepted, it will be in man's power to dissolve any marriage; and the law of Christ, allowing no divorce but in case of adultery, will be to no effect. Neither will there be any cause, why the same divines should not allow the act of Justin, that dissolves marriage upon consent; which they are forced to disclaim, allowing the rest of those causes which the imperial laws create. Indeed, whether any accident, absolutely hindering the exercise of marriage and falling out after marriage, may by law become of force to dissolve it, I need not here any further dispute. For, to the securing of any Christian man's conscience, it is not the act of secular power enacting it for law, that can avail; unless the act of the Church go before, to determine, that it is not against God's law, and therefore subject to that civil power which is Christian. The reason indeed may fall out to be the same, that makes impotence of force to do it: and it may fall out to be of such force, that Gregory III. pope is found to have answered a consultation of Boniface of Mentz in the affirmative; [Caus.] xxxii. qu. vii. c. Quod propoustit. But this

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}} \text{Scil. in this chapter, \S 1.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2}} \text{Corrected from MS.; "accepted," in orig. text.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}} \text{Corrected from MS.; "in any man's," in orig. text.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{4}} \text{See above in c. xiii. \S 20. note o. See above, \S 1. note r.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{k}} \text{Corrected from MS.; "whither," in folio edition; as indeed the word is usually misprinted in that edition.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{l}} \text{Corrected from MS.; "so," in orig. text.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{m}} \text{"Quod propoustit, quod si mulier infirmitate correpta non valuerit debi-} \]
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makes no difference in the right and power of the Church, but rather evidences the necessity of it. For though, as Cardinal Cajetan says, the canon law itself allows, that popes may err in determining such matters; cap. iv. De divorciis, cap. Licet de sponsa duorum (which every man will allow in the decree of Deudedit pope, Epist. unica): yet, the ground of both powers witnessing the constitution of the Church as a necessary part of Christianity, as it determines the true bounds of both, so it allows not the conscience of a Christian to be secured by other means. And were it not a strange reason of refusing the Church this power, because it may err; when it must in that case fall to the secular powers, who have no ground to pretend any probable cause of not erring? For he, that proceedeth in the simplicity of a Christian heart to use

tum viro reddere, quid ejus faciat ju-
galis: bonum esset, si sic permaneret, ut abasintem vacaret: sed quia hoc magnorum est; ille qui se non poterit continere, nubat magis: non tamen subsidii opem subtrahat ab illa, quam inimicitas presset, non detestabitis culpa exclusit. Greg. III. Papa Bonifacio Episcopo: ap. Gratian., Decret., P. ii. Caus. xxxiv. Qu. 7. c. 18. p. 591. a. It is really from a letter assigned to pope Gregory II., and to the year 726; Epist. xiii. § 2; ap. Labb., Concil., tom. vi. p. 1448. E. Gratian subjoins a remark, that "illud Gregorii sacris canonibus, immo evangelicis et apostolicis doctrinae, penitus inventur adversum."

"Cajetan, in his tract De Author. Papae et Concilii, c. ix. (Opuscul., tom. i. tract. i. fol. 6. b. Anuv. 1612), alleges, that the pope cannot err "errori judiciali in fide," but can err "personali." In the Apologia for this tract, c. xiii. (ibid., tract. ii. fol. 26. a.), he cites among other cases the "quanto de divorciis" (as quoted below in note o), and answers it, admitting the discrepancy, by saying, that neither Innocent nor his predecessor (whom Cajetan supposes to be Celestinus) passed a definitive sentence, but spoke only in such terms as "sensisse," and "credimus."

"Licet quidam predecessore noster sensisse alitervideatur," &c. "Si vero alter fidelium conjugum vel labatur in heresim vel transeat ad gentilitatis errorum, non credimus, quod in hoc casu quis relinquitur, vivente altero, possit ad secundas nuptias convolare," &c. Innocent III. Papa, Decret. Greg. IX. lib. iv. tit. xix. De Divortiis, c. 7. p. 221. b. Pithacus determines the "predecessor" to be Urban III. —Alexander III. Pope, ap. Decret. Greg. IX. lib. iv. tit. iv. De Sponsa Duorum, c. 3. p. 207. b, decrees, that "sponsalis de praesi non solvuntur per sequens matrimonium, etiam carnali copula consummata;" "quannois aliter a quotidie nuntiatur, et aliquando judicatum." And the contrary determination here mentioned, it appears, had been acted upon in the Church of Modena (ibid., c. 6. p. 208. a.) —"cap. iv." in the text appears to be a mistake.

Enacting, that "separatur viri ab uxorisibus, qui aliquo casu natos proprios coram episcopo tenent:" ap. Gratian., Decret., P. ii. Caus. xxx. Qu. 1. c. 1. p. 374. b; and Labb., Conc. tom. v. pp. 1648. D—1649. B: dating circ. 614. It goes so far as to prohibit marriage up to the seventh degree of spiritual kindred, and to enact that wives, "cum separata fuerint pro hac illicita re," shall recover their whole dower, "et post expletum annum recipient alium virum; similiter et vir uxorem." It is pronounced spurious by Labbe; and contradicted by decrees of later popes and councils, Grat., ibid., ec. 3. sq; although confirmed by a decree of the council of Verrieres (Verberie, near Soissons, in France), A.D. 756, ibid., c. 2.

Misprinted "power," in orig. text.
the means, which God by Christianity hath provided for his resolution, may promise himself grace at God's hands; even when he is seduced by that power, which is not infallible. But he, that leans upon that warrant, which God by his Christianity hath not referred him to, must answer for his errors, as well as the consequences of the same.

CHAPTER XVI.

OF THE POWER OF MAKING GOVERNORS AND MINISTERS OF THE CHURCH.

OF THE POWER OF CONFIRMING, AND THE EVIDENCE OF THE HIERARCHY WHICH IT YIELDETH. OF THOSE SCRIPTURES WHICH SEEM TO SPEAK OF PRESBYTERIES OR CONGREGATIONS.

Now are we come to one of the greatest powers of the Church. For all societies, according as they are constituted, are by their constitution either enabled to give themselves governors or tied to receive them from those by whose will they subsist. The society of the Church, subsisting by the will of God, is partly regulated by the will of men, voluntarily professing themselves Christians. If God, having limited the qualities and the powers by which His Church is to be governed, do refer the designing of persons to bear those qualities and powers to His Church; it must needs appear one of the greatest points that He hath left to their choice. Therefore I have made it appear from the beginning, that the original of this power was planted by our Lord Christ in His apostles and disciples; to whom immediately He committed the trust of propagating it.

§ 2. And now, that I may further determine, within what bounds and under what terms those His immediate commis-saries did appoint it to be propagated to the end of the world; I say, that, by their appointment, the body* of Christians contained in each city, and the territory thereof, is to con-

* See below, § 7, 8. notes e—p: and * Corrected from MS.; "bodies," in orig. text.
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Institute a several Church, to be governed by one chief ruler, called a bishop, with presbyters or priests subordinate to him for his advice and assistance, and deacons to minister and execute their appointment; the said bishops to be designed by their clergy, that is, their respective priests and deacons, with consent of neighbour bishops ordaining them, and by the assent of the people whom they are to govern. I say further, that the Churches of greater cities, upon which the government of the less dependeth, are by the same rule greater Churches; and the greatest of all, the Churches of the chief cities: so that, the chief cities of the Christian world at the planting of Christianity being Rome, Alexandria, and Antiochia, by consequence those were by this rule the chief Churches; and, in the first place, that of Rome.

§ 3. This position excludeth in the first place that of Independent congregations: which maketh a Church and a congregation to be all one, so that the people of each congregation to be able, first to give themselves both laws and governors, then to govern and manage the power of the keys according to God's word, that is, according to that which they shall imagine to be the intent of it. For whatsoever authority they allow their ministers or elders: seeing they are created out of the people by the mere act of the people, and that the consent of the people is required to enact every thing that passeth; it will be too late for them to think of any authority not subordinate to the people, upon whom they have bestowed the sovereign.

§ 4. On the other extreme, this position excludeth that of the Romanists: who will have the fulness of ecclesiastical power to have been first settled upon St. Peter, as sole monarch of the Church, and from him derived upon the rest of the apostles, as his deputies or commissaries; so that the power, which other bishops, priests, and deacons have in their respective Churches, being granted by the successors of St. Peter, bishops of Rome, is therefore limitable at their pleasure; as no otherwise estated by Divine right, than because

1 See Prim. Gov. of Churches, ec. iv., v., xii.: Rt. of Ch. in a Chr. State, ec. ii., iii.: Epil. Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii. § 5, sq.

2 Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. vii. § 5: Rt. of Ch. in a Chr. St., c. ii. § 15—19.

* See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., ec. ii. § 24, iv. § 8.
God hath settled it in St. Peter and his successors, as the root and source of it.

§ 5. Between these extremes there remain two mean opinions: whereof one is the platform of the presbyteries; in which every congregation is also a Church, with a consistory to rule it, consisting of a minister with his lay-elders (whom now they call "triers," referring to them the trial of those who come to communicate) and deacons. Of these congregations, so many as they (without rule or reason so far as I know) think fit to cast into one resort or division, they call a session or class; and as many of those as they please, a synod; and of synods, a province: so that, as the Churches of all one sovereignty constitute the national Church, containing all the provinces thereof, so would they have also provincial, synodical, and classical Churches, consisting of the congregations, classes, and synods, which each respective classis, synod, or province, containeth.

§ 6. The other mean opinion is the frame of the Catholic Church, as I have shewed (and shall shew) it to have been in

Bellarm., De Roman. Pontif., lib. ii. cc. 12, sq.: lib. iv. cc. 22, sq.: Controv., tom. i. pp. 740. D, sq., 1018, D, sq.—One point in the above statement is not held by Bellarmine or the major part of Romanists: viz., that "the rest of the apostles received" their ecclesiastical power from St. Peter. "Sunt autem tres de hac re theologorum sententiam" (speaking of the source of episcopal jurisdiction). "Prima eorum, qui volunt apostolos quam ceteros episcopos immediate a Deo accepisse et accipere jurisdictionem. Ita docet Franciscus Victoria,... et Alphonsus a Castro" (to whom might have been added many others, and in particular a large number of the bishops of the council of Trent, especially the Spanish bishops: see Bramhall, Just Vindic., &c., c. vi.; Vindic. of Grotius, &c., c. iv.; Works, Pt. i. Disc. ii. vol. i. p. 189, Pt. ii. D. ac. iii. ibid. vol. iii. p. 529).—"Altera est eorum, qui volunt apostolos non a Christo sed a Petro, et episcopos non a Christo sed a Petri successoris, accepisse vel accipere jurisdictionem. Ita Joannes de Turcrecumata, lib. ii. c. 54. Summae de Ecclesiis" (fol. 169, b, 170. a. Venet. 1661), "et Dominicus Jacobitus, lib. x. De Conciliiis, art. 7" (pp. 664. D, sq. Rom. 1538)—"Tertia est media, eorum, qui volunt apostolos quidem accepisse a Christo immediate omnem suam auctoritatem; tamen episcopos non a Christo sed a summo pontifice eam accipere. Ita Cajetanus," &c. &c.; "quae sententia verissima est." Bellarm., as above, lib. iv. c. 22. pp. 1044. D, 1045. A.

For the "triers," see above, c. xi. § 25, note m; and Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. viii. § 16. note f; and the ordinances of Parliament of March 14, 1645, and June 5, 1646.

An ordinance of Parliament passed Aug. 19, 1645, for electing and choosing of Ruling-Elders in all the congregations, and in the Classical Assemblies for the cities of London and Westminster, and the several Counties of the Kingdom;" which contains also directions for the constitution of Classical, Congregational, Provincial, and National Assemblies. See also Heylin, Hist. of Presbyterians, lib. xiii. § 52. p. 475. There was another ordinance of a similar purport January 19, 1644.

Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. viii.—x. And see below, § 8. notes u, o, p, and references there given.
force from the time of the apostles; having first shewed, that the visible unity of the Church is a thing commanded by God, in the first place, for the communion of all Christians in the true faith, and in the service of God according to the same.

§ 7. For it is visible, that the means, by which this hath been attained, is the dividing of Christendom into Churches, which we now call dioceses; providing each of them a sufficient number of priests and deacons, under one head, the bishop, as well to regulate the faith and manners of the people, as to minister unto them the offices of God’s service. Therefore, whatsoever means I employed at the beginning to shew, that those persons, who succeeded the apostles in time, obtained not their places by force or fraud but by their will and appointment, will here be effectual to prove, that the qualities which they held in their several Churches, were not obtained by force or fraud but by the same appointment. Wherefore, having shewed, that from the beginning the unity of the Church hath been maintained by the mutual intelligence and correspondence of the chief Churches (upon whom the less depended); and that this intelligence and correspondence was always addressed and managed by the heads of the said Churches (nor could it indeed have been maintained, had there not been such heads always ready to address and manage the same): I have in effect shewed, that this was the course, whereby the apostles executed their design of maintaining unity in the Church. Is it not plain by the instances produced in the first Book, that the whole Church remained satisfied of the faith of each Christian upon the testimony of his bishop, because they rested satisfied of his? that hereupon, whosoever was recommended by his bishop, was admitted to communion as well abroad as at home? What other interest had the Church of Rome in the faith of Paulus Samosatenus, or Dionysius Alexandrinus? the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch, in the proceedings of

---

*c Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., ca. v., vi.
*d See references in § 8. notes n, o, p.
*e Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x.
§ 27, sq.
*f Ibid., § 34—39.

c Corrected from MS.; “bishops,” in orig. text.
* Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 21, 22.
* Ibid., § 23.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

CHAP. XVI.

Novatianus\(^k\)? all Churches in the fortune of Athanasius\(^l\)? What other reason can any man give for that uniform differ-

mity of ecclesiastical traditions and customs, which appeareth

from point to point in all matters, the whole Church agree-
ing in things of highest concernment, but all Churches dif-

fering in matters of less consequence? Is it not manifest,

whenever instead of this daily correspondence synods were

assembled upon more pressing occasions, that only bishops

appeared in behalf of their respective Churches\(^m\)? For if

147 others appeared in the name of bishops upon occasion of old

age or other hindrances; I need not say, that it was the

bishop's right, in which another appeared. Into these quali-
ties and preeminences over the rest, whether of the clergy

or people, that bishops should be able to insinuate themselves

all over Christendom, had it not been so appointed by the

apostles: it is no less contradictory to common sense, than

that Christianity should ever have been received, had not

such men as our Lord Christ and His apostles preached and
done such things as the Scriptures relate, to make it receiv-
able; or than that all Christians should of their own in-
clinations agree to those laws, which have made the Church
one society from the beginning, had they not found them-

selves tied to follow the appointment of the apostles that

founded it.

§ 8. Wherefore I will not take upon me to shew you the

names of archbishops, primates, and patriarchs, in the Scrip-
tures: much less any command there recorded, that all

Churches be governed by bishops, all higher Churches by
higher bishops. But I pretend to have shewed (by the partic-

ulars produced in the Right of the Church, chap. iii.,
in the Primitive Government of Churches throughout, and
in the Apostolical form of Divine Service, chap. iv., and
never contradicted to my knowledge), that there are express
marks left us in the Scriptures of several Churches planted
in several cities; so that there is never mention of more
Churches than one in one city, but perpetually of more than
one in one province: of heads of those Churches, whether

---

\(^a\) Ibid., § 17.
\(^b\) Ibid., § 25.
\(^c\) See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii.
\(^d\) § 64, 65.
\(^e\) § 1—17.
\(^f\) See especially cc. ii.—vii.
\(^g\) Serv. of God at Relig. Assemblies, c. iv. § 1—17.
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apostles themselves, or their fellows and successors, applied to the charge of several Churches: of chief Churches, and inferior Churches, according to the capacity of the cities in which they were first planted.

§ 9. I challenge further here, as proved by that which hath been said in the first Book⁹, that this form of government hath been in force ever since the time of the apostles; whose immediate successors are to be named in the greatest seers, upon which it is evident that inferior Churches depended from the same time: as manifest by that, which hath been said in the places afore-named, that the advice and assistance of presbyters, together with the ministry and attendance of deacons, to and upon the said heads, is as anciently evident in the records of the Church, as any record of any Church is ancient. And upon these premisses I conclude, that the same course and way of government by bishops, priests, and deacons, which afterwards prevailed throughout the whole Church, was first begun by the apostles; as without whose authority it could not have taken effect all over the Church.

§ 10. And of those, that take upon them to depart from the Church that they may not be so governed, I take myself enabled to demand, where there is any precept recorded in Scripture, that the government of the whole Church be settled either in independent congregations, or in congregational, classical, synodical, provincial, and national Churches. The very names are as barbarous to the language of the Scriptures, as the subject is to the writers of it.

§ 11. And yet, were all this shewed me, I would say, that, as the magicians of Pharaoh in the third miracle, so must the architects of this design fail in the highest point of oecumenical or catholic; which having never been compassed but by the means of single heads of the chief Churches, it is absolutely too late for any other form to pretend (I say not, to come from any command of the apostles, but) to be receivable in the Church, being founded by God for one and the same body to continue till the coming of Christ to judgment. For if the apostles of our Lord, determining in part that order which should preserve the unity of the Church

⁹ Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii. § 1—13.
(which what it was, the original practice of the whole Church evidenceth), leave the rest to be determined by the Church for its own necessity and use; that which is so determined by the Church, whencesoever it becomes necessary to maintain unity in the Church, shall no less oblige, than that which the apostles determined in specie themselves. The reason is the unity of the Church, not only of Divine right, as provided for by the apostles, but holding the rank of an end, to which particular provisions of the apostles in this matter [serve her? but as means.

§ 12. It is true, I am far from believing, that, had the reformation retained this apostolical government, the Church of Rome would thereby have been moved, to join in it. But when I see the schism which it hath occasioned to stand partly upon this difference; when I see so many particulars begun by the apostles (as the Scriptures themselves evidence), others determinable by the Church; when I see those, that correct Magnificat*, introduce instead of them those laws, which have neither any witness from the Scriptures nor any footing in the authority of the whole Church: I must needs conclude those, that do these things, inasmuch as they do them, to be causes of the schism, that is, schismatics. For what authority upon earth can introduce any form unreconcileable† with that, which the apostles first introduced to procure the unity‡ of the Church (being to continue one and the same body from the beginning to the end), but he must give cause of dissolving the unity of the said body; unless he can convince the rest of the Church, that it is God’s act, to Whom all the Church is to be subject, whereas to him they are not?

§ 13. Wherefore let not Presbyterians or Independents think, that they have done their work, when they can answer texts of Scripture, so as not to be convinced that bishops are of divine right. Unless they can harden themselves against the belief of “one Catholic Church,” they must further give account, why they depart from that, which is not against God’s law, to introduce that, which it commandeth not. For

* Corrected from MS.; “seem,” in orig. text.
 p. 291.
* Corrected from MS.; “reconcileable,” in orig. text.
* Corrected from MS.; misprinted “vanity,” in folio edit.
that is to proclaim to the Church, that they will not be of it
unless they may be governed as they list themselves; whereas
they cannot be of it by being governed otherwise, than the
whole Church from the beginning hath been. Let them not
marvel, that those, who go not along with them in it, fore-
warn others of making themselves schismatics by communi-
cating in their innovations.

§ 14. But against the Independents I must further take
notice, that, by the supposition of one society of the whole
Church, the whole pretence of the congregations is quite ex-
cluded. For if God appointed all Churches to make one
Church by the communion of all in the service of God, sup-
posing the same faith; then did not God appoint all congre-
gations to be chief within themselves, but to depend upon the
whole, both for the rule of faith and for the order of God’s
service. Again, it is evident to common sense, that the
people of one Church can pretend no interest to give law to
another Church: whereas, whomsoever we enable to preserve
the unity of the whole, those persons must either have right
to oblige those that are not of their own congregations;
or else God shall have provided that the Church shall be
one, but excluded the only means by which it can be pre-
served one.

§ 15. And, therefore, to all those texts of scriptures, which
are alleged to prove the chief power of the people in the
Church, which is the ground of the congregations, I give here
this general answer, which elsewhere I have applied to the
said several passages\(^2\): first, by way of exception, that they
can infer no more now against the clergy, than they could
then against the apostles; so that, seeing the apostles were
then chief, notwithstanding all that those scriptures contain,
the clergy also remain now chief in the Church; secondly,
and directly, that they import no more than the testimony,
consent, and concurrence of the people, by way of suffrage or
agreement and applause, to the acts of the clergy; the in-
terest whereof is grounded upon the sensible knowledge,
which the people have, of the persons concerned in ordina-
tions, censures, or other acts of the Church; in regard whereof
it is no more than reason requires, that they be duly satisfied

\(^2\) Prin. Gov. of Ch., c. xii.: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 33—39.
of the proceedings of the Church, without making them judges of matters of right in it: so that to make the people chief in Church matters upon account of this title, is to make the people of England sovereign, because English juries have power to return evidence in matter of fact, either effectual or void.

§ 16. Another reason I here advance, upon supposition of the force and weight of the tradition of the Church in evidencing the reason and intent of the sayings and doings of the apostles recorded in the Scriptures. Philip, one of the seven, having preached and converted and baptized the Sama-
ritans, the apostles at Jerusalem send down to them Peter and John, at whose prayers with laying their hands upon them they receive the Holy Ghost; Acts viii. 14—17. And so St. Paul lays hands upon the twelve men, that were bap-
tized afore at Ephesus, and they receive the Holy Ghost; Acts xix. 1—7. For what reason shall we imagine, why they, that were enabled to baptize, were not enabled to give the Holy Ghost (baptism being the condition upon which the Holy Ghost was due by the promise of the Gospel), but to shew, that they were baptized into the unity of the Church, out of which they were not to expect the Holy Ghost? Therefore, that their baptism may have effect, that is, give the Holy Ghost, the allowance of the apostles (upon whose government the unity of the Church dependeth) is requisite; which allowance their prayers for the Holy Ghost, and imposition of hands, implieth and presupposeth. It cannot be doubted, that the visible grace of speaking in strange languages the great works of God, was then given for an evidence of the presence of the Holy Ghost with God’s people; whereupon it is called by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 7, “the mani-
festation of the Spirit.” But even of this kind of graces St. Paul saith again, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33;—“The spirits of the pro-
phets are subject to the prophets; for God is not” the author “of unsettledness but of order, as in all Churches of the saints.” If therefore there come no confusion upon prophets prophesying one by one, because God, Who is the author of order, grants such inspirations and revelations to inferiors, that they cease not therefore to be subject to those which He grants to superiors; how much more reasonable is it,
that the gift of the Holy Ghost, promised to them that are baptized, should nevertheless depend upon the blessing of the apostles. So that, when St. Peter says to them that were converted at Pentecost, Acts ii. 38, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;" it seems to me no more than reason requires, that he supposes the same blessing: as also St. Paul, in those of whom he saith, that, "having believed in Christ, they were sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise;" and again, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed to the day of ransom:" Ephes. i. 13, iv. 30. Unless a reason could be shewed, why St. Peter and St. John should travel from Jerusalem to Samaria to do that, which they need not do at Jerusalem, where they were: or, originally, why the imposition of the apostles' hands should be requisite to procure some the Holy Ghost, and not others.

§ 17. This being that which the Scriptures record of the apostles, all men know, how ancient, how general, the custom hath been in the Church; for bishops to confirm the baptized, by praying for the effect of it, which is the Holy Ghost, with imposition of hands; professing thereby, that they own their faith and baptism, and acknowledge them for part of their flock, as acknowledged by them for their pastors: which is that eminence of honour due to the bishop, in which the welfare of the Church consisteth, saith St. Hierome, Adversus Luciferianos. For Tertullian also (De Bapt. cap. xvii.) reserveth unto the bishop the right of granting baptism; though he allow not only priests and deacons, but partly also laymen,
to baptize. Now if from the beginning this privilege was reserved the apostles, in sign of the truth of that baptism which so they allowed; if those, who received baptism at years of discretion, having themselves made profession of their faith, were nevertheless to acknowledge their pastors, and the unity of the Church wrapped up in them, as that upon which the effect of baptism dependeth: how much more those, that are baptized infants? who cannot otherwise, according to the original constitution of the Church, be secured, that they profess the faith of the whole Church, but by their bishop's allowance; through whom they have communion with the whole Church. For as I have shewed\textsuperscript{b}, that there was originally no other mean to maintain the unity of the Church, but the faith of the bishop to secure the whole Church of the faith of his flock; so was the same the only mean to secure the flock, that they held the faith of the whole Church, which owned their bishop and his faith.

§ 18. And howsoever the profession of faith may be limited, and the bishop in exacting the same; yet is it necessarily an act of chief power in the Church to allow the communion of the eucharist. So that, when once Presbyterians share this part of the bishop's power among their "triers" (allowing them to admit to the communion those that can say the catechism which they made themselves\textsuperscript{c}) : first, they put upon us a new faith, which we must own for the faith of the Church; then, to debauch partizans to themselves, they authorize the malice of gross carnal Christians to domineer over their neighbours: whom they may easily pick a quarrel with for not answering their catechism, but are not able either to warrant or to teach them the truth of the least tittle of it; which so nearly concerning their salvation, how necessary is it that it be reserved to the head of each Church? Besides that by acknowledging him they visibly submit to the laws of the Church by which he governs, and to his authority in such matters as the laws do not determine; which is the very means of maintaining unity in the Church.

§ 19. And, truly, the consideration of this point discovers the unity unto us the only sure ground, upon which any man may re-

\textsuperscript{b} See above, § 7, 8.
\textsuperscript{c} See above, c. xi. § 25. note m: and Review of Serv. of God at Rel. As-
sembl., c. viii. § 16.
solve what offices of Christianity may be ministered by the several orders of the Church. For when the power of confirming, proper to the bishop, evidenceth, that he alone granteth baptism (either by particular appointment, or by general law, in which his authority is involved); but a layman sometimes may minister it: we see what St. Paul means, when he says, 1 Cor. i. 17, "God sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel;" our Lord having said, Matt. xxviii. 19, "Go preach, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost:" to wit, that the power of appointing it, not the ministry of doing it, is proper to the apostles and their successors. Which reason will hold in sundry particulars, concerning ordination, concerning absolution and penance, concerning confirmation, and others: in all which, this being once secured that no man act beyond the power which he receiveth, it will be no prejudice to the unity of the Church, that some orders do that by particular commission from their superiors, which their order enables not all that are of it to do; because, in such cases, it is not authority, but ministry, which they contribute.

§ 20. As for the order of priesthood; that the power of consecrating the Eucharist is equal to the power of the keys, in which that order hath an interest, in the inward court of conscience (the outward court of the Church being reserved to the bishop, with advice and assistance of his presbyters); whereas the power of preaching and baptizing is of ordinary right communicable to deacons: for the proof of all this, I refer myself to that, which I have said in the Right of the Church, chap. iii.; and to that, which must be said here in due place.

§ 21. Let not then those of the presbyteries or congregations think their business done, till they can give us some reasonable account, how all the Christian world should agree to set up bishops into a rank above their clergy and people both, if this had been forbidden, nay, if it had not been so ordered, by the apostles.

§ 22. Not that I grant them to have any more appearance of evidence from the Scriptures, to destroy the superiority of

---

4 § 13, sq.

* Below, c. xx.
the bishops and the concurrence of the clergy to the mainte-
nance of unity in the Church, than the Socinians have, to
destroy the faith of the Holy Trinity, and the satisfaction of
Christ: but because I do grant these, as I granted the other, that there is that appearance of evidence, which every one
that is concerned to be subject to bishops cannot evidently
resolve; as every one, that is bound to believe the Holy
Trinity and the satisfaction, is not bound to be able evi-
dently to resolve all objections which the Socinians can
make against it out of the Scriptures.

§ 23. For it is granted, that St. Hierome¹ hath alleged many texts of scriptures, to shew, that bishops and priests
were both the same thing under the apostles; and that, therefore, the difference between them is but of positive
human right by custom of the Church: and hath many
followers in this opinion among Church writers²: though
with this difference, that it can never be pretended, that St.
Jerome, or any ecclesiastical writer after or before St. Jerome,
ever alleged the words of St. Paul, 1 Tim. v. 17,—“The
elders that rule well are worthy of double honour, specially
those that labour in the word and doctrine,”—or any other
syllable of the whole Scripture, to shew, that any of those,
that St. Paul pronounces “worthy of double honour,” were
laymen, that is, of the rank of the people; which is now an

¹ Above, Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., cc. xvii., xxvii.
² “In utraque Epistola” (sc. S. Paul
to Timothy and to Titus), “sive episcopi
sive presbyteri, quamquam apud veteres
idem episcopi et presbyteri fuerint; quia
illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc estatis.”
S. Hieron., Epist. Ixxii. Ad Ocean.;
Op., tom. iv. P. ii. p. 648.—“Nam
quum apostolus perspicue doceat eos
dem esse presbyteros quos episcopos,
quos picturam mensaram et viduarum
minister, ut supra eos se tumidus effe-
rat, ad quorum preces Christi Corpus
Sanguisgigi conicitur?”—and again,
after quoting several passages from S.
Paul to prove “presbyter” the same as
“bishop”—“Quod autem postea unus
electus est, qui centem præponeretur,
in schismata remedium factum est; ne
unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ec-
clesiam rumperet.” Id., Epist. ci. Ad
Evang.; ibid., pp. 602, 603.—“Hac
propereca” (after quoting from Holy
SS. to shew “presbyter” to be equiva-
lent to “bishop”), “ut ostenderemus
apud veteres eosdem quisque presbyteros
quos et episcopos: paulatim vero ut
dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad
unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delat-
tam. Sic erto presbyteri sciant se
ex ecclesiis consuetudine ei, qui sibi
praepositus fuerit, esse subjectos: ita
episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine
quum dispositionis Dominicae veritate
presbyteris esse majores; et in com-
mune debere ecclesiam regere, imitan-
tes Moysen,” &c. Id., In Epist. ad
Titum, c. i.; ibid., P. i. pp. 413, 414.

³ Calvin, Instit., IV. 4.—Beza, Re-
spons. ad Saraviam.—Blondel, Apolo-
gia pro Sentent. Hieron. de Episc. et
Presbyt.—Salmusius under the name
of Walo Messalinus, De Episc. et
Presb.—And see below, § 26. note r:
and Bramhall, Serpent Salve; Works,
Pt. ii. Disc. ii. vol. iii. pp. 466, sq.: and
Vindic. of Grotius, &c., ibid., Disc. iii.
cc. ii. iv.; ibid., pp. 517, sq., 531, sq.
essential ingredient of the design both of our presbyteries, and also, so far as I know, of the congregations.

§ 24. I do indeed acknowledge, that there is difficulty in expounding those texts of the apostles, which speak to this purpose, so as to agree them with the original and universal practice of the Church. And therefore it is no marvel, if learned men, that have handled this point among us (where without affectation I may say, that it hath been most curiously and ingenuously disputed), have gone several ways, upon several grounds, in assigning the reason, why the degree of deacons is mentioned next to the degree of bishops in so many texts of the apostles, having the order of priests between both, as the original and perpetual custom of the Church required.

§ 25. For it is well enough known, that there is an opinion published and maintained by many learned observations in the primitive antiquity of the Church, that, during the time when those texts of the apostles were written, there were but two orders, of bishops and deacons, established in the Church; though bishops also are called presbyters, the name not being yet appropriated to the middle order, while it was not introduced, as afterwards it came to be. And this opinion allegeth Epiphanius very fitly, confusing Acrius the heretic

1 See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. ix. § 2—9; and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 40.
2 See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 23.
3 See below, § 25—27. notes m, r, s, and c. xvi. § 4. note m: not to mention Hooker, E. P., VII., Abp. Usher, On the Original of Episcopacy, &c.; and the names of Whitgift, Bridges, Bilson, Bancroft, Sutcliffe, Downham.
4 This is the position of Dr. Hammond, in the fourth of his Dissertations Quatuor, quibus Episcopatus Jura ex S. Scripturis et Primum Anti- quitate adstruuntur, contra Sententiam D. Blondelli et aliorum; Works, vol. iv. pp. 693, sq. Lond. 1683. See Diss. iv. cc. vi. sq. pp. 799, sq.: where, of four possible ways of explaining the equivalency of the terms 
5 See Acrius Epiphanius and 
6 In the N. T., Hammond enquires, “Annon primum aut quarto demum idem genos hic locum habere possit, ita ut aut utroque vocabulo episcopus et presbyteros soli singulares episcopi constant et nunquam non in sacro Codice denotantur, aut saltum, voces episcopus ad solos singulares episcopos pertinentes, voces presbyteros communiter ad episcopos, quandoque tamen licet raro ad presbyteros pertinent.” And in c. xxi. § 3, 4, p. 816, he instances James v. 14 as the only passage where presbyteros may mean presbyter, although he does not think it does even there. See also the passage quoted in the next note. This tract was first published 4to. Lond. 1651.

or schismatic, objecting the same; that at the beginning, the multitude of believers in less places being so small, that one governor together with some ministers to attend upon him in executing his orders might well serve them, it is no marvel, if there be no mention of any more orders in so many texts of the apostles.

§ 26. And it may be said, that, as there were Churches founded and governed by a certain order from the beginning that we read of them in the apostles, so no bishop, priest, or deacon, was appropriated to any particular Church till after that time by degrees they came to be settled to certain Churches by ecclesiastical law and custom: so that, during the time of the apostles, themselves, and their companions whom they associated to themselves for their assistance, were in common the governors of Churches then founded, according as they fell out to be present in those Churches, to whom they had the most relation by planting and watering the faith planted in them; either by virtue of the agreement


"Nam, inquit ille." (Epiphanianus), "ἐκαστὸν τρίγμα τοὺς ἀναρχῆς τὰ πάντα ἔγραψε, ἀλλὰ, προβαλλοντος τοῦ κυρίου, τὰ πρὸς τελεσίων τῶν χρείαν κατηγορίας... "Sic, inquit, "Moses ad Aegyptum mittitur ἄδειαν μήν—sola virga" munitus, tandem et Aaron sufficiatur, dein principes populi tandemque septuaginta seniorum synedrium. Pulcherrima certe totius rei σκιαγραφία. Primo Mosem... singularis tantum rectus aut principis (additis tantum, ut fas erat, οὐρανία, lictoribus aut ministris) populo populo.
taken by the apostles within themselves, or by the appointment of some of them, if we speak of their companions and assistants\(^a\). But afterwards, when the faith came to be settled, then, as those, which had been governors of Churches in common before, became chief governors of particular Churches, to whom by lawful consent they became appropriated, so were they provided of priests and deacons to assist and attend them in the execution of their office towards the body of Christians, then multiplied in several Churches\(^b\).

§ 27. I do confess to have declared\(^c\) an opinion something differing from both of these sayings, about the reason here demanded; as not being persuaded, either that the order of presbyters was not yet introduced into the Church during the apostles' time, or that chief governors were not appropriated and settled in some churches during the same: though I have no need to undertake that in all they were; believing and maintaining, that the apostles themselves, in the Churches of their own planting and watering, were acknowledged chief governors in ordinary\(^d\), notwithstanding their extraordinary, both power, not confined to any one Church, and graces and abilities proportionable: in which regard, and under which limitation, visible to the common sense of all men of their own and the next ages, I do maintain bishops to be their successors. Whereupon it follows, that I allow the name of bishops, in the apostles' writings, to comprehend priests also, because of the matter of their function common to both: though with a chief power in the bishop; in priests, so limited, as to do nothing (that is to say, nothing of consequence

---

\(^a\) Corrected from MS.; "assistances," in orig. text.

\(^b\) See below, c. xvii. § 19.—Saravia, in his tract De Diversis Gradibus Ministerorum Evangelii, c. 8. (pp. 9, 10. Lond. 1611). maintains, that "Ecclesiae nullos in suis primordiis habuerint episcopos et presbyteros praeer Apostolos et eorum coeperatores:" distinguishing in c. 10. p. 11, the first presbyters, ordained as "cooperatores apostolorum in opere Domini," from another kind subsequently ordained, "qui oppidatim... singulis ecclesias fuerunt prefecti," and tracing from this distinction "duos diversas authoritatis presbyterorum ordines... quibus et Scriptura distincta non dedit propriaque vocabsula, posteritas dedit," sc. episcopi et presbyteri.—See also Hooker, E. P., VII. xi. 8: quoting (besides Aeneas Sylvius, Marsilius, and Thomas Waldensius, and Calvin and Bullinger) Jewel, Defence of Apology, Pt. ii. c. ix. div. 1. (Works, vol. iv. p. 637. ed. Jelf), and Fulke, Answ. to Rhemists, on Tit. i. 5; as maintaining, that episcopal government did not begin until after the death of the apostles.

\(^c\) Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. iii. § 2, sq.

\(^d\) Corrected from MS.; "ordering," in orig. text.
to his power over the whole Church) without his consent and allowance."

§ 28. But this variety of opinion in expounding these scriptures draweth after it no further consequence, to prejudice the primitive law of government in the Church, than this—that there are more ways than one to answer the seeming probabilities, pretending to make the evidence of Catholic tradition unreconcileable with the truth of the Scriptures; in the agreement whereof the demonstration of this truth consisteth. I conceive, therefore, I might very well refer myself to the reader's free judgment; to compare the reasons, which I have produced, with those, that since have been used. Notwithstanding, I shall not think much, briefly, according to the model of this design, to express the sense I have of the most native meaning of the most texts alleged in this business; that I may have opportunity to point out again the peremptory exceptions, which are visible in them, either to the imagination of mongrel presbyteries, compounded of clergy and people, during the time of the apostles, or of the chief power of any such presbyteries in their respective Churches.

CHAPTER XVII.


First then, as the name of apostle in the original meaning is very general, to signify any commissary, proxy, delegate, or ambassador, so the use of it in the apostles' writings is larger than to be confined to the twelve. For when St. Paul saith, that our Lord appeared to "the twelve," afterwards to "all the apostles," 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7; he must needs understand other apostles besides the twelve: perhaps the same

---

\* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., cc. v., vii.; view.
Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii.; and Re-
\* See below, c. xvii. § 4. note m.
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that he meant, where he reckoned Andronicus and [Junia as*] "remarkable among the apostles," Rom. xvi. 7; and that, in another sense than Paul and Barnabas are called "apostles," Acts xiv. 4, 14; for, the name of apostle intimating whose apostle he is that is called an apostle, we have no reason to count Paul and Barnabas any man's apostles but our Lord Christ's, though they were first sent with the blessing of such doctors and prophets as the Church of Antioch had, Acts xiii. 1—3; whose authority cannot in any reason be thought to extend so far as to constitute an apostle parallel to the twelve, which St. Paul so oft, so expressly, challenges. For since we see their commission is immediately from the Holy Ghost, that is, from God, we are not to value their right by the solemnity which it is visibly conferred upon them with: unless you will say, that by virtue of that imposition of hands they were messengers and commissaries of that Church, and that they then appeared to be no more than so, though afterwards God set on them marks of the same authority with the twelve. Truly, those whom St. Paul calls "false apostles, ... transforming" themselves into the apostles of Christ," 2 Cor. xi. 13, must needs be understood to have pretended commission from our Lord Christ Himself. For hereupon they stood upon it, that they had seen Him in the flesh, disparaging St. Paul that had not, who therefore vindicateth himself to be nevertheless; 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2 Cor. v. 16. And indeed there is great cause to think, that they were of Cerinthus his party; who, as Epiphanius relateth\(^*\), having taught at Antioch that Christians are tied to Moses' law, and being disowned by the apostles to have received no such commission from them (Acts xv. 1, 24), out of discontent set up a sect by themselves, borrowing to their former doctrine something of Simon Magus (being of that time); as you may see by Epiphanius\(^a\) and Irenæus\(^b\): whereof this\(^c\) may justly seem to have sowed the seeds at Corinth about that time. As for those who pre-

---

\(\text{x Misprinted "Junias," in folio edition.}\)

\(\text{y Corrected in MS.; "transferring," in orig. text.}\)

\(\text{z See Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. xii. § 7.}\)

\(\text{a 1bid., § 8, 9.}\)

\(\text{b 1bid., § 12, 13.}\)

\(\text{c Altered in MS. into, "they;" or, alter, into, "their having seen Christ, and yet been disowned by the apostles."}\)
tended to be "apostles and were not," but were discovered to be otherwise by the angel of the Church of Ephesus (Apoc. ii. 2); whose commission they pretended, our Lord's, or the apostles', or what besides, let every man judge. For those, whom St. Paul calls "apostles of the Churches," 2 Cor. viii. 23; and Epaphroditus, when he is called "the apostle of" the Philippians, and "minister" of St. Paul's "necessities," Phil. 153 ii. 25: I am confident their titles import not apostles to, but from, the said Churches; that is, not sent by God, or any body else, to them (not that they might not have commission from the apostles, but that it is not here signified by this title), but sent by those Churches with commission to bestow their oblations at Jerusalem; and by the Philippians, to present the offerings which they contributed to the support of St. Paul, Phil. iv. 10—18.

§ 2. Now our Lord having ordained not only twelve apostles for the heads of the twelve tribes of that spiritual Israel of His Church which He now began to create, but also seventy inferior disciples, though not called apostles, yet sent to preach by our Lord during His lifetime, Luke x. 1, answerable to the seventy elders of Israel under Moses and in other ages; though it cannot be doubted, that those, whom our Lord had set His best marks upon during His lifetime, were, and were to be, of greatest authority in His Church after the raising of it; yet we have no mark left to shew, that these seventy were, by the said commission of our Lord during His lifetime, entitled to any rank or particular charge in the Church after His death, but by the appointment of the twelve and acceptance of the Church.

§ 3. And, therefore, I find no difficulty in believing those ancients, which conceive, that some of the seven (which are the first that we read of applied by the apostles to any particular office or function in the Church) may have been of the seventy, and were deacons. And the seventy disciples.

—Epiphanius, Adv. Haer., lib. i. tom. i. Haer. xx. § 4. (Op., tom. i. p. 50. C, D), appears to be the principal authority for the assertion. See Review of RL. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 34. note g. His testimony is disputed by Blondel, Apol. Hieron., sect. iii. § 8. pp. 113, 114: and defended by Hammond, Dissert. Sis. c. 5. pp. 783, 784. The only other evidence (so to call it) given in Blondel, is that of Dorotheus, De Vita et Morte Prophet. &c. Synopsis (sp. Bibl. PP. tom. iii. pp. 149. H. 149. A): whose authority may be estimated by the fact, that he includes one "Caesar, bishop of Dyrarrachium," among the 72 disciples (which is the number he gives), on the authority of St. Paul, Philipp. iv. 22.
number of the said seventy disciples. No, not though we allow, according to the sense of all antiquity, that they were properly deacons to the twelve as governors of the whole Church, at that time comprised in the city of Jerusalem and the adjacent parts. For was not their function sacred and ecclesiastical, which before the ordaining of them was performed by the apostles themselves? Were not the monies which they dispensed the oblations of Christians, consecrated to God, in the maintenance of the Church? Were not the “tables” which they “furnished” out of those goods, the feasts of love, where Christians at the beginning (to have more opportunity of instruction from the apostles, and to strengthen one another) did eat together, the poor at the charge of the rich, celebrating withal the eucharist? He that doubts of the premises, let him satisfy himself by the reasons premised. He that finds the evidence of them, why should he make difficulty in admitting those seven to be deacons then, more than in admitting those, who afterwards either waited at the altar or dispensed the oblations of believers to the maintenance of the poor? The state of Christianity was altered, and so the manner of exercising their function was not the same; but if the reason of the difference be no more than follows upon [that] alteration in the state of Christianity, the society and corporation of the Church remaining all one, then is the office the same. Let no man then, that believes a Church by divine right and consecration of the same, imagine the deacon’s office to be conversant in temporal things (because in dispensing of monies), those monies being consecrated to God for the maintenance of the faith. Nor let any man, that sees these seven, as soon as they are ordained to “wait upon” these “tables,” fall to preaching the Gospel (Stephen at Jerusalem, Philip in Samaria, and why not all the rest as occasion might serve?), think this

* See ample authorities in Bingham, II. xx. 1.
† See Caes. as quoted above, Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii. § 11. note a. But the principal original objectors are the Trullan Council—

θησε της ἀποστολικής μητρός των νοῦν ἐφαρμοσάντες τῶν πατέρων, ἐδρομέν, ὡς ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν οὗ περὶ τῶν τούτων μυστη-

πλοίων διακονομήσσων ἢν ἄνδρων, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς χρείαις τῶν πατρίων ἑθουργίας." can. 16; ap. Labb., Conc., tam. vi. p. 1150. B.—And so also Calv., and his followers, for whom see Rt. of Ch. in a Chr. St., c. iii. § 68. note f.

* Added from MS.

† Corrected from MS.: “may,” in orig. text.
any stranger, than that the apostles themselves should wait upon the same tables at such times, as no man doubts that they preached the Gospel. The empty noise of “minister of the word and sacraments,” sounding in the mouth of those, who scorn to acknowledge any error in themselves or their faction, binds up poor people like children in a biggin of vain belief, that by God’s law no man is to preach or baptize that may not consecrate the eucharist: who, were they to prove what they take for granted, would be as silent as their hearers.

§ 4. But if these seven attend upon these tables, and that under the apostles; how comes it, that the oblations of the Antiochians are consigned to the hands of the presbyters by Paul and Barnabas, Acts xi. 30? Forsooth, what were these presbyters, but so many lay-elders, to give check to the apostles by their interest in disposing of the Church goods? Sure, they that have heard of twelve princes of tribes and seventy elders, that governed all Israel with and under Moses, and, in correspondence with them, twelve apostles and seventy disciples, the first-fruits of the spiritual Israel under our Lord Christ, will not commit so gross an inconsequence as not to subordinate them to the twelve. He that admits that which I said even now, that it doth not appear that the seventy disciples (whatsoever dignity and respect they might have among the disciples by being so sent) did hold any office in the Church by virtue of it, but that which they were designed to by the act of the Church; must also allow, that, upon such designation, both the seventy and others might properly be called presbyters or elders. Only, supposing the name of presbyters to be relative to the body of those whereof they are presbyters, there will be as much difference between them and the apostles, as between the twelve princes and the elders of Israel (to whom all matters of the law resorted, which could not be ended at home), and every little picpoudre judge, that could decide alone or with two more upon compromise. Wherefore I will not contend with them, who think it so convenient to say, that those 1 See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. ix. § 5. note p; and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 1 b.

See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. x. § 6.
elders of Acts xi. 30 were presbyters of the local Church of Jerusalem. For when, upon the matter, the Church of Jerusalem and the whole Church were both a thing (the Church of Antioch being but yet in the cradle, and therefore those of Judea and Samaria, mentioned Acts ix. 31, where the harvest was less, though somewhat elder, yet not more considerable): whether as elders of the whole Church, that is, bishops; or as elders of the Church of Jerusalem, that is, priests (supposing the same order promiscuously called bishops and presbyters, which I never doubted, and since hath been largely and learnedly proved); will scarce be decided by these texts. And the interesse of the Church will be secure, though it be not decided. For when the deputation of the Church of Antioch is addressed to the apostles and these elders; when they assemble to consider of it; when the answer containing the decree goes forth in their name, Acts xx. 2, 4, 6, 23: it is still the decree of the princes and elders of the Israel of God, whether you take them for elders of the Church of Jerusalem or bishops of the whole Church. Nor is the case much otherwise, when Paul and his companions consult with James and the elders, almost about the same business, Acts xxii. 18: though, of the twelve, it seems there was none then left at Jerusalem but James (whom, for the many marks which the Scriptures give us that his care was appropriated though his power no way confined to that Church, the Church calleth bishop of Jerusalem); and of those presbyters, many were either settled in or dispersed to other functions (as those, whom first we read of in the Church of Antioch, must have been of that quality, Acts xiii. 1; no less than Barnabas and Silas, Acts ix. 27, xi. 22—26, xv. 22).

§ 5. But is there any man, that can pick out of all this any manner of pretence for the equality of, whether governors, or ministers, of the Church, [or] for the concurrence of lay-elders to the acts of their government? For the concur-

---

1 So Thorndike himself, Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 64. Hammond maintains them to have been the bishops of Judea (Dissert. iv. c. 20. § 7. p. 815); but allows the other opinion possible.

rence of the people there may be some pretence: because they are present at passing the decree, and the letter that bears it goes in their name; Acts xv. 4, 23: and because the choice of Matthias and of the seven proceeds upon their allowance and nomination of the persons; Acts i. 20—23, vi. 3—6. But that therefore the chief interest should be in the people, is an imagination too brutish. Cannot the apostles, finding themselves obliged to ordain persons so and so qualified for such and such offices in the Church, appeal to the people, whom they acknowledge so and so qualified; cannot St. Paul afterwards provide, "that no man should blame" them "in dispensing the power which" they "are trusted with," 2 Cor. viii. 20: but a consequence must thereupon be inferred against themselves, that they are commanded by God to refer things concerning the salvation of God’s people in general, as the power of an apostle, the order of deacons, the decree of the synod at Jerusalem, to the temerity and giddiness of the people? when it is evident in the text, that the people are neither left to themselves, whether to proceed or not, nor to proceed but within bounds limited: so that, proceeding within those bounds, they could not prejudice the apostles’ interest; without, they were to be restrained. As for the matter of faith determined at Jerusalem, is any man so little a Christian as to doubt, whether it obliged them whom it concerned, or whether by virtue of that act? Those that so readily admitted it, Acts xvi. 4, did not. The whole interest of the people, consequent to this proceeding of the apostles, consists in being reasonably satisfied of matter of fact concerning persons and causes, to be justified by the apostles and their successors in the Church; and can no more argue the people to be chief in the Church, than the trial by juries can argue England to be no monarchy. Which interesse, when it is shamefully abused to the dishonour of Christianity, I say not I would have it taken away, as in some places perhaps it is; but I say, he that would not have the satisfaction which they may demand limited by certain bounds,

* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. in orig. text.
§ 1, 2, 18: Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. * Corrected from MS.; "whither,” § 33—38; and c. iii. § 71.
* Corrected from MS.; “deacon” in orig. text.
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with force of law, that it may not be so abused any more, can
neither pretend to be reasonable, nor Christian. But that
the people of one Church should do an act which must oblige
other Churches, is a thing so gross, that they, who allow their
Christians the freedom to be tied to nothing but what them-
selves please, do by consequence, allowing others the same,
destroy all principles and grounds of one Catholic Church:
which having proved as largely as my design admits, I remit
those, who may pretend themselves unsatisfied in this point,
to void me these grounds, before they claim of me that which
cannot stand with the truth of them.

§ 6. But, the due interest of the people being thus satisfied,
and their pretended interest by the same means excluded;
what becomes of the lay-elders' interest upon their account?
For lay-elders can be no more than the foremen of the people,
to act that interest which they challenge to their due advan-
tage. And, in this quality, I have granted elsewhere (and
cannot repent me of that opinion), that in some parts of the
western Church some of the chief of the people (that is, that
were not of the clergy) did concur to the acts of the Church
in behalf of the people and of their interest. And, in this
quality, Blondel, the most learned of Presbyterians, claims
the lay-elders of Geneva to be receivable. Which as he knew
very well, and all his party will own, to be utterly inconsistent
with the meaning and intent of them who first brought them
in at Geneva; so will it both cut off all pretence for them,
that is derived from any other ground, and leave the claim
also to be limited by that, which the preservation of the
whole Church and the unity thereof will require.

* Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. vii.—x. See the account of "the elders of
the people" in the African Churches,
in Serv. of God at Relig. Assembl.,
c. iv. § 19, 20; and Rt. of Ch. in Chr.
St., c. iii. § 76.
* "Sub Constantino A.D. 312 ... nova rerum facies apparuit ... Seniores
suos habuit, a clero diversos, qui fidelis
plebis nomine regeminis quasunque
partes suo ordine ac modo attingerent;"
&c. Blondel, De Jure Plebis in Re-
gim. Eccles., p. 38; in fin. Grotii De

1648. And see also p. 68. In pp. 79,
sq., he maintains at length, that the
well-known text, 1 Tim. v. 17, has
nothing to do with an order of lay-
elders. And in p. 83, he assails Bucer,
as speaking "nou modo falso sed et
compugnantia," in defending the Ge-
nevan doctrine touching the lay-elder-
ship.
* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. ix. § 2. note
h: and Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr.
St., c. iii. § 25—27: and Bp. Sage,
Vindication of Principles of Cyriacian
460. Edinb. 1846.
§ 7. In the mean time, the order of bishops, and the superiority thereof above the order of priests, stands exemplified in the person of St. James the brother of our Lord, by so ancient testimonies, concurring with such circumstances of Scripture, marked out bishop of Jerusalem, whether one of the twelve or not*. In that, indeed, the reports of the ancients are not reconcilable. But if not, why should St. Paul be so careful to protest, that he received not his authority from him, no more than from St. Peter and St. John: Gal. i. 18, 19; ii. 9—12? Could there be any question of receiving his authority from any but those of the twelve? Therefore, and for other reasons elsewhere alleged*, I count it, as shouldered by most probabilities, so subject to least difficulty, to believe him to be James the son of Alpheus; as having nothing of consequence to answer, but why Hegesippus, writing so soon after the apostles, hath not remembered it*. But of that let each man think as he finds most reasonable. Those testimonies of antiquity, which expound those circumstances of Scripture, which mark him out for the head of that Church, do not discharge him from the care of other Churches, especially of the circumcision: which, perhaps by his care, together with St. Peter and John, were won to Christianity; according to the division which St. Paul hath recorded unto us, Gal. ii. 9, 10: whereupon we see him exercise the office of an apostle to the Churches of the Jews' dispersions by his Epistle; James i. 1.

§ 8. But let us proceed. St. Paul and Barnabas ordained them prebysyters "Church by Church"—"κατ' ἐκκλησίαν," Acts xiv. 23: and appointed Titus to constitute presbysyters in Crete "city by city," Tit. i. 5. Be it granted, because Epiphanius hath said it*, and it is a thing in itself reasonable, that in some places the number of believers was so small, that there needed but a bishop to govern, and a deacon or deacons to attend upon the execution of his orders. That there should be Churches constituted by the name of such Churches in

---

* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. ii. § 1—4: Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 3—5: and Review of Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. ii. § 2.
* See the places cited in note u.
* Corrected from MS.; misprinted,
BOOK III. such provinces, and no more people any where specified, would make them Churches that might be, not that were. Tertullian's saying, "Ubi tres, ecclesia [est], licet laici"—"Where there be three, though of the laity, there is a Church," is not meant of such Churches; but that three Christians (or two in our Saviour's terms, Matt. xviii. 19), that meet to serve God, are a Church, because so assembled, being of the Church. At least, in mother Churches of mother cities (where the apostles made their chief residence, because the harvest was there greatest, and likewise their ministers), that there should be no more Christians than one bishop could govern and teach during the apostles' time, seems to me to carry no appearance of truth. And to imagine, that those, who were designed for pastors of Churches in being, were always resident in the mother Church (though occasions, whereof there is no rule, might and must cause their presence there many times); the reason of their office admits not. But if we admit "πρεσβυτέρους κατὰ πόλιν" καὶ "κατ᾽ ἐκκλησίαν" to signify more than one in a city and a Church, it seems not to be refusible, that they were appropriate to those Churches; the name of "presbyters of such and such Churches" being relative to the people of their respective Churches.

§ 9. Further, St. Paul, sending to Ephesus, "called" to him "the elders of the Church," whom by and by he saith "the Holy Ghost" had placed bishops over His "flock, to feed the Church of God;" Acts xx. 17, 28. Here ἡ ἐκκλησία, by virtue of the article, may refer us either to the whole Church, or to that part of the Church which the speech most concerned, or in fine to the very Church of Ephesus. There is a conjecture, that St. Paul makes them bishops, by saying, that God had made them bishops of His Church, who were presbyters when he sent for them. But I allow not those of the Church of Rome, that our Lord made the bread and wine of His last Supper His Body and Blood by saying, "This is My Body, This is My Blood;" but by that which He did


d Corrected from MS.; "refutable," in orig. text.

e "How and if these presbyters which came from Ephesus and the other parts of Asia were made bishops at Miletus?" &c. Jer. Taylor, Episc. Asserted, § xxi. num. v. (first published in 1642.) Works, vol. v. p. 77. ed. Eden. But this does not quite come up to the statement in the text.

f See above, c. iv. § 1, sq.
before He said it. For the same reason, therefore, I cannot allow, that St. Paul here makes them bishops of presbyters by saying, God hath made you bishops in His Church; not declaring, by any thing that he says or does, any intent so to do thereby to be understood. But I cannot but consider, that Irenæus (iii. 148) tells us, that St. Paul at this time called together "the bishops and presbyters, qui erant ab Epheso et [a] reliquis proximis civitatibus"—"which were of Ephesus and other the next cities;" and St. Jerome (Ad Evagri. b), that he called together "omnes illos apud quos praedicaverat"—"all those with whom he had preached." Which if we grant, the article of "τῆς ἐκκλησίας" will refer us to that part of the Church that was concerned; whereas the words as they lie (as [that I] he "sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the Church") refer us to the Church there mentioned, of Ephesus.

§ 10. When St. Paul addresses his Epistle to the Philippian, "together with the bishops and deacons," Phil. i. 1; when, in his instructions to Timothy, he passes immediately from bishops to deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 1—8: it is said k, that the bishops of the next cities together with their deacons were present or ordinarily resident on the capital city, according to that which I said even now of Ephesus. And it may be said, that they were bishops and deacons at large, in respect to the Church at large; not applied to the functions either of bishop or priests in this or that Church. And, truly, I do remember the words of Clemens (Ad Corinth. l), speaking of the apostles:—"Κατὰ πόλεις οὖν καὶ χώρας κηρύσσοντες τῶν λόγων, καὶ βαπτίζοντες, κατέστησαν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν...ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν"—"Preaching therefore the word by cities and by countries, and baptizing, they made the first-fruits of them" (whom they had baptized) "bishops and deacons of those that should believe:"—and that St. Paul addresses his Epistles "to the

---

b These words are not in S. Jerome's Epist. ad Evangelum, or (as in edd. before Bened.) Evagrium.
1 Added from MS.
1 S. Clem. Rom., Epist. ad Cor. I. § 42; ap. PP. Apost., tom. i. p. 144. ed. Jacobson; quoted above in Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. vii. § 3; and Serv. of God in Rel. Assembl., c. xi. § 2; and in Epil. Bk. II. Of the Cov. of Gr., c. iv. § 15.
Church that is at Corinth, and to all that called on the name of the Lord in all Achaia," 2 Cor. i. 1: so that they provided for the ordering of them, that should become or were become Christians, before they were yet cast into Churches. And it is reasonable to think, that those were ordained in the mother cities, and there stood upon their guard, expecting opportunity of framing their flocks. And that this was a cause, why the titles of bishops and presbyters are promiscuously used and attributed. But I cannot therefore yield, that one bishop with one or more deacons could serve the Churches of Philippippi, Corinth, or Ephesus; or that as yet no governors were affected and applied to several Churches. For when St. Paul directs Timothy to dispose of the stock of the Church for "the honour," that is, the maintenance, of widows and presbyters, to "receive accusations against presbyters under two or three witnesses," and to "rebuke them that should offend before all," 1 Tim. v. 2, 16—20: it seems not reasonable to imagine Timothy the judge of the bishops of inferior Churches, as regularly every bishop is of his own presbyters; that he should rebuke the bishop of foreign though inferior Churches before the people of his Church of Ephesus; that he should dispose of the stock of his Church at Ephesus upon widows or presbyters of other Churches than that at Ephesus: but, rather, that the proceeding of Timothy is prescribed as a form for the proceeding of others in their respective Churches.

§ 11. Another opinion saith, that the deacons whom St. Paul puts next to bishops are presbyters: called also "ministers of God" and "Christ;" as Timothy, 1 Thess. iii. 2; and St. Paul himself, [1 Cor. iv. 1]; "ministers of the New Testament," as St. Paul, 2 Cor. iii. 6; "ministers of the Gospel," as St. Paul, Ephes. iii. 7; "ministers of righteousness," into whom "the ministers of Satan" are "transformed," 2 Cor. xi. 15; "ministers of the Church," as St. Paul, Col. i. 25: observing, that the vulgar Latin of St. Jerome translates "διακόνως," Phil. i. 1, 1 Tim. iii. 8, "diaconos;" elsewhere,

= So Jer. Taylor, Episcopacy Asserted, § xxiii. num. 7. (Works, vol. v. pp. 86, 87). And see also above in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 68. note g. And for later writers, below, note p. But Thornæke's immediate reference has not been traced. Calvin (ad loc.) suggests as a possible interpretation, that the deacons meant were the lay presbyters.

* Misprinted in folio edit., "2 Cor. ii. 23."

* See note m.
in thirty places, "ministros;" and concluding, that these deacons are the same with presbyters under the apostles and the bishops their next successors, till the order of deacons was brought in by the Church. Which to me seems strange;—that the titles of the apostles and their companions should constitute or signify an inferior order of presbyters:—and, therefore, [I think it more pertinent to the meaning of those texts, to observe the terms which are added in them, to limit that ministry for which they are called "ministers," either by the persons or subject matter to which it relates. For the apostles' commission being immediate from our Lord (as the commission of their companions, when they became their apostles, from themselves), and the matter in which the apostles ministered to God or Christ (their companions also to them), being "the word" or "the Gospel" (that is, the work of publishing it), distinguishes them from the deacons, that are under bishops, in St. Paul, as those that ministered to their respective bishops, and by their appointment to the people, as the seven at Jerusalem by the appointment of the apostles. For if St. Paul be called "minister of the Church," Col. i. 25; he is so called as minister of the whole Church, or minister of God in the work of it, not of this or that Church; which deacons are called deacons because they minister to, but at the order of their bishops and presbyters. As for the companions of the apostles, when they are sent upon their commissions to preach the Gospel, they are fitly called "ministers of the word—the Gospel—the New Testament," or "evangelists:" when they give personal attendance upon them, the apostles, they may fitly be understood to be called their ministers, in the same sense as deacons are called deacons for attending upon their bishops; allowing always as much difference between them and ordinary deacons, as between St. Paul, for example, and the bishop or priest on whom the deacon attends. And for these two several notions you have just grounds in the texts of the apostles: Acts i. 17, 25; vi. 1, 4; xix. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 5—7, 11. Besides, when Phoebe is called a deaconess of the

---

\[footnote\]

church at Cenchreae, Rom. xvi. 1; when St. Paul says, that "they, who minister well, procure themselves a good step, and much freedom in the faith which is in Christ Jesus," 158 1 Tim. iii. 13: I understand not, what this opinion would make of deaconesses, or what is that "fair step" which deacons attain by ministering well; which in my opinion is clearly the rank of presbyters, as Clemens Alexandrinus 4 and others of the fathers' have expounded it. Neither do I think it possible to give a more reasonable reason, why the Vulgar, translating διακόνους "ministros" so often elsewhere, should translate it "diaconos," Phil. i. 1, 1 Tim. iii. 8*: than to put a difference between that sense, in which it stands for the deacons of Churches (which the Greek word "diaconus" hath 4 been used to signify all over the Latin Church), and that signification, in which the apostles and their companions are called the "ministers of Christ," or "of the Gospel;" in which, because the Greek "diaconi" was not famous in the Latin, therefore he employeth the Latin "ministri," that answers it. Plainly, seeing the word διακονεῖν beareth a notion of 'waiting upon another's pleasure in executing his orders;' and the word πρεσβύτερος, of 'ruling and governing;' and seeing I have shewed, that the presbyters, according to the ancient custom of the Church (derived originally from the synagogue), did sit with their bishop, though in a rank under him, while the deacons stood, as waiting upon them (as you may see in the Apostolical Form of Divine Service, chap. iii. and iv. 6, and in the Right of the Church, chap. iii. 8): I cannot see, how both these names can be accepted to signify the same persons; or how the degree, which St. Paul saith is attained by well performing the deacon's office, can be any thing but the rank of presbyters.

§ 12. There remains the words of the apostles, 1 Thess. v. 12, 13:—"Now we request you, brethren, to know those that labour amongst you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them more than abundantly in

4 Clem. Alex., Strom., lib. vi. c. 13, and lib. vii. c. 1: Op., tom. ii. pp. 793, 830. And see Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 69.


6 B.—And so both Grothus, and Estius, ad loc.

* See above, note p.

1 Corrected from MS.; "had," in orig. text.

6 Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. iii § 20, c. iv. § 10.

8 Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 9.
love, for their work’s sake:” — and again, Heb. xiii. 7, 17: —

"Remember your leaders, which have spoken to you the word, the issue of whose conversation seeing, imitate ye their faith;" — and, — "Be ruled by your leaders, and yield to them, for they watch for your souls, as those that must give account; that they may do it joyfully, and not groaning; for that is not for your turn." Where, it is manifest, he distinguisheth those that first planted the Churches to whom he writes, from those that governed them at present. But whether it be more reasonable to understand by these words one governor to one Church, or a bench of presbyters to each; whether assigned to one particular Church, or belonging to any Church as much as to these: I shall willingly refer it to the reader to judge.

§ 13. The words of St. James I conceive admit no denial. [The "presbyters of the Church" in St. James.]

James v. 14: "Is any man among you sick? let him call for the presbyters of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." Here are elders more than one; and those proper and relative to one and the same Church; and the office which they do, not compatible to any lay-elders, according to any pretence, supposing especially that which I said afore to clear the intent of it.

§ 14. In fine, "the seven stars," which "are the angels of the seven Churches, and the seven candlesticks," which "are the seven Churches," Rev. i. 20, seem to yield us a pregnant evidence of so many governors, proper to so many Churches; to wit, so many bishops: as is argued elsewhere.

§ 15. As for the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xii. 28: "And some hath God set in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors, then miracles, then graces of healing, helps, governments, kinds of languages:" — and Ephes. iv. 11; "And He gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and doctors:" — it is true, the offices of "apostles and evangelists" cannot be confined to one particular Church; but the offices of "pastors and doctors" may and ought, of "helps and governments" must: at least if we understand them, as I have shewed that they are to be under-

---

7 See Prim. Gov. § 3—6.
8 Above, cc. ix. § 21.
stood; to wit, "governors" of the sick, impotent, and needy, and their assistants in that work. For I may freely say, there hath nothing been said to the purpose of those offices but this. And therefore, seeing the apostle in both places speaks of the whole Church, which consisteth of all Churches, the form whereof is still the same, how much soever they differ in bigness; it seemeth to me very reasonable to understand by St. Paul, that God hath placed in the Church as well those offices which relate to all or to many Churches, as those which relate unto one; that, by the means of all of them, the university of Christians may be edified in and to the unity of one body, which is the whole Church.

§ 16. These being the particulars that concern this point in the writings of the apostles, I am not solicitous for an answer to the puritans' objections; finding in their no ingredient of any of their designs, but only a number of presbyters of the same rank in one and the same Church, no ways inconsistent with the superiority of bishops, no ways enduring the power of the keys in the hands of lay-elders.

§ 17. But if the writings of the apostles express not that form of government by bishops, priests, and deacons, which it is manifest that the whole Church ever since their time hath used: first, neither can it be said to agree any thing so near with any of their designs; and all the difference is reasonably imputable to the difference between the state of the Church in making and made, the qualities of apostles and evangelists not being to be propagated to posterity any more than their persons, but the uniformity of succeeding times not being imputable to any thing but their appointment.

§ 18. As for the reason, why the titles of ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος are so promiscuously used, as well in the records of the primitive Church, as in the writings of the apostles: I admit that of Epiphanius, that at the beginning a bishop with his deacons might serve some Churches; I admit the ordaining of bishops for inferior Churches to be framed, and

c Thordike had originally followed a different interpretation of the word "government" in 1 Cor. xii. 28. See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. iv.

§ 30, 38.—Grotius and Hammond (ad loc.) interpret it severally of presbyters and bishops.

d See above, c. xvi. § 25. note n.
e See above, § 8. note b.
in the Churches of mother cities, according to Clemens\(^7\); I admit the ordaining of clergy to no particular Churches\(^8\); but I cannot reject that, which I learned from an author no ways inconsiderable, the supposed St. Ambrose upon St. Paul’s Epistles. He, not only in the words quoted in the first Book\(^9\), upon 1 Cor. xi.\(^{10}\), but upon Rom. xvi.\(^{11}\) and 1 Cor. i.\(^{11}\), alleges, that, when St. Paul writ, governors were not settled in all churches, acknowledging that presbyters were. Can he then be thought to make presbyters and the governors of Churches all one? But Amalarius, De Officiis Eccles. ii. 13\(^{12}\) (quoting things out of these commentaries, which now appear not\(^{12}\)), and out of him Rabanus, upon 1 Tim. iv. 14\(^{13}\), and Titus i.\(^{14}\),

---

\(^7\) Quoted before in § 10: and see references in note 1 there.
\(^8\) See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iv. § 45.
\(^9\) Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xvi. § 31. See also Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. iii. § 3.
\(^10\) Quoted by Thorndike, as in last note.
\(^12\) Quoted above in Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 1.
\(^13\) See Review, &c. as quoted in note m.

---

CHAP. XVII.

records of the primitive Church.
BOOK III.

says, that they, who under the apostles had power to ordain, and are now called bishops, were then set over whole provinces by the name of apostles (agreeing herein with Theodoret upon 1 Tim. iii., iv. 3, and St. Hierome upon Gal. i. 5, and many others of the fathers, that extend the name of apostles far beyond the twelve); as Timothy in Asia, Titus in Crete: the Churches of particular cities having their own presbyters to govern them, but expecting ordinances, and the settling of the more weighty causes, from these their superiors. These were the presbyters that ordained Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. 14; saith Rabanus: who certainly, being ordained to so high a charge, could not be ordained by the presbyters of any particular Church. Now the successors of these apostles or presbyters, finding themselves inferior to their predecessors, saith he, and the same title a burden to them, appropriated themselves the name of bishops, which imports care, leaving to priests that which imports dignity, to wit, that of presbyters. This Amalarius allegeth out of the said commentaries: adding, that in process of time, through the bounty of those who had the power of ordaining, these bishops were settled two or three in a province; until at length not only over all cities, but in places that needed not bishops. This, being partly the importance of this author's words, partly that which Amalarius and Rabanus gather from his meaning, gives

tionem; divisorunt ergo ipsa nomina, et illias, id est, presbyteris, presbyterii nomen relinquuerunt. Alii vero episcopi sunt nuncupati, hi qui et ordinationis praediti sunt potestate, ut plurisimae idem praepositus se ecclesiariarum esse cognoscerent; facta sunt vero et ampliores episcopi, causa sic dependente."

Id., ibid., pp. 500, G—501, B. "Presbyteros vero hoc in loco non eos nominavit qui nunc nominantur presbyteri: nec autem res admissit istos manus imponere ad ordinationem ipsius functionis, sed apostolorum dicit conventum, qui aderat apostolo Paulo, et cum eo manus imponebant in ejus ordinationem. „Presbyterium autem illud nominavit contemplatione honoris," &c. Id., ibid., c. 4; in 1 Tim. iv. 14; ib., p. 501, F, G.

"Audiant episcopi, qui habent constituenti presbyteros per urbes singulas potestatem," &c. Id., ibid., lib. xxv. c. 1; in Tit. i. 5; ibid., p. 520. D: from S. Jerom: citing also, a little further on, the other well-known passages on the subject from the same father.


* See Suicer in v. Ἀπόστολος, II. 3.

† See note o.

‡ See note o.

§ See references in notes h and m.
a clear answer to all that St. Jerome\textsuperscript{7} hath objected out of Chap.

the writings of the apostles, to prove that bishops and pres-
byters are by their institution both one, because they are
called both by the same title: and therefore cannot, with any
judgment, be alleged to his purpose\textsuperscript{8}.

§ 19. In fine, the same author upon Ephes. iv. affirmeth, [In what way bi-
shops came in the room of apostles.]

that, for the propagation of Christianity, all were permitted
at the first to preach the Gospel, to baptize, and to expound
the Scriptures in the church; but when Churches were settled,
and governors appointed, then order was taken, that no man
should presume to execute that office, to which he was not
ordained. By whom I beseech you, but by the same, who had
formerly allowed and trusted all Christians with all offices,
which the propagation of the common Christianity required?
Even the apostles and disciples, and their companions and
assistants, in whom that part of power rested, which the
apostles had endowed them with: until, bishops being settled
over all Churches, they might truly be said to succeed the
apostles in the government of their respective Churches;
though nobody can pretend to succeed them in that power
over all Churches that belonged to their care, which the
agreements passed between the apostles must needs allow
each one.

§ 20. Nor need I deny that, which sometimes the fathers affirm\textsuperscript{b}, that even presbyters succeed the apostles. For in the Churches of Barnabas and Saul’s founding, Acts xiv. 23,
while they had no governors but apostles and presbyters; it
is manifest, that the presbyters did whatsoever they were
able to do as lieutenants of the apostles, and in their stead.
But shall any man infer thereupon, that they, who say this,
allow presbyters to do whatsoever the apostles could do;
seeing them limited, as I have said\textsuperscript{c}, by the authors which I
allege? For what if my author say, upon Ephes. iv\textsuperscript{d}, that at

---

\textsuperscript{7} See above, c. xvi. § 23, note g.

\textsuperscript{8} As they are by c. g. Blondel, Apol.
pro Sent. Hieron., sect. ii. cc. 40, 42.

\textsuperscript{9} See Prim. Gov. of Ch., cc. ix. § 5, x. § 8.

\textsuperscript{b} So Ignatius, Ad Magnes. § 6, Ad
Trall. § 3, Ad Smyrnens. § 8; ap. PP.

\textsuperscript{c} Above, § 18, 19.

\textsuperscript{d} Quoted above in Prim. Gov. of
Ch., c. xii. § 4: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr.
St., c. iii. § 54.
the first the eldest of the presbyters succeeded upon the bishop's decease? Shall the rule of succession make any difference in the power to which he succeeds? Or both acknowledge the laws, which they, that order both, shall have appointed, even the apostles?

§ 21. Let St. Hierome then (and whosoever prefers St. Hierome's arguments before that evidence which the practice of the Church creates) have leave to dispute out of the Scriptures the beginning of bishops from the authority of the Church, which neither St. Hierome, nor any man else, could ever have brought the whole Church to agree in, had not the apostles' order gone afore for the ground of it: provided that the love of his opinion carry him not from the unity of the Church, as it did Aerial (for he, that saith that this ought to be a law to the Church, need not say, that every Christian is bound upon his salvation to believe that it ought to be a law to the Church). So long as the succession of the apostles is upon record in the Church in the persons of single bishops, by whom the tradition of faith was preserved, according to Irenæus and Tertullian, the unity of the Church, according to Optatus and St. Augustin; what wilfulness can serve to make all presbyters equal in that power, which all the acts whereby the unity of the Church hath been really maintained evidently challenge to the pre-eminence of their bishops above them in their respective Churches? The constitution of the whole Church out of all Churches, as members of the whole, will necessarily argue a pre-eminence of power in the bishop above his presbyters, not to be derived from any agreement of the Church, but from the appointment of the apostles. In the mean time, supposing the whole Church to agree in that, which God had enabled them to agree in, having not tied them to the contrary, but having tied them to live in visible unity and communion, all Churches with all Churches; they, that depart from this unity upon this account, shall be no less schismatics, than had the superiority.

* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xiv. § 2.
* See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii. § 8. note z.
* Ibid., note a.

a See ibid., § 6: and Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. v. § 8. note h.
1 See ibid.: and Prim. Gov., ibid., note i.
of bishops been settled by the apostles. This is that which I come to in the next place.

CHAPTER XVIII.


Some consideration I must now bestow upon that position, which derives a monarchy over the Church from St. Peter's privileges. For I make no scruple to grant, that he was indeed the first and chief of the apostles, as he is reckoned in the Gospels, Matt. x. 2, Mark iii. 16, Luke vi. 14: and that, in likelihood, because he was the first in leaving all to adhere unto our Lord, as the man to whom our Lord's call is directed, Luke v. 4—11; though he was first brought to our Lord by his brother Andrew, as Philip once brought Nathanael that was not of the twelve, John i. 41—46; so that this first call gave them acquaintance, but made them not apostles. And from this beginning we may well draw the reason, why St. Peter is always the forermost to answer our Lord's demands, and to speak in the name of his fellows: Matt. xiv. 28, xv. 15, xvi. 16, xvii. 24, xviii. 21, xix. 27, xxvi. 33; Mark viii. 29, x. 28, xi. 21, xiv. 29; Luke viii. 45, ix. 20, xii. 41, xviii. 28, xxii. 34; John vi. 63, xiii. 6; Acts i. 13, 15, ii. 14, 37, iv. 8: which it would not become the reverence we owe the apostles to impute to St. Peter's forwardness, without acknowledging the ground of it, being visible.

§ 2. But these privileges will not serve to make St. Peter [But no sovereign over the apostles. The stress lies upon Matt. xvi. sovereign over them.]

---


1 Corrected from MS.; "so," in orig. text.
BOOK III.

16—19:—"And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God; and Jesus answered and said to him, Blessed art thou, Simon son of Jonas, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, but My Father in the heavens; and I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou bindest on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou loosest on earth, shall be loose in the heaven:"—and upon John xxii. 15—17, where St. Peter, thrice professing to love Christ, receives of Him thrice the command of "feeding His sheep." But will this serve the turn ever a whit more? It must be either by virtue of the matter, which our Lord says of or to St. Peter, or by virtue of His saying it to St. Peter and to none else. Against this latter consideration I conceive I have provided by the premisses. For seeing there is a sufficient reason to be given otherwise, why St. Peter answers before the rest, when our Lord demands whom they acknowledge Him to be; the reply of our Lord, addressed to him alone, will give him no more than the precedence, not the sovereignty over the apostles. Which is still more evident in St. John; because St. Peter, having undertaken before the rest to stand to our Lord in the utmost of all His trials, had deserted Him most shamefully of them all, denying under an oath to have any knowledge of Him. For it is not observed for nothing, that he professes the love of Christ thrice." Let St. Peter then be the prince-archbishop, or the chief apostle; let him be, if you please, the prince of the apostles: there will be found a wide distance between "princeps apostolorum" in Latin, as some of the fathers have called him, and "sovereign over the apo-


stes." When Augustus seized into his hand the sovereign power of the Roman empire "nomine principis," as we read [in] the beginning of Tacitus,—"under the title of prince;"—he was well aware, that the title, which he assumed, did not necessarily proclaim him sovereign, which he desired not to do.

§ 3. As for the matter of our Lord's words: those, that fear where there is no fear, will have our Lord say, that He buildeth His Church upon the faith of St. Peter, professing our Lord to be Christ; or to point at Himself, when He saith, "Upon this rock will I build My Church." But what needs it? Saith He any more to St. Peter, than St. Paul saith to the Ephesians, ii. 20; "Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone?" or St. John of the new Jerusalem, Rev. xxi. 14; "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, upon which were the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb?" How then shall St. Peter be sovereign by virtue of an attribute common to him with the rest of the apostles?

§ 4. Some conceive, that, when our Lord proceeds to tell

* Bellarm. (De Verbo Dei, lib. iii. c. 4. Controv., tom. i. p. 175. A: De Roman. Pontif., lib. i. c. 9. ibid. pp. 638. C; sq., et lib. iv. c. 25. p. 1049. C) distinguishes the power assigned to S. Peter from that assigned to the other apostles thus—that S. Peter's power "ordinaria fuit, reliquiorum extraordi- naria;" S. Peter "potestatem suam transmettere potest," the others could not; S. Peter "super alios apostolos potestatem habuit," the rest not so: in short, that S. Peter had a "monarchia" instead of a simple "primatus." Inconsistently too with his general admission quoted above, c. xvi. § 4. note y, he affirms (De Rom. Pont., lib. i. c. 18. p. 687. A—C), that "solus Petrus a Christo episcopus ordinatus fuerit, ceteri autem a Petro episcopalem ordinacionem acceperint."

* Added from MS.

* Annal., lib. i. c. 1. See Grotius, De Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. i. c. iii. § 10. num. 1, and Cocceius's notes; for the difference between principatus and regnum.


* "De diaboli aut etiam de improbiorum molitionibus tanto consensus hunc locum exponi valde miror. Nusquam enim pererio ηδον vocem neque apud Hellenistae neque apud Novi Foderis Scriptores in alia significacione
him, that “the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church,” He means no more, but that He will rescue His from death by raising them again. But raising from death implies raising from sin in the Old Testament, expresses it in the New; and the city of God, which is the Church in the New Testament, refers to the “city of Satan” that oppugneth it: and, therefore, “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,” cannot signify less than a promise, that the Church shall continue till our Lord’s second coming to judgment, notwithstanding the malice of Satan and his complices. But St. Peter is not the only foundation of it, though nobody else be named here.

§ 5. Again, our Lord gives St. Peter “the keys of His Church” here; as in St. John He commands him to “feed His flock.” But is the office of ‘feeding Christ’s flock’ St. Peter’s peculiar? Have not the apostles the charge of it, even from our Lord? Do they do it by virtue of St. Peter’s commission, or by His appointment? How are they Christ’s apostles otherwise? As for the keys of the Church: they are given to St. Peter here; they are given to the twelve by ‘the power of remitting and retaining sins,’ as I have shewed, John xx. 21—23; by ‘the power of binding and loosing’ they are given to the Church, Matt. xviii. 18. And can any man make St. Peter sovereign over the apostles and over the Church by virtue of that, which is no privilege of his, the rest of the apostles and the Church being all endowed with it?

§ 6. Hear we not what St. Luke saith, Acts viii. 14: “The apostles at Jerusalem, hearing that Samaria had received the word of God, sent to them Peter and John?” Can St. Peter go upon commission from the apostles, who gives the apostles the commission they have? Those, that preached circumcision at Antioch, had “no commission” for it from the Church at Jerusalem; Acts xv. 24. It must have been from St. Peter, if that Church had acted then by virtue of his commission;
but he was present, and is signified as one of them that writ
these words. Let any man stand upon it, that will⁵, that
the “false apostles,” whom St. Paul writes against 2 Cor. xi.
13, pretended commission from St. Peter; because of the
opposition, which they made between him on the one side,
and St. Paul and Apollos on the other side; 1 Cor. i. 12.
(though I shewed you better reason afore⁶, that they pre-
tended that commission from the apostles, which they dis-
owned Acts xv. 24): it is easy for me to say, that they pre-
tended not St. Peter’s name as sovereign over the apostles,
but as founder of the Church of Corinth as well as St. Paul,
which Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius witnesseth⁷. Whereas,
when St. Paul pleads his commission of apostle from God
and not from man, Gal. i. 1, ii. 6—9, and that in express op-
opposition to St. James and St. John as well as to St. Peter, it
is manifest, that they, as well as St. Peter, might have pre-
tended to give it, had he not been an apostle: but, being an
apostle, none but our Lord Christ. And, therefore, when he
resists St. Peter and reproves him to the face, Gal. ii. 11—
14; understand this resistance and reproof as you please,
whether true or colourable⁸; had St. Peter been monarch, it
had not been for an apostle to colour his proceeding with a
pretence, inferring rebellion against his sovereign.

§ 7. Wherefore there may be [lesser⁹] and greater apostles,
for personal¹ qualities; and St. Paul, that is “the least of
them for his calling, may be inferior to none for his labours,

⁷ “In his quidem adventendum est,
quoniam non sic dicebat alii se esse
Cephas, quod Cephas Corinthi predi-
casset; . . . sed potius, quo illam con-
tentionem et scissuram ecclesiae decili-
narent, rem ad suum principium redu-
centes (quod sic falli non possent)
dicerent alii, se esse prstim omnium
post Christum pastoris et ecclesiae Ca-
pitae Petri discipulos, alii vero Auctoris
omnium Christi. Idcirco idem Paulus
inferius, nulla de Cepha habita men-
tione, nec de Christo, sed quia sui
tantum causa et Apollo oborta fuerat
contentio, subdit,” &c. Baron., An-
nal., in an. 87. num. iii. tom. i. p. 446.
C. Antv. 1597: quoted by Estius, ad
loc., in order to reject the interpretation.
⁸ Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr.,
c. xvi. § 81.
¹ See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. v. § 3.
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The apo-
stes
[therefore]
all of equal
power; St.
Peter only
chief in
managing
it.

¹ Corrected from MS.; misprinted
“personable,” in folio edit.
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1 Cor. xv. 9, 10, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11, 12; nay, St. Peter may have a standing pre-eminence, of head of the bench, to avoid confusion and to create order in their proceedings; and yet their commission be immediate from our Lord, and the matter of it, and the power it creates, the same for substance.

§ 8. Having thus destroyed this ground, upon which some people claim a monarchy over the Church for the pope by the Scriptures (without seeking for other exceptions to the pretence that may be made to the same purpose from the tradition of the Catholic Church); I proceed to settle the ground of that eminence and superiority, which I conceive some Churches have over others, for the unity of the whole Church: because of necessity the reason and ground, upon which it stands, must be the measure of it how far it extends; and the positive truth thereof will be negatively an exception to that sovereignty, which the bishop of Rome by the succession of St. Peter pretendeth. I say then, that the apostles and disciples of our Lord Christ, intending to convert the world to the faith, and to establish one Church of all that should be converted to it, did agree and appoint, that the Churches of the chief cities should be the chief Churches; and that the Churches of inferior cities should depend upon them, and have recourse to them in all things that might concern the common Christianity (whether in the rule of faith or in the unity of the Church in the offices of God’s service); reserving unto themselves the ordering of those things, which, being of less moment, might concern their own peace and good order rather than the interest of other Churches.

§ 9. I do not pretend to produce any act under the apostles’ hands, in which this conclusion is signed: but to proceed upon the principles premised to argue and to infer, that those things, which I shall evidently shew have passed in the Church, could not otherwise have come to pass; unless we could suppose, that a constant order, which hath wholly taken place in the Church ever since the apostles, could have prevailed over those infinite ways which confusion might have imagined, had there been no ground from whence

---

* Scil. Bellarmine (see § 1. note k) from Turre-Cremata, Cijetan, &c.: and Romanist controversialists in general.

f See below, cc. xix., xx.

§ See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St. c. ii.: and Epil. Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. viii—ix.
this certain order should rise. And here I do profess, that if any man will needs be contentious, and say, that this order came not in by the appointment of the apostles themselves (because during their time the probability of converting the Roman empire and other nations to Christianity could not appear, and that it doth not appear by any circumstance of Scripture that the spirit of prophecy was given them to such purposes); I will rather grant all this, than contend about those terms which I need not insist upon: though I do firmly believe, that, before all the apostles left the world, the conversion of the gentiles was their design, and the design of their successors. But I will provide, on the other side, that, whether the apostles themselves, or their companions and successors, in whom the power of governing the whole Church was as fully to all purposes as in the apostles themselves (for though they might be assisted by the gift of prophecy in those occasions, as it is probable they were at the council of Jerusalem, Acts xv., yet must their authority proceed, whether so assisted or not), the obligation upon the Church must needs remain the same, to cherish and maintain that order which once might have been established by them; the unity of the Church, which is the end of it, not being otherwise attainable.

§ 10. And upon this ground I maintain, that the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, had from the beginning a privilege of eminence above other Churches. For, Rome being the seat of the empire, Alexandria and Antioch, which had formerly been the seats of the successors of Ptolemy in Egypt and Seleucus in Asia, having from their first coming under the Roman empire had their peculiar governors, it is no marvel, if the Churches founded in them held their peculiar privileges and eminences over the Churches of their resorts, from the very founding of Christianity in these mother-

---

b De Dominis, De Rep. lib. iii. c. 12. § 21. tom. i. p. 335, and Brerewood, Of Patriarchal Government, Qu. 1, "reckon the first rise of patriarchs to have been after the apostolic age, and some time before the council of Nice" (Bingh., II. xvii. 7): which opinion Bingham (ibid. 8) prefers to that of Baronius and others, affirning the apostles themselves to have originated them, and of Launoy, Bausage, and others, dating their origin after, and of S. Jerom, apparently dating it at, the council of Nice.

1 See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. vi. § 5; Serv. of God at Rel. Ass., c. ix. § 4; Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii.: Epil. Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii. § 4, sq.
cities, and the propagating of it from thence into inferior
cities, and thence over the confines. And this is the only
reason that can be rendered, why the Church of Jerusalem,
which in respect of the first abode of the apostles and the
propagation of Christianity is justly counted the mother of
all Churches, and which gave law to that of Antiochia and
the rest that were concerned in the same dispute with it, and
during the apostles' time received oblations of maintenance
from the Churches of the gentiles, became afterwards inferior
to these, and in particular to that of Antiochia\(^k\). But he,
that shall compare these cities, and the greatness of them
and eminence over their respective territories, with that of
Rome, not only over the rest of the empire, but over those
cities, will find it consequent to the ground of this design,\(^1\)
not that the Church of Rome should be sovereign over the
Churches of these cities (for that were consequent to the
power of the apostles whence it proceedeth—who, as I have
proved\(^1\), were equal among themselves—and the authority of
their companions and successors, into whom it stood imme-
diately divided); but that it should have that eminence over
them (and, by consequence, much more over the Churches
of inferior cities), as is requisite to the directing of such
matters as might come to be of common interesse to the whole
Church, to such an agreement as might preserve the unity
thereof with advantage to the common Christianity. Now
when I name these Churches of Antiochia and Alexandria,
for example's sake, supposing, that the Churches of the chief
cities of other provinces of the empire had also their eminence
over the Churches of inferior cities within the said provinces;
I suppose also, that they accordingly approached to the digni-
ty and privileges of that at Rome: the power of obliging
the whole (which for the state, under God, rested then in the
emperor alone within the empire) resting for the Church in
the successors of the apostles, according to the\(^m\) weight and
greatness of their Churches. For though Tertullian, De
Prescrip. Hæret., cap. xxxvi.\(^n\), challengeth, that the very

---

\(^k\) E. g. the Trullan council (can. 36. ap. Labb., Conc., tom. vi. p. 1169. B) places the five patriarchates thus—Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem.

\(^1\) Above, in § 1—7.

\(^m\) Corrected from MS.; "this," in orig. text.

\(^n\) See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. iii. § 4: Serv. of God at Rel. Assa., c. iv. § 6.
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chairs which the apostles sate in, the very authentic letters which they sent to the Churches of Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, and Ephesus, were extant in his time in the said Churches; yet doth it not therefore follow, that the privileges of those Churches should be all the same with all Churches wherein the apostles sate: which would necessarily follow, if nothing were to come into consideration but that they were founded by the apostles themselves. For supposing, that the apostles themselves (or their companions and successors, endowed with the same power, as not confined by any act of the apostles, under whom they claimed, to the contrary) appointed, that regard should be had to the privilege of the cities wherein they were planted: it follows of reason, that St. Peter for the Jews, and St. Paul for the gentiles (at least principally), should make it their business to plant Christianity and to found the Church of Rome; and that the eminence of these apostles (one chief by our Lord's choice, the other eminent for his labours) may very well be alleged for the privileges of that Church, and yet the consequence not hold in other Churches, for which it may be alleged that they were the seats of apostles, because the reason for which these apostles bestowed their pains there hath a reason for it, to wit, the eminence of that city.

§ 11. Here you easily see, that, deriving the pre-eminence of the Church of Rome, not from St. Peter's personal pre-eminence only (which it would be impossible to shew how it comes entailed upon that Church, the pre-eminence of the apostles not resting in all their Churches), but from an order given out by the apostles, advancing the privileges of Churches according to the secular eminence of cities; I say, you easily see, that the concurrence of St. Paul with St. Peter to the founding of it is a confirmation of that ground, whereupon the pre-eminence thereof standeth: whereas that opinion, which derives it only from the personal eminence of St. Peter, admits not the concurrence of St. Paul to the constitution of this pre-eminence. Wheresoever therefore you find St. Peter and St. Paul acknowledged joint founders thereof in the writings of the fathers*, all that must be understood; to settle the opinion which I here advance, and to destroy that

* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. v. § 3, 4.
plea, which derives it from the sovereign power of St. Peter over the rest of the apostles.

§ 12. And Epiphanius is not the only author where you find it. The disputes of these times will afford you more than this abridgment can receive. But I conceive I have made a fair way to the ground for it, by observing some probabilities, that St. Peter should be head of those that turned Christians of Jews, as St. Paul, of gentiles, at Rome: which I will here confirm, by expounding the inscription of Ignatius his epistle to the Romans according to it, otherwise not to be understood. It addresseth to the Church, "ὅτπερ προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων"—"which governeth in the place of the fields at Rome." The word τόπος is here used, as many times besides, speaking of those places which a man would neither call cities nor towns; as Acts xxvii. 2, "Μέλλοντες πλεῖν τούς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους"—"Being to sail by the places of Asia." Χώρα, it is plain, signifies "the country." "Τόπος χωρίου Ῥωμαίων," then, must necessarily signify here the Vatican, lying in the fields as a suburb to Rome, and being the place where St. Peter was buried, and where the Jews of Rome then dwelt; as we learn by Philo, *Legatione ad Caium*, speaking of Augustus;—"Τὴν πέραν τοῦ Τιβέρεως ποταμοῦ μεγάλην τῆς Ῥώμης ἀποτομήν...οὐκ ἤγιόθεν κατεχομένην καὶ οἰκουμένην πρὸς Ιουδαίον Ῥωμαίοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλεοῦσι ἀπελευθερωθέντες αἰχμάλωτοι γὰρ ἀχέντες εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ἱντὸ τῶν κτησαμένων ἠλευθερωθήσαν, οὕτω τῶν πατρίων παραχαράζατε βιασθέντες"—"He knew that great quarter of Rome, which is beyond the river Tiber, to be held and inhabited by Jews, most of whom were Romans and libertines; for, being brought captives into Italy, they were set free by their masters, without constraining them to adulterate any of their country-laws." Hereupon "the synagogue of the libertines," Acts vi. 9, is the synagogue of the Roman Jews. Now St. Peter's church we know is to this day in the Vatican, as St. Paul's in the way to Ostia; as from the beginning we understand by Caius,
in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii. 25a, the places of their burials were. Which circumstance points them out heads, the one of the Jewish Christians at Rome, the other of those that were converted being gentiles. For that the Vatican was then the Jewry at Rome, we learn also by Tully, in his oration pro Flacco; where he complains, that his cause was heard in the fields of Mars, "prope gradus Aurelios," that the Jews, who were offended at Flaccus for prohibiting them to send their oblations to Jerusalem, when he was governor of Asia, might come in and discountenance the cause. For plainly this was hard by the bridge, that passed out of those fields into the Vatican, where the gate called Porta Aurelia stood (hard by St. Peter's church); to which gate it seems there were steps to go up, which he calleth there "gradus Aurelios."

§ 13. It is also easy to see, that this supposition draweth the ground and reason of the superiority of Churches originally from the act of temporal power, which constituteth the eminence of cities over other cities: but, nevertheless, immediately from the act of the Church (or of those that have authority to oblige the Church); taking the superiority of cities, as it is, for the most reasonable ground of planting in them the most eminent Churches, but by their own authority providing, that so it be observed. Therefore it is to be considered, that the Church is (by God's command, howsoever by His promise) to continue one and the same till the coming of our Lord unto judgment; but the dominion of this world, upon which the greatness of cities is founded, changes, as God's providence appoints: besides that change, which temporal power, remaining in the same hands, is able to produce within its own dominions. The consequence of which consideration will be this: that, where temporal power makes

causa dicitur. Ob hoc crimen hic locus abs te, Ludii, atque illa turbæ quaerita est. Scis, quanta sit manus, quanta concordia, quantum valeat in concionibus. Summissa voce agam, tantum ut judices audiant."

Cic., Pro L. Flacco, 28.

7 Ernesti however locates the Aurelii gradus with the Aurelium tribunal in the Forum.
such a change in the state of those cities which are the seats of Churches, that the government and advancement of Christianity either may proceed, changing the privileges of the Churches, or cannot proceed otherwise, there the Church either may or ought to transfer the pre-eminences of Churches from city to city; and therefore that, where the case is otherwise, the Church is not bound upon every act of temporal power to proceed to any change. If this seem obscure, being thus generally said; let not the reader despair, before we have done, to find instances in things that have come to pass, not only to clear my meaning, but also to evidence the reason upon which I proceed.

§ 14. It is likewise easy for him, that considers this supposition and the effect and consequence of it, to see, that it gives no jurisdiction to the Church of Rome over the whole Church.

§ 15. It is also easily to be observed, that this eminence of the greatest Churches over their inferiors (which originally is no further defined and limited than the consequence of this ground in respect of the rest of Christendom required) might lawfully be defined and limited further, either by silent custom, or by express law of the Church consenting, at least in effect and practice (which is the only real positive law that rules all societies): whereby new rights and privileges might come to the Church of Rome, as well as to other Churches; which might also be for the good of the whole in maintaining the unity of the Church together with the common interest of Christianity. But I deny not, on the other side, that this power, the beginning whereof is so necessary and just, the

* See below, in c. xx.
intent so excellent, by the change of the world and the state of things in it may be so enhanced, that, though it do provide for the unity of the Church, yet it shall not provide for the interest of Christianity. But of this, and the consequence of it, in due time.

§ 16. For the present, the reason upon which my position, the effect and consequence whereof I have hitherto set forth, is grounded, is the effect of it in all proceedings of the Church, recorded first in the Scriptures, and afterwards in Church-writers, as they succeed: those, that I must here principally consider, being the very same that I considered in the first Book, to make evidence of the being of the Church in point of fact as a body; out of which now the right which held it together, as the soul, must appear; adding the consideration of such eminent passages in succeeding times, as may serve to the same purpose. I will not here repeat the marks of it, which I have produced out of the Scriptures in the Right of the Church, chap. ii. For the dependence of Churches is part of this position; as an ingredient, without which the unity of the whole is not attainable.

§ 17. I will only add here the consideration of that, which I alleged in the first Book out of St. John’s last Epistle, 5—10. Some have thought it so strange, that Diotrephes and his faction should not acknowledge those that were recommended by St. John an apostle, that they have rather entitled the Epistle to a successor of his in the Church of Ephesus, whose tomb St. Jerome saw there, besides St. John the apostle, whom Papias called John the elder, as he is)

---

a Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., cc. ix., x.  
b § 4—11.  
c Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 31.  
d "Hanc epistolam et eam quæ sequitur" (1 and 2 John) "non esse Johannes apostoli multi jam olim crediderunt, a quibus non dissentienti Eusebius atque Hieronymus. Et magis suum in id argumenta. Nam duo suisse Johannes Ephesi, apostolum et presbyterum ejus discipulum, semper constitut ex sepulchris alio hujus alio illius; quæ sepulchra vidit Hieronymus. Deinde hic scriptor non 'apostolum' se vocat sed 'presbyterum.' ... Præterea apud multas gentes hæ epistolae non fuerant receptæ. ... Tum vero credibile non est quemquam, qui Christianus se dici vellet, ea fuisse audacia ut apostolo se opponeret." Grot., ad Epist. Johannis secund. v. 1.  
f "Ex quo apparat ex ipso catalogo nominum, alium esse Johannem, qui inter apostolos ponitur; et alium seni-
called in the beginning of these two Epistles: Hieron., Catal. in Johanne et Papia; Euseb., Ecclesiast. Hist. ii. 25. But he, that considers what St. Paul writes to the Corinthians of his adversaries there, will not marvel, that St. John should find opposition at the hands of Diotrephes, aspiring to the bishopric by banding a faction against the Jewish Christians, whom it appears sufficiently that St. John cherished. And therefore the mark here set upon Diotrephes is not for introducing episcopacy, as the Presbyterians would have it, but for disobeying the superior Church, whereof St. John was head, to the endangering of unity in the whole. For could Diotrephes hope to make himself bishop in his own Church, when nobody was bishop in any Church besides? Or might not Diotrephes hope to do it by heading a party, that disallowed compliance with Judaism at that time? If then the apostles provided not that the Church should continue always one, if this unity was not always maintained by the dependence of Churches; let this reproof have no effect in any succeeding time of the Church. But if the eminence of St. John's Church above the neighbour Churches in ensuing ages was a necessary ingredient to the unity of the whole; then be it acknowledged, that St. John's successors might lay the blame of Diotrephes his ambition upon any successor of his that should follow it.


- See last two notes.

b Euseb., Hist. Eccles., lib. iii. c. 39. p. 111; alleging the existence of two Johns on the same evidence as S. Jerom, viz., Papias' list, and the different tombs; saying nothing of the authorship of the epistles ascribed to S. John; but assigning that of the book of Revelations probably to the latter (or presbyter) of the two. The reference in the text is a mistake, arising from the quotation made above in § 12, text to note u.

u "Diotrephes hic fuit aliquid ex presbyteris ejus ecclesiae in qua erat Caius, ex Gentili fatus Christianus, et episcopatum tunc vacatam ambiens. Is vero ex illo erat hominum generis, qui Judæos quanquam Christum professos, si Legis ritus observabant... ad suos catus non admittebat.... Johannes autem apostolus multum solebat largiri Judæis conversis, ut ex Judaica per Asiam Paschatis observations apparent. Et hunc imitabatur Johannes presbyter, Judæus et episcopus. Vide Irenæum ad Victorem, etc. Euseb. v. 22-24." Grot., ad 3 Joh. 9.—And see Review of Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. v.

1 So e.g. Henderson, First Paper in Answer to King Charles I. concerning Change in Ch. Gov., in 1646. And Blondel, Apol. pro Sent. Hieron., sect. ii. § 1. p. 13. And one account of those given by Waldo Messalinus, De Episc. et Presb., c. i. p. 24, of Diotrephes, is, that, "inter suas collegas presbyteros, hoc est, episcopos, qui nec non se noluitse admittere Johanne, quia eam ejus ambitione... castigasset."
§ 18. Before I go any further, I will here allege those fathers, which do teach, that our Lord gave St. Peter the keys of His Church in the person of the Church and as the figure of it: namely, St. Cyprian, Pacianus, St. Hieronymus, St. Augustin, and Optatus; whose words I will not here write out, to inflame the bulk of this book, because you have them in the Archbishop of Spalato, De Rep. Eccl. I. vii. 17—29; viii. 8, 9; adding only to them St. Ambrose, De Dignitate Sacerdotali, cap. i., affirming, that in St. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given to all priests; and cap. ii., speaking of the words of our Lord to St. Peter, "Feed My sheep;"—"Quas oves, et quem gregem, non solum tunc beatus suscepit [apostolus] Petrus, sed et nobiscum eas suscepit, et cum illo eas nos suscepsimus omnes"—"Which sheep, and which flock, not only St. Peter then undertook, but also he with us, and with him we all, undertook them;"—and Venerable Bede, upon the words of our Lord, "Tell [St. Matt. xviii. 17.

k S. Cyprian, De Unit. Eccles., Op., pp. 106—108: being the passage containing the well-known words, "Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio predivit et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur ut ecclesia una monstre
tur," to which, after the word "Petrus," was added in older editions, "sed primatus Petro datur ut una ecclesia et cathedra una monstre
tur," since shewn to be spurious.—And Id., Epist. ad Jubaian, as quoted below in p. 19.


m "At dica, super Petrum fundatur ecclesia; licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni coelegant accipiant, et ex sequo super eos ecclesiam forti


o De Rep. Eccl., lib. i. c. vii. § 17—29. tom. i. pp. 76—83: quoting at length the fathers cited above in notes k—o.

p Ibid., c. viii. § 8, 9. pp. 88—90: explaining at greater length the quotations from Optatus and S. Augustin.

q Claves illas regni coelegant, quas in beato Petro apostolo cuncti susce
pimus sacerdotes." Gilbertus, or Ger

r Gilbertus, ibid., p. 559. C; quoted by De Dominis, as in note p, § 26. p. 82.

s There are statements precisely and fully to the effect of that in the text in Bede's Comment. on S. Matthew c. xvi. (Op., tom. v. p. 52. Colon. 1612), and in his Hom. Estiv., lib. de Sanctis in die Sancto (ibid., tom. vii. p. 112),
the Church;”—“Hac potestas sancta Ecclesiae episcopis specialiter commissa est, generaliter vero omni Ecclesiae data creditur; nam quod Dominus alibi hanc ligandis solvendique potestatem Petro tribuit, utique in Petro, qui typum gerebat Ecclesiae, omnibus apostolis hoc concessisse non dubitat.”—“The power of the keys is committed especially to the bishops of the holy Church, but is believed to be given generally to every Church; for whereas our Lord elsewhere gives unto St. Peter this power of binding and loosing, there is no doubt, that in Peter, bearing the form of the Church, He gave it to all the apostles;”—proceeding to allege St. Jerome*, and St. Augustin† to the same purpose‡:—and upon the words of our Lord, “Feed My sheep†;”—“Quod Petro dictum est, omnibus Christi discipulis dictum est; hoc namque fuerunt cæteri apostoli quod Petrus fuit, . . . pastores sunt omnes; [sed] grex unus ostenditur, qui et ab apostolis [omnibus] tunc unanimi consensus pacebatur, et deinceps a successoribus eorum communis cura pascitur”—“That which is said to Peter, is said to all Christ’s disciples: for what Peter was, that were the rest of the apostles; they are all shepherds, but the flock appears to be but one; which, as then it was fed by the apostles with unanimous consent, so is it since fed by their successors with common care.” These fathers then, when they give this for the reason, why our Lord gives Peter only the keys of the Church with the charge of feeding His flock,—that He bore the person and form of the Church,—suppose the Church to be a body compacted of all Churches (ruled by the same form of government, for the preserving of unity in the whole); as the college of the apostles consisteth of so many persons endowed all with one and the

where he refers to S. Matt. xviii. 17; besides the passage cited below in note z. But the precise words quoted above in the text have not been found in his works; nor do they occur in the only Homily or part of a homily, which he has (scil. Hom. in Feriam iii. post Oculi, Op., tom. vii. p. 255), upon the text of Scripture above referred to.

* See above in note m.

† See the references in note n above.

‡ A very large number of parallel passages both from the fathers and from later writers to the effect of the above quotations may be found in Andrewes, as quoted above in note n; and

in Buckridge, De Potestate Papae, lib. ii. e. iii. pp. 191—195. The latter quotes the three passages here given from Bede, but mentions no others from him.

same power, for whom one answers, to signify the unity of the whole. Whereby it appeareth, first, negatively, that the Church did not understand any sovereign power to be committed to St. Peter by these words: then, positively, that our Lord, speaking to him alone, signifies thereby the course which He hath established for preserving unity in the Church; to wit, that, all Churches being governed in the same form, the greater go before the less in ordering matters of common concernment.

§ 19. St. Cyprian, from whom all the rest have this doctrine, hath cleared the intent of it, when he thus writeth, Epist. ad Jubai. lxxii[i]:—“Manifestum est autem ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum datur, que in baptismo scilicet datur: nam Petro primum Dominus, super quem edificavit Ecclesiam et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit, ut id solveretur in caelis quod ipse solvisset in terris; et post resurrectionem quoque ad apostolos loquitur dicens, ‘Sic ut misit Me Pater, et Ego mitto vos; hoc cum dixisset, inspiravit, et ait illis, Accipite Spiritum Sanctum, si cuius remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi, si cuius tenueritis, tenebuntur;’ unde intelligimus non nisi in Ecclesia prepositis et in evangelica lege [ac] dominica ordinatione fundatis licere baptizare et remissam peccatorum dare”—“Now it is manifest, where and by whom remission of sins is given, when it is given in baptism: for our Lord first gave to Peter (upon whom He built His Church, and in whom and from whom He instituted and declared the original of unity in it) this power, that it should be loosed in heaven, whatsoever he had loosed on earth; and after His resurrection also, speaking to the apostles, He saith, ‘As My Father sent Me, so send I you; and having said this He breathed on them, saying, [Receive ye the Holy Ghost;) If ye remit any man’s sins, they shall be remitted him; if ye retain any man’s, they shall be retained:’ whence we understand, that it is not lawful for any but those that are set over the Church, and grounded in the evangelical law and the ordinance of our Lord, to baptize and give remission of sins.” Because Peter received the keys, therefore all and every Church,

that is, those that are over it, and none else, can give remission of sins by admitting to baptism. Shall we think the consequence extravagant, having so clear a ground for it; to wit, the unity of the whole Church, settled upon two ingredients, the same form in all Churches, but with dependence of the less upon the greater Churches? If any man say, that all this is disputed by Cyprian, to prove that baptism given by heretics is void, wherein he hath been disowned by the Church; and that therefore the reasons are not well grounded from whence it is inferred: the answer is easy, because he infers upon them that, which though true they do not enforce. That a man cannot lawfully baptize, is not so much, as that, if he do baptize, his baptism is void. St. Cyprian took both for one; and therefore his reason is good, though it conclude not his purpose. Why not void, being unlawful; I refer myself to what St. Augustin\(^\text{b}\) since hath disputed, and the Church decreed and practised\(^\text{c}\). And here you have one ground for that distinction between the power of order and the power of jurisdiction, comparing one with another the bishops and priests of several Churches, according to the original constitution of the Church.

\textit{§ 20.} I allow St. Hierome to say, that “wheresoever there is a bishop, whether at Rome or at Engubium” (an obscure city near Rome), “he is of the same worth, as of the same priesthood;” \textit{Epist. lxxxv.}\(^\text{d}\) For, as to the inward court of the conscience, the office that is ministered by the bishop or priest of a less Church, is no less effectual, than by one of a greater Church. But, as to the outward court of the Church, supposing all Churches governed in the same form, but the Churches of less cities subordinate to the Churches of greater cities by the appointment of the apostles, the act of the less Church, of the bishop or a priest of it, cannot be of that consequence to the whole, as the act of the greater Church; and so, though the bishop or the priest of a little Church be of the same order with the bishop or priest of a great Church,
yet the authority of the one extendeth without comparison further than the authority of the other can do. And you may perhaps dispute, whether this authority produce any such [thing*] as jurisdiction or not; but whether there be ground hereupon to distinguish between the order, which is the same in both, and the authority which it createth, in which there is so great difference, you cannot dispute. Certainly the office of a deacon in a greater Church may be of more consequence to the whole, than many bishops can bring to pass: as the assistance of Athanasius in the office of a deacon to Alexander bishop of Alexandria at the council of Nicea; was of more consequence to the obtaining of the decree of the council than the votes of many bishops there.

CHAPTER XIX.


Amongst the proceedings of the Church, I will first allege that of the Church of Rome in refusing Marcion her communion, because excommunicated by his own father the bishop of Sinope in Pontus, in bar to the pretence of sovereignty in the Church of Rome8. For if Marcion’s father, bishop of Sinope in Pontus, if Synesius bishop of Ptolemais in Cyrenaica3, could oblige the Church of Rome, and all Churches, not to admit unto the communion of the Church those whom they had excluded, because the unity of the whole could not be preserved otherwise; then is not the infinite power of one Church, but the regular power of all, the mean which the apostles provided for the attaining of

---

* Added from MS.
‡ See Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., cc. i. § 31. note h, ii. § 23. note y.

THORNDIKE.
unity in the whole. Not as if the Church of Rome might not have admitted Marcion to communion with itself; had it appeared, that he had been excluded without such a cause as obliged any Church to excommunicate. For in doubtful causes, the concernment being general, it was very regular to have recourse to the chief Churches; by the authority whereof the consent of the rest might be obtained. But could it have appeared, that such a thing had been done without any cause; then would it have been regular for any Church, to have no regard to such a sentence.

§ 2. In the next place, the consideration of Montanus his business at Rome, there alleged, shall evidence some part of my intent\(^{1}\). Being condemned and refused by the bishops and Churches of Asia, he sends to Rome, to solicit a higher Church, and of more consequence to the whole, to own the spirit by which he pretended to speak, and to admit those stricter orders which he pretended to introduce. A pretence for those, that would have the pope sovereign\(^{k}\); but not so good as they imagine, unless they could make it appear, that he made the like address to no other Church but that of Rome. For my part, finding in other occasions frequent and plentiful remembrance of recourse had to other Churches as well as to Rome in matters of common concernment, I find it necessary to impute the silence of his other addresses to the scarcity of records left the Church; not doubting, that he, and the Churches of Phrygia engaged with him, would do their utmost to promote the credit of his prophecies, by persuading all Churches to admit the orders which he pretended to introduce. And how much greater the authority of the Church of Rome was than that of an ordinary Church, so much more had he prevailed by gaining it. That no man may imagine, that all lay in it; nor yet that the consent of it signified no more than the consent of every Church.

§ 3. For consider the Church of Carthage, and the choler of Tertullian, expressed in the beginning of his book *De Exhortatione Castitatis*\(^{1}\), against Pope Zephyrinus, for admitting

---

\(^{1}\) See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 9.


adulterers to penance. And, in consequence thereunto, consider what we have upon record of historical truth from St. Jerome, Catal., in Tertull., and the authorities quoted afore; that Tertullian, falling to the doctrine of Montanus upon affronts received from the clergy of Rome, set up a communion of his own at Carthage, which continued till St. Augustin's time, by whom his followers were reduced to the Catholic Church. For what occasion had Tertullian to break from the Church of Carthage because of the affront received from the Church of Rome in rejecting Montanus, had not the Church of Carthage followed the Church of Rome in it?

§ 4. The same is the consequence of that which passed in that famous debate of Victor Pope, about breaking with the Churches of Asia; because they kept not Easter on the Lord’s day, as most Churches did, but, with the Jews, observing the passion upon the full moon, celebrated the resurrection [on the] third day after that. For might not or ought not the Church of Rome refuse to communicate with these Churches, had the cause been valuable? In case of heresy, in case of any demand destructive to the unity of the Church, you will say, that not only the Church of Rome but any Church whatsoever both might and ought to disclaim the Churches of Asia. But I have to say again, that in any such case there is a difference between that which is questioned for such, and that which is such, and ought to be taken for such; and that nothing can lightly be presumed to be such, that any Church seems to profess: but that, in reducing such unavoidable debates from questionable to be determined, the authority of the chief Churches is by the constitution of the Church requisite to go before, and make way towards obtaining the consent of the whole; and that it cannot be thought, that Victor would have undertook such a thing, had it not belonged to him in behalf of his Church to declare himself in the business, in case there had been cause. All this while I would not have any man imagine, that,
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Victor having withdrawn his communion from the Churches of Asia, the rest of Christendom were necessarily to think themselves obliged to do the same. It is true, there were two motives that might carry Victor to do it. For, seeing the council of Nicea did afterwards decree the same, that he laboured to induce the Churches of Asia to, it is too late to dispute, whether side was in the right. For that which was for the advancement of Christianity at the time of that council, was certainly for the advancement thereof at the time of this dispute. And though in St. John’s time it might be and was without doubt for the best, to comply with the Jews in matters of that indifference, for the gaining of opportunities to induce them to become Christians; yet, when the breach between the synagogue and the Church was once complete, that reason being taken away, the reason of uniformity in the Church, upon which the unity thereof so much dependeth, was to take place. And therefore a man may say with respect to those Churches, that the zeal of their predecessors’ credit seduced them into that contentiousness, which human frailty engendereth. And those, that after the decree of the council persevered in the same practice, are not without cause listed among heretics, taking that name largely to comprehend also schismatics. So I allow, that Victor had just cause to insist upon his point. But it is also evident, that it would have been an increase of authority and credit to Victor, and to his Church, to seem to give law to those Churches by reducing them to his rule. For reputation and credit with the world necessarily follows those that prevail. And Victor, being a man, as I have granted his adversaries were, might be moved with this advantage, as much as with the right of his cause. But though I allow, that Victor had reason to insist upon his opinion; yet I do no way allow, that he had reason to interrupt the communion of the Church, because those of Asia did not yield to it: the matter itself not being of consequence to produce such an effect, nor uniformity in all things necessary, though conducing to the unity of the Church. And
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therefore I do no way allow, that other Churches could be obliged to follow the Church of Rome in this sentence; the unity of the Church, which is the end, being of nearer interest and concernment to them all, than the authority of Victor or of his Church, or than uniformity in this point, which is but the mean to obtain it. Which as it is true, so was it indeed the reason that Irenæus alleged to Victor to divert him from that resolution, in Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. v. 25, 26; where you may see, that his credit, and the credit of the rest of those that held communion with both, prevailed to void those letters which Victor had issued to break off communion with the Churches of Asia. And therefore I cannot wish to shew you better marks, both of the dependence of Churches, and the superiority of the Church of Rome; and, also, that this superiority was regular (and not sovereign as that of a monarch): when the greatest of inferior Churches have recourse and respect to it as the centre of their communion, and yet do not absolutely give up themselves to yield to the authority of it, as they do to the sentence of the council of Niceæ, because it could not be reasonable for the Churches of Asia to stand out with it: whereby you see the difference between the authority of the pope, and the authority of a general council.

§ 5. The business of Novatianus¹ will not require many words, to evidence the same consequence by it. The Church of Rome itself was the seat of the business; and the calamity thereof, suffering a schism within her own bowels, the occasion of it. And I appeal to the experience of the world, whether intestine disension do not discover the respect all men owe to their neighbours, by the need they have of them for the composing of it. But not to speak of occasion of advantage, but of terms of right; that Church having gotten two heads, Cornelius and Novatianus, who was then judge, which side ought to be accounted the Church of Rome, so that the other party should be obliged to submit and join with it? For had it been a law that obliged the whole Church, that those who had fallen away in time of perse-


¹ See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 5;
cation be not admitted to penance, and by consequence to the communion, any more (which was the motive and ground why Novatianus was made bishop against Cornelius): certainly the rest of the Church must have acknowledged Novatianus, who maintained it, not Cornelius, who waved it; notwithstanding that Cornelius was made by sixteen bishops of the then resort of that Church, Novatianus but by three. For though the canon of the apostles, requiring only three bishops or two at least to the ordaining of a bishop, may very well seem to be the ancieneter custom in the Church, than the fourth canon of Nicæa, which provideth, that it be done by the consent of all the resort, either present, or under their hands referring themselves to three that are present; yet is it plain, that the act of three, or two at least, was accepted upon presumption of the consent of the rest, and for dispatch of business, because ordinations would otherwise have been unreasonably troublesome. But this canonical advantage of Cornelius his cause could not have weighed against the Novatians' plea, had it been indeed a part of God's law to the whole Church, that apostates be not re-admitted to penance. For this, not only the Novatians stood upon, but afterwards, under the persecution of Diocletian, the Meletians fell away from the Church upon no other quarrel: as you may see by Epiphanius, Hær. lxviii. In that case, therefore, the authority of the rest of the Church must have overswayed the authority of the resort of the Church of Rome, the greatest part whereof by much was for Cornelius. And because it was a point hitherto not decided, but taken for questionable in the Church, therefore it comes to the sentence of the Church. Now it is a question, not to be answered by those who make the pope in behalf of the Church of Rome monarch over the whole, how then the right of giving law to that Church should depend on other Churches; as here manifestly it doth. For the common interest of Christianity, whether in matter of faith, which is the ground of the dispute, or in the unity of the Church, which it calleth in ques-
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n See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. Tr., c. viii. § 8.

v See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. v. ii. Hær. 68. Meletiani, § 2; Op., tom.
§ 2. note k; Gov. of Prim. Ch., c. xii. i. pp. 717. C, sq. And see also Bk. I.
§ 6; Epil. Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 41.
tion, is that which makes the Novatians, whether heretics or schismatics, not acknowledging Cornelius after that he was acknowledged by the rest of the Church. And for this cause it is, that the Church of Antioch (that is, the synod whereof that Church was the head) challengeth a return from the Church of Rome for the favour they did it in settling Cornelius, which they made great difficulty to do a great while; as you may remember by that which I related in the first Book. For supposing, that the Church of Antioch did no more in the business than right required; yet, as the world goes, he that hath right done him, may well acknowledge himself obliged to him that doth him right. In the mean time St. Cyprian, and the Church of Carthage, with the dependencies of it, declare for Cornelius from the beginning: Dionysius, with his Church of Alexandria, and the dependences thereof, upon due information are won to their side: neither could Fabius and the Churches that resorted to Antioch have stood out, without great mischief to the whole: and, therefore, what thanks soever they may deserve of the Church of Rome for doing their duty in such a distress of it, who can say, that the sovereign power of the Church of Rome obliged them to make it sovereign de facto (which, being divided, de jure it was not), when it is so evident, that the unity of the Church obliged them, each in their several ranks, to concur to that means which God had provided for the maintenance of it, by establishing the Church of Rome in the first place?

§ 6. In the business that fell out about rebaptizing heretics that returned to the Church, when we see the Church of Rome alone engaged against the Churches of Africk and of the East both (for you must remember what I observed afore, that those, who made the most difficulty in disowning Novatianus, were the same that stood for rebaptizing heretics with the African Churches on their side); we are bound to presume, that many and great Churches depended upon it, to weigh against so great a consent of the point of fact it is evident, that it was the rest part, that obliged the rest to join the consent of the greatest part with it: and in point of right the presumption is peremptory, that the greatest part of God’s law, but walked

* See ibid., § 15.
* See ibid., § 18, 19.
* Ibid., § 18.
within those bounds which God had confined His Church with. We are not then to marvel so much at the heats which passed between Stephen, bishop of Rome, on one side, and St. Cyprian of Carthage, and Firmilianus, chief bishop of Pontus, on the other side. For it is evident, that they referred not themselves to Stephen's opinion concerning God's law, whose successors are now pretended infallible; and yet did refer themselves to the judgment of the whole Church, departing from their rigour in consideration of it. In the mean time, it must not be neglected, that Rome, having Dionysius of Alexandria to side with it, was able to weigh against so great a consent; which giveth no leave to abate any thing of the regular pre-eminence of it above other Churches. But when we see, that neither Rome prevailed, that no heretics should be rebaptized, nor the adverse party, that all: but an abatement is made by the council of Nicaea, in rebaptizing Samosatenians; of Laodicea, in rebaptizing Montanists; by the Churches of Africa (the practice whereof Optatus relates), in rebaptizing Sabellians (to say nothing of other rules mentioned in the first Book): did they take, shall we say, the breast of the pope for the centre of infallibility in the Church; or the voice of the whole Church for evidence of tradition from the apostles, and the sentence thereof to be without appeal in matters not determined by it?

§ 7. Neither will I pass by that little that we have upon record in the case of Dionysius of Alexandria, complained of to Dionysius of Rome, as inclining to that, which was afterwards the heresy of Arius, in things that he had written against Sabellius; without observing (not, as most do, that in so great a case recourse is had to the Church of Rome and
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to no Church besides it, but) that there is no remembrance left of any recourse had to other Churches, whenas there is remembrance of the recourse that was had to the Church of Rome, in it. For it appeareth by the course that was held in other cases, that the ordinary way was to communicate matters concerning the common interest with as many Churches as there was convenience to do; as expecting redress by their concurrence and assistance. And therefore I count it ridiculous to suppose, that a matter of so great concernment was not referred to any but the bishop of Rome, because it is not recorded of any besides it. For what reason or sense is there to expect, that, when we are so scant of records in the first ages of the Church, we should find in every particular business remembrance of that which was always done? But when in this, as in all other cases which I have touched, you find recourse always had to the Church of Rome, but very little or no mention of other Churches (in the west especially), though concerned in the matter as much as it; shall we not take it for an argument, that they usually referred themselves to the Church of Rome, expecting satisfaction in their common interests from the trust which they reposed in it?

§ 8. In the matter of Samosatenus\(^a\), there are two passages, expressly signifying the two chief points of my position. Read the letter of the synod, giving account of their proceedings to all Churches\(^o\); and tell me, who can have the confidence to maintain, that the force of their sentence depended only upon the pope's allowance. It is true, the letter is written on purpose to obtain the consent of other Churches by giving them account of their proceedings. For they did not presume of the justice of them upon any visible circumstance of the persons, place, manner, or form, in which they were assembled. This they expected from the matter and ground of their sentence, and the way of proceeding to it. But when the same account, that is given to Rome, is given to other Churches, every one as they were of consequence to the whole\(^p\); neither can the approbation of one be supposed

\(^a\) See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 21, 22.
\(^o\) Ibid., § 21. note n.
\(^p\) For the clause beginning "every one," is substituted in margin in MS., "not to the least Churches, but to the chief, as of most consequence to produce the consent of the whole."
to oblige the whole, nor doth any thing hinder it to be held for the head or prime part of the whole, and of most consequence to sway the resolution of the whole; in which the presumption that the sentence is according to right becometh complete. But when the secular power is called upon to give execution to it by the force of this world, Aurelian the emperor suspendeth his proceeding upon the resolution of Rome and Italy. Whereby he sheweth, that these were held to be of most regard and consequence in matters that concerned the whole. For seeing Aurelian, at that time having a good opinion of Christians (whom a while after he persecuted), determined to do them a favour in quieting their differences by way of right; it cannot be imagined, that he would take a course which they should refuse, but such as the order of the Church established before did require. And therefore the allowance of the bishops of Rome and Italy is expressed for a just presumption, that an act done by such a synod, and afterwards acknowledged by them, could not be disowned by the rest of the Church. In the mean time, when he names the bishops of Rome and Italy, I must not omit an opinion that hath been published many years since, because it seems considerable: the ground whereof is this; that Sextus Aurelius Victor (Epit., in Adriano) reports, that the government of the Roman empire, which was afterwards established by Constantine, was first moulded and framed in the most material points of it by Adrian; whereupon it becomes probable, that, when Aurelian refers himself to the judgment of the bishops of Rome and Italy, the meaning is, to the bishops of Rome and Milan, and the rest of those Churches that resorted unto Rome and Milan, as the chief Churches upon which they depended. For that after Constantine Milan was the head of all the rest of those provinces of Italy that re-

\[\text{8 See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 22. note c, § 26. note u: from Euseb., H. E., lib. vii. c. 50.}
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OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

CHAP. XIX.

is not to the Church of Rome, it is so manifest, that I will not trouble the reader with proving it here again.

§ 9. There are, besides, some cases mentioned in St. Cyprian's Epistles, of great force to clear the terms upon which the unity of the Church subsisted, as well as the being and constitution of it; which some of them have been already alleged to evidence.

§ 10. Basilides, bishop of Asturica in Spain, convicted of apostasy in persecution to the worship of idols, was deposed by the bishops of those quarters, and another settled in his stead. He repairs to Stephen bishop of Rome, to obtain by false information and favour his sentence, to restore or to confirm him. St. Cyprian excuses Stephen as circumvented, blaming him that did it, but not for going to Rome, or seeking to be restored by that means. For, to say truth, he must have blamed the contrary party, that had recourse to Carthage, seeking to maintain what they had done by the sentence of the Church of Carthage; which that sixty-eighth Epistle carries, as well for Martialis, bishop (it seems) of Emerita in Spain, as Basilides, whom for the like crime he judges unworthy to hold his bishopric.

§ 11. Again, Marcianus, bishop of Arles, adhered to Novatianus; as St. Cyprian was informed by the bishop of Lyons. Hereupon he writes to Stephen at Rome, to write into Gaul for the deposing of Marcianus, and the settling of another in his stead; Epist. lxvii.

§ 12. Again, Felicissimus and Fortunatus, presbyters of the Church of Carthage under St. Cyprian, with others to the number of five, having made a party to restore those that were fallen away in persecution, contrary to the resolution of the Church, which had referred it to a council (as we learn by St. Cyprian, Epist. xxxviii. and xl.), with Fortunatus, a bishop of this party, betaking themselves to Rome, are first refused by Cornelius; but, upon appearance of a party in his Church for them, put him to a stand. In this case St. Cy-
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prian, writing his fifty-fifth Epistle, acknowledges the Church of Rome the seat of St. Peter and the principal Church, whence the unity of the priesthood was sprung: but maintains, that every bishop hath a portion of Christ's flock assigned him to govern, upon his account to Christ; and, therefore, that causes are to be ended where they rise, and the good intelligence between bishops ought not to be interrupted by carrying causes abroad to be judged again.

§ 13. Is not all this true, supposing the case? For who can choose but blame a schismatical attempt? But could any man hinder Basilides and Martialis from seeking the Church of Rome, had their cause been good, seeing their adverse party did and might seek to foreign Churches? Was it not necessary to seek both to Carthage and to Rome for the freeing of the Church of Arles under Marcianus from communion with the Novatians? Here I conceive lies the truth. Some causes of necessity have recourse to the Church of Rome; to wit, such as necessarily concern the whole Church, either in the faith, or in the unity of it. Such was the cause of Marcianus, which could not be ended but by the same consent which cast the Novatians out of the Church. Was the cause of Basilides and Martialis of the same weight? Was it not merely personal, and concerning matter of fact, whether they had indeed sacrificed to idols or not; no question remaining in point of right, that such could not be bishops? Yet could not the bishops of Spain overrule the bishop of Rome, not to receive information from the aggrieved. Their way was, to have recourse to other Churches; the consent whereof might outweigh the Church of Rome, together with the goodness of the cause. And the Church of Carthage

"Post ista... navigare audient, et ad Petri cathedram atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos... ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum. Quae autem causa veniendi et pseudo-episcopum contra episcopos factum nunciani?... Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, et sequum sit pariter ac justum, ut unusquisque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis pastori- bus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus; oportet utique eos quibus presumus non circumcursare, nec episcoporum concordiam cohaerentem sua subdola et fallaci temperatiae collidere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui crimini possint; nisi si paucia desperatis et perditis uinorum videtur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, qui jam de illis judicaverunt," &c. Id., Epist. lix. (Pamela. lv.), Cornelio; Epist., pp. 135—137.
must have done the same, had Felicissimus and Fortunatus found reception at Rome, and credit to balance their cause against St. Cyprian and the African Church. So that, causes of faith necessarily concerning the whole Church whenever they render the peace thereof questionable, those, that for their weight do not concern the whole, will concern it, when they render the peace thereof questionable. And so long as law provideth not bounds to determine what causes shall be ended at home in the parts where they rise, what cause is there that may not be pretended to concern the whole, and by consequence the Church of Rome? which being the principal Church, what cause concerning the whole can end without it? He, that admits not this supposition, consisting in the regular pre-eminence, denying the unlimited power, of the Church of Rome over other Churches, will never give a reason, why recourse is always had to the Church of Rome; and yet, if the cause require, to other Churches, to balance it. The unity of the Church, and communion with it, is the thing that is sought. The consent of the greatest Churches (that of Rome in the first place) is the means to obtain it.

§ 14. This business therefore is much of kin to that of the Donatists under Constantine: when they petitioned the secular power, that they might be heard by the bishops of Gaul, intimating the reason, why they declined the bishops of Italy, to be, because they might be tainted with falling away or shuffling in the persecution of Diocletian, which they charged their adverse party in Africk with; because they express this for the ground of their petition (in Optatus i.), that under Constantius there had been no persecution in Gaul. Here I must pass by the consideration of any thing that may concern the dispute between secular and ecclesiastical power, as not concerning this place. But when Constantine by his answer assigns them for judges the bishops of Rome and Milan with such and such of their suffragans, joining with

---


\[e\] "Rogamus te, Constantine op- time imperator, quoniam de genere justo es, cujus pater inter cæteros im- peratores persecutionem non exercuit, et ab hoc facinore", (scil. traditionis)

them the bishops of Collen, Autun, and Arles in Gaul, to satisfy them: it is plain, that he refuses them to transgress that respect, which the constitution of the Church challenged for the Churches of Rome and Milan; that such causes as concerned the unity of the Church in the western parts of the empire should be determined (not by the pope alone, nor the Church of Rome alone, but) by the Churches of Rome and Milan, as the chief Churches of that part of the empire; the Church of Rome always in the first place. On the other side, when the Donatists, not satisfied with their sentence, petition the emperor again, that it may be reviewed, and the emperor adjourns them for a second trial to a council at Arles: it is plain, that he allows them not an appeal from the former sentence, because many of those, that were judges in the former synod, did vote in the latter synod; but it is as plain, that the parties then held not the pope's judgment (either alone or in council) unquestionable, unless all were mad, in pretending to give either check or strength to that sentence which was originally unquestionable. If, therefore, a sentence given by the pope in a council of Italy, [with b] some Gaulish bishops joined thereunto, might be revised in a fuller council of Gaulish bishops, with the concurrence of many others, as well Italian and Spanish (to say nothing of three from Britain, the first unquestionable record of the British Churches): is it not manifest, that Euclid's axiom—that the whole is greater than any part of it—takes place in the Church; as well as the words of St. Jerome, "Orbis major est urbe," that "the world is greater than the city of Rome?" Surely, if St. Augustine (Epist. clxxi.) say well, that the Donatists might have appealed to a general council, had they been justly grieved by the sentence at Rome; his say-

---

1 Misprinted "which," in folio edition.
ing will hold, if they had been grieved by the council of Arles, though concluding the western Church: but it will hold also of the council of Arles, that it had been madness to call it, had not the generality thereof extended to conclude the western Church further than the former at Rome, though the cause came not to it by appeal.

CHAPTER XX.


Here, the next consideration for time being that of the council of Nicæa, the sixth canon whereof first limited by written law the pre-eminences of Churches in the empire, having taken place by custom before, I will not repeat that ground for councils and for their authority, which I have laid in the first Book; nor bound the right of civil and ecclesiastical power in giving force to the acts of them, which I reserve for the end of this third Book: but, to evidence the constitution of them, from whence their authority in the Church must proceed, I maintain here from the premisses, that the original constitution of the Church determineth the person of the bishop to represent his respective Church in council; and that the constitution of councils, consisting of bishops representing their respective Churches, evidenceth the authority of bishops in the same; which produceth the effect of obliging, either the whole Church, or that part which the council representeth, by the consent of [their]

\[\text{footnotes:}
\begin{align*}
\text{See below, § 11.} & \quad \text{c. xxxii.} \\
\text{Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. viii.} & \quad \text{Added from MS.}
\end{align*}
\]
§ 2. The act of the council of Jerusalem under the apostles, Act. xv., was respective to the Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch, with those which were planted from thence by Paul and Barnabas; but made by an authority sufficient to oblige the whole Church. The elders which concurred to the vote with the apostles, those, that will be so ridiculous, may take for lay-elders or presbyters; but will never tell us, how the votes of lay-elders should oblige the Church of Antioch and the plantations of it. They were the elders, who, joined with the apostles (from whom they could not be disjoined), were able to oblige the whole Church. And indeed there is no mention of them in the acts of choosing Matthias, and the seven deacons, Acts i., vi.; which acts concerned the whole Church. And therefore there is appearance, that the authority, which they always had in respect of the Church to be constituted, was by that time known to be limited by the allowance and consent of the apostles. But when I granted, that St. Paul seems to allow both the Romans and the Corinthians to eat things sacrificed to idols, as God's creatures: I did not grant, that his authority could derogate from the act of the apostles; but that the act of the apostles was only intended for the Churches represented at the doing of it. As that which was done Acts xxii., how great soever the authority might be that did it, seems to extend no further than the occasion in hand. That which remains, then, in the Scriptures, agreeth perfectly well with the original practice of the whole Church.

§ 3. It cannot be denied, that there are here and there in the records of the Church instances evidencing the sitting of presbyters in council; which I deny not must needs import the privilege of voting. But the reason of their appearing there appears so often to be particular, by commission from their bishops, and to supply their absence; that there is no means in the world to darken this evidence for the super-i

\[\text{Acts xxi. 18—25.}\]

\[\text{How it happened, that presbyters occasionally sat and voted in councils.}\]

\[\text{c. xxiv. § 18—21.}\]

\[\text{§ 4. note l.}\]

\[\text{Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr.,}\]

\[\text{Corrected from MS.; misprinted "of" in folio edition.}\]

\[\text{"Is there any reason to doubt, but the elders, who joined with the apostles Acts xv., were the bishops of Jerusalem and Judæa?" Added in MS. at the top of the page. See above, c. xvii.}\]

\[\text{Corrected from MS.; "not," in orig. text.}\]

\[\text{See Bilson, Perp. Gov. of Christ's Church, c. xvi. pp. 391, 392. Lond. 1610:—Field, Of the Church, bk. v. c. 30. pp. 513, 514. Oxf. 1628:—Bingham, II. xix. 13.}\]
riority of bishops. For can it possibly be imagined, that the bishop should always represent his Church in all councils, without choice or other act to depute him, were he no more than the first of the presbyters? Is it not evident, that the whole Church always took him for the person, without whom nothing could be done in the Church; which, whether in council or out of council, never dealt with his Church but by him, always with his Church by his means?

§ 4. Now, for the authority of councils thus constituted: though, for peace' sake, and because an end must be had, the resolution of all councils must come from number of votes, which sways the determinations of all assemblies; yet there is thereupon a respect to be had to the provinces or parts of the Church, which those that vote do represent; unless we will impute it to blame to those that suffer wrong, if they submit not themselves to the determinations of those, whom themselves have more right to oblige. This consideration resolves into the grounds of the dependence of less Churches upon greater Churches, all standing in the likelihood of propagating Christianity out of greater cities into the less, and of governing the Church in unity by submitting less residences to greater, rather than on the contrary: which is such a principle, that all men of capacity will acknowledge; but all would not stand convict of, had not the Church admitted it into effect from their founders, before they were convict of the effect of it by human foresight. Upon this supposition, the Church cannot properly be obliged by the plurality of bishops, who all have right to vote in council; but by the greatness and weight of the Churches for whom they serve, concurring to a vote. And hereof there be many traces in the histories of the Church; when they mention the deputation of some few bishops, representing numerous provinces, which for distance of place or other peremptory hindrances could not be present so frequent as others. For can this be a reasonable cause, why they should be obliged by the votes of those who were present in greater number?

§ 5. [This is] the true reason, why the decrees of councils have not always had, nor ought always to have, the force and

---

* Corrected from MS.; "in," in orig. text.

7 See Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. orig. text.

THORNDIKE.
effect of definitive sentences, but of strong prejudices, to sway the consent of the whole:—because there was never any council so truly general, that all parts concerned were represented by number of votes proportionable to the interest of the Churches for whom they serve; for certainly greater is the interest of greater Churches. Which case whenever it comes to pass, those, that are not content, have reason to allege, that they are not to be tied by the vote of others but by their own consent. And therefore the unity of the Church requireth, that there be just presumption, upon the matter of decrees, that they will be admitted by those who concur not to them, as no less for their good than for the good of the rest of the Church.

§ 6. In the mean time, the pretence of the pope's infinite power remains inconsistent with the very pretence of calling a council. For why so much trouble, to obtain a vote that shall signify nothing without his consent, his single sentence obli: Ing no less?

§ 7. These are the grounds of that aristocracy, in which the Church was originally governed by the constitution of the apostles (unless we will think, that a constant order, visible in all the proceedings thereof, could have come from the voluntary consent of Christendom, not prevented by any obligation, and drawing every part of it towards their several interests): which makes the obligation of councils, and their decrees, harder to be obtained, but, when once obtained, more firm and sure; as not tending to destroy the original way of maintaining unity by the free correspondence and consent of those who are concerned, but to shorten the trouble of obtaining it. And if this were understood by the name of the hierarchy, why should not the simplicity of apostolical Christianity own it?

§ 8. Now because the greatness of Churches depended, by the ground laid, upon the greatness of the cities; which was in some sort ambulatory, till it was settled by the rule of the empire, begun by Adrian and completed by Constantine*: my meaning will neither be clear nor evident, unless I limit the greatness of Churches by such degrees, as took place afterwards, when Constantine, having put the civil govern-

* See above in c. xix. § 8. note a.
ment of the empire under four \textit{prefectis pratorio} (whom we may call in English, "masters of his palace"), appointed every one of them several lieutenants in their several quarters: as him of Gaul (to speak of the west, which concerns us most), one in Britain, one in Gaul, and one in Spain; him of Italy, one at Rome, one at Milan, and one at Carthage in Africk, which was laid to that government; him of the east, one at Alexandria for Egypt, one at Antiochia for that quarter which was properly called the east of the empire, one at Cæsarea for Pontus, one at Ephesus for Asia, and one at Constantinople for Thrace; and him of Illyricum, one for the east of it at Thessalonica, one for the west of it

\[177\] at Sirmium. For every one of these lieutenants having under his disposition a certain mass or number of provinces, and every one of these provinces a certain chief city (the seat of the civil government as well as the chief Church of the province), and the residences of the lieutenants themselves being the resorts of the appeals out of the provinces, the rule of the Church remains settled by the subject of it; the Churches of the head cities of every diocese (so they called that mass of provinces which was allotted to each lieutenant) challenging a regular pre-eminence over the Churches of the chief cities of other provinces, as they over the Churches of ordinary cities within the same province. But as it would be ridiculous to attribute these pre-eminences to the secular power, because it createth the civil pre-eminences of the cities, and not to the Church, which, presupposing the act of civil power, cast itself into the like form (for the same rule was in force, when the empire, enemy to the Church, did nothing in it); so I shall challenge all men, that "have their senses exercised to discerner" of such matters, to judge, whether all Christians could have agreed of their own heads to yield these pre-eminences, had they not found the rule delivered them by the apostles

\[\text{Heb. v. 14.}\]

\[b\] Corrected from MS.; misprinted "some," in orig. text.
to require it. For it is manifest, that from the beginning, afore Constantine, there was respect had to the pre-eminence of Churches proportionably to the greatness of their cities in the government of the empire; the instances of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Thessalonica, Cæsarea, Carthage, Milan, Lyons, and others, as others come to be mentioned in the records of the Church, not admitting any visible exception to a rule so originally, so generally, so evidently received.

§ 9. Therefore, as for that plea, which the Church of Rome advanceth so far beyond reason and measure, of St. Peter's headship by divine right, of his sitting last at Rome, before at Antioch, and by his deputy St. Mark at Alexandria, as if all the Churches of Asia, Afric, and Europe, were by this means of his lot*: if we take it as it sounds, it will appear a contradiction to the light of common reason, that the Church of Rome should have that pre-eminence by being the seat of the first apostle, to which other Churches have nothing proportionable by having been the seats of other apostles. For had there not been more in the case, that which Epiphanius, Hær. lxx.4, saith,—that, had the controversy about keeping Easter risen before the removing of the Church of Jerusalem to Pella, at the beginning, under the apostles, it must have resorted thither,—must have taken place always; that is, the Church of Jerusalem, which was at the first the seat of all the apostles, must have been for ever the chief Church. But if we suppose, that the apostles' order was, the greatest Churches to be those of the greatest cities; we give a reason of the greatness of the Church of Rome, from the privilege, not of St. Peter alone, but of St. Peter as the chief apostle, and [of§] St. Paul as him that laboured most, when they upon that agreement made choice


* Corrected from MS. "as," in orig. text.—Compare Arnald's scheme, founding the papal supremacy upon St. Peter and St. Paul both; for which see Gieseler, Eccl. Hist., Period II. Div. i. c. iii. § 94. vol. i. p. 443. Davidson's transl.
of Rome for their seat and the exercise of their apostleship. But that the Church of Alexandria (the privileges whereof never extended beyond the diocese of the governor of Egypt, lieutenant in that quarter) should have right over all the Churches of Africk, that the Church of Antioch (the privileges whereof were never visible beyond the diocese of the east) should have right over all the Churches of Asia, by St. Peter’s headship (and yet Alexandria, where he never sat but in and by St. Mark, before Antioch, where he sat in person seven years)—is such a device, as nothing but prejudice and faction can make probable.

§ 10. For the right, then, of summoning and ordering councils: if we speak of provincial councils, it is manifestly in the bishop of the mother city, which succession hath called the archbishop; if of a greater resort, in the first bishop of a diocese, called since the primate; if it were gathered out of several dioceses (whereof we have an instance in that of Antioch against Samosatenus, out of Pontus and Asia as well as the east), it is to be ascribed to the authority of the greatest and next bishops concurring to quench the fire in their neighbour Church, as Firmianus of Cæsarea and Macarius of Jerusalem were presidents in that of Antioch. For though the privileges of the Church were settled upon the form of the empire, yet it seemeth there was always an exception for that of Jerusalem (as having been the mother Church before the rule was to take place), not only by the canon of Nicæa, which now I come to, but by the act of Chalcedon, which made it absolute within certain quarters, utterly exempted from Antioch by a concordat confirmed in council.

§ 11. The canon of Nicæa, which I spoke of, is thought to be of Rome for their seat and the exercise of their apostleship. But that the Church of Alexandria (the privileges whereof never extended beyond the diocese of the governor of Egypt, lieutenant in that quarter) should have right over all the Churches of Africk, that the Church of Antioch (the privileges whereof were never visible beyond the diocese of the east) should have right over all the Churches of Asia, by St. Peter’s headship (and yet Alexandria, where he never sat but in and by St. Mark, before Antioch, where he sat in person seven years)—is such a device, as nothing but prejudice and faction can make probable.

§ 10. For the right, then, of summoning and ordering councils: if we speak of provincial councils, it is manifestly in the bishop of the mother city, which succession hath called the archbishop; if of a greater resort, in the first bishop of a diocese, called since the primate; if it were gathered out of several dioceses (whereof we have an instance in that of Antioch against Samosatenus, out of Pontus and Asia as well as the east), it is to be ascribed to the authority of the greatest and next bishops concurring to quench the fire in their neighbour Church, as Firmianus of Cæsarea and Macarius of Jerusalem were presidents in that of Antioch. For though the privileges of the Church were settled upon the form of the empire, yet it seemeth there was always an exception for that of Jerusalem (as having been the mother Church before the rule was to take place), not only by the canon of Nicæa, which now I come to, but by the act of Chalcedon, which made it absolute within certain quarters, utterly exempted from Antioch by a concordat confirmed in council.

§ 11. The canon of Nicæa, which I spoke of, is thought to be of the sixth canon of the council of Nicæa.

b Cave, Anc. Ch. Gov., c. iv. § 6; Bingham, ix. i. 6, and ii. 6, and even Simond, in his tracts quoted below § 12. note v.

Cave, ibid., § 6: Bingham, IX. i. 6; ii. 9, sq.

k Euseb., H. E., lib. vii. c. 28. p. 278. A.

l Corrected from M.S.: “bishop,” in orig. text.

m See below, § 11. note o.

n The council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), can. xxvii. (ap. LAbb., Conc., tom. iv. p. 769. A—C.), “πανταχου τοις των άγιων πατέρων δροις έπομενοι, και των άρτιων άνάγυμβατα και των άνθρωπων άκτος εις τοις των άγιων πατέρων δροις έπομενοι, και των άρτιων άνάγυμβατα και των άνθρωπων άκτος εις τοις των άγιων πατέρων δροις έπομενοι,

1 Corrected from M.S.: “bishop,” in orig. text.

m See below, § 11. note o.

n The council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), can. xxvii. (ap. LAbb., Conc., tom. iv. p. 769. A—C.), “πανταχου τοις των άγιων πατέρων δροις έπομενοι, και των άρτιων άνάγυμβατα και των άνθρωπων άκτος εις τοις των άγιων πατέρων δροις έπομενοι,

1 Corrected from M.S.: “bishop,” in orig. text.

m See below, § 11. note o.

n The council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), can. xxvii. (ap. LAbb., Conc., tom. iv. p. 769. A—C.), “πανταχου τοις των άγιων πατέρων δροις έπομενοι, και των άρτιων άνάγυμβατα και των άνθρωπων άκτος εις τοις των άγιων πατέρων δροις έπομενοι,

1 Corrected from M.S.: “bishop,” in orig. text.
have been made upon occasion of the schism of Meletius in Egypt, which had withdrawn the Churches there from their obedience to Alexandria; for it orders, that the ancient rights thereof be maintained, as also those of Antiochia (with an exception for Jerusalem, saving the respect due to the mother see of Cæarea), because the Church of Rome also hath the like privilege over those Churches, which Ruffinus in his histories of the Church translates "suburbicarias."

§ 12. This translation hath occasioned many books, to shew, what were these "ecclesia suburbicariae;" whereof it seems there are but three meanings possible. There was then a governor of the city of Rome, to whom resorted all appeals from the magistrates of the city and within a hundred miles; all which country being comprised in one title of "regiones suburbicariae," there is an opinion, that the Churches of that precinct, by the name of "ecclesia suburbicariae," were then of the pope’s jurisdiction, and they alone. Another conceit may be, that "urbs" in the derivative "sub-


p Misprinted "these," in folio edition.

q Ruffinus in his translation of Eusebius, H. E., lib. x. c. 6, abridges the sixth canon of the Nicene council thus — "Ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Romana vetusta, conuenutum servetur, ut vel ille Ἕβγυτο vel hic suburbicarium ecclesiæm sollicitudinem gerat."

r Altered in MS. into "those;" the alteration being apparently intended for the word a few lines back.

* See notes t—v below. Of writers later than Thorndike, Launoy published a tract on the subject in 1652, answered by H. Valesius, Observ. Eccles. in Socratem et Sozomenum, lib. iii., in 1668, and defended by Launoy in another tract in 1671. For others still later, e. g. Cave, Dupin, &c., see Bingham, IX. i. 9.


2 Morinus, Exercit. Eccles., lib. i. Exerc. 30. pp. 237—254, maintains something like this: viz., that "suburbicarium" means whatever is subject to "urbs;" the city, i. e. Rome; and, therefore, between Augustus and Constantine was equivalent to the whole world, but after Constantine, and the division of the empire into East and West, and so in the time of Ruffinus, was only equivalent to half this extent, viz., the Western empire.—So also Sirmond, as below in note v.—Cardinal Perron (Replique a la Response &c., liv. i. c. 33. pp. 232. sq.) prefers an explanation equivalent to that of Morinus.—See also Baromius, Annal. in an. 323. numm. 184, 135.—Bellarmine, De Rom. Pontif., lib. ii. c. 13. (Controv.,}
"urbicariae" is opposed to "orbis," and all Churches in the world subject to the canon to the Church of Rome, as all cities were to Rome. Which is for nothing. For what jurisdiction had any civil magistrate that governed Rome over other cities without the precinct of it? And yet shall we be so ridiculous, the canon describing the privileges of the Church of Rome by those of Alexandria, which extended as far as the government of Egypt, to confine those of the prime Church of the empire within the hundred miles? I suppose, therefore, they have far the best cause, who suppose those to be called "regiones suburbicariae," which were under the lieutenant of Rome; in opposition to the lieutenant of Italy, resident at Milan, having under him seven of those provinces, into which that government was then divided: in which regard the other ten provinces, which were under the lieutenant of the city resident at Rome, are properly called "suburbicariae," though part of them were the isles of Sicilia, Sardinia, and Corsica, &c.

§ 13. And here lies the greatest question, nothing else bearing water in my judgment. For by this canon all the right and title of the Church of Rome is to be measured by the right of any one of those Churches, which were the heads of dioceses (taking dioceses for the residences of lieutenants); all which are to be supposed equal in power, granting only Rome the precedence, which all order requires. For what right can the Church of Rome challenge, which this canon acknowledges not? Is it right or wrong, which the decree of the whole Church alloweth not? Strongly argued, I confess; which notwithstanding I am not satisfied with. For the intent of the canon being to settle the rights of Alexandria, is satisfied by rehearsing the like rights in the Churches of Rome and Antiochia; which

---

[How far this canon limiteth the right and title of the Church of Rome.]

tom. i. p. 749. A.), gets rid of the question by declaring Ruffinus in error. * So, among others, Berterius, Pitam., Ditr. i. c. 5. p. 26; c. 5. p. 48.—Sirmond also in his various tracts in reply to Gothofred and Salmusius (in tom. iv. pp. 1, sq., of his collected Works, Paris 1690), maintains this interpretation of the Regiones suburbicarium, but denies that the ecclesiastical corresponded with the civil provinces: and interprets Ruffinus, much as Morinus does, to mean by the phrase the whole Western Church, as constituting the pope's Patriarchate; in distinction from his episcopal, metropolitan, primatial, authority, on the one side, and on the other his papal supremacy over the whole Church. His first concession however appears really to cut away the foundation of his whole argument. See also Cave, Anc. Ch. Gov., cc. iii. v.: Bagnase, Hist. de l'Eglise, P. i. liv. vii. c. iv. § 4. sq. tom. i. pp. 351, sq.: and Bingham, IX. i. 9—12.
by supposing as in force of old, it setteth for the future. But is this to declare and limit the title thereof in regard of the rest, especially for the western Church, which the council had no occasion to meddle with? Judge, first, by that which appears. In the greatest concerns of the Church, concerning Montanus, concerning the keeping of Easter, concerning the cause of the Novatians, of re-baptizing heretics, of Paulus Samosatenus, of the Donatists, of Dionysius Alexandrinus; in fine, concerning those which I mentioned out of St. Cyprian's Epistles*: what one Church can there be named, to the concurrence whereof the like respect hath been had in things concerning the faith and unity of the whole, as that of Rome? For that which follows, I think there remains no dispute; the privileges thereof still increasing, as well by the acts of councils as by custom and use. And of that I must demand a reason, how they should come to be cast upon one, had there not been from the beginning a stock of title, exclusive to any other of the greatest Churches (acknowledging the order of the apostles to have provided no further, than that the Churches of the chief cities should be the chief Churches, leaving the rest to the Church upon consideration of the state of the world to determine).

§ 14. One particular I must insist upon for the eminence of it. I have already mentioned the general councils; whereof how many can be counted general by number of present votes? The authority of them, then, must arise from the admitting of them by the western Churches. And this admission, what can it be ascribed to, but the authority of the Church of Rome, eminently involved above all the Churches of the west in the summoning and holding of them, and by consequence in their decrees?

§ 15. And, indeed, in the troubles that passed between the east and the west from the council of Nicea, though the western Churches have acted by their representatives upon eminent occasions in great councils (as the Churches of Britain had their bishops at the first council of Arles7, at the councils of Sardica4, and of Ariminus8), in other occasions

---

* Above, c. xix. § 1—14.
† See above, c. xix. § 14. notes i, j.
‡ A.D. 347: see Ussher, Brit. Eccl.
§ Antiq., c. viii., Works, vol. v. p. 237; on the authority of SS. Athanasius and Hilary. And so also Selden and others.
they may justly seem to refer themselves to that Church, as
resolving to regulate themselves by the acts of it: so that
St. Jerome might very well name Rome and the west as the
same party in his seventy-seventh Epistle—“Hæreticum
me cum occidente, hæreticum cum Egypto, hoc est, cum Da-
maso Petrogue condemnent”—“Let them condemn me for a
heretic with the west and with Egypt; that is, with Da-
And against Vigilantius, he calls the western Churches the
Churches of the apostolic see. So St. Basil calls the bishop of
Rome “δυτικῶν κορυφῶν”—“the crown of the west;”
Epist. x.d And St. Augustin (Cont. Jul. Pelag. i. 2.):
“Puto tibi eam partem orbis sufficere debere, in qua primum apo-
lorum suorum voluit Dominus glorioso martyrio coronare;
cui ecclesia presidentem beatam Innocentium si audire volu-
isses,” &c.—“I conceive that part of the world should serve
your turn, in which it pleased God to crown with a glorious
martyrdom the first of His apostles; the president of which
Church, blessed Innocent, if you would have heard,” &c.
He supposes Innocent, being over the Church of Rome, to
be over the western Church. In the council of Ephesus,
St. Cyril threatens John of Jerusalem, that those, who will
have communion with the west, must submit to the sentence
of the synod at Rome against Nestorius; Part i. cap. xxi. The
letter of Pope Agatho to the emperor in the sixth
general council, Act. iv.§, supposes the synods of the Lom-

but see Cave, art. Conc. Sardicense;
and Bramhall, Schism Guarded, sect.
A.D. 359: see Ussher, ibid., p.
235; on the authority of S. Athanasius in
Theodoret and Nicephorus, and others.
S. Hieron., Epist. xv. (olim lxviiii.),
“Quid facient Orientia ecclesiae; quid Αἰγυπτίων et sedis Apostolicae?”
“Εγώ μεν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἢ θυσίᾳν αὐτῶς” (acil. Occidentaliunum) “ἐντε-
στίλλα τῷ κορυφῶ.” S. Basil. M.,
Epist. ccxxxix. (olim x.), Eusebio
Episc. Samosatorem, § 2; Op., tom. iii.
p. 368. E.
lib. i. c. 4 (2 in the text is a mistake),
§ 13: Op., tom. x. p. 503. F.
“Ἡ ἀγία Ῥωμαίων σαφοῦς φανερὰ
tetώπως, καὶ δὴ γεγράφη χρῆς τὴν
συν διελθήσθαι, ὁταν καὶ ἄλλης ἡμεῖς
τοὺς ἀντικείμενος τῆς πρὸς ἑκατὸν τῆς
δόσιν καινωνίας.” Cyril. Alex., ad Joan.
A.D. 431, P. i. c. 21 : ap. Labb., Conc.,
tom. iii. p. 380. B.
Epist. Agathonis et Romanæ Syn-
nodi, . . que fuit velut instructio lega-
torum qui missi sunt ad synodon sext-
tam celebrandum: in Act. Conc. Con-
stantin. III. (A.D. 680), act. iv.: ap.
Labb., Conc., tom. vi. p. 685. C, D.
The letter is addressed to the emperor
Constantine, and apologizes for delay
on the ground of the necessity of con-
sulting brethren scattered among the
nations named above in the text, naming
BOOK III.

bards, Slaves, Franks, Goths, and Britons, to belong to the synod of Rome; and that the council was to expect account of them from it. No otherwise than to the letter of the synod of Rome to the second general council ninety bishops of Italy and Gaul concurred; according to Theodoret. And Cornelius, in St. Hierome's Catalogue, writ to Flavianus, bishop of Antiochia, from the synods of Rome, Gaul, and Africk. Whereby it may appear, how the western Churches always went along with that of Rome.

§ 16. Which though it give not the Church of Rome that privilege over the Churches of eight dioceses, which the canons of Nicea do confirm to the bishops of Alexandria over the diocese of Egypt, and the Church of Antiochia over the eastern dioceses, yet necessarily argueth a singular pre-eminence in it over them all: in regard whereof he is styled patriarch of the west during the regular government of the Church; and, being so acknowledged by King James of excellent memory in his letter to the Cardinal of Perron, may justly charge them to be the cause of dividing the Church, that had rather stand divided than own him in that quality. But granting the Church of Rome to be regularly the seat of the chief patriarch (for so he is styled in the council of Chalcedon Act. iii.), so the emperor Justin calls Hormidas,

especially archbishop Theodore of Canterbury.

a The letter intended is one addressed by pope Damasus and ninety bishops from Italy and Gaul to the bishops of Illyricum about A.D. 389; not to the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. See it in Theodoret, H. E., lib. ii. c. 22. pp. 102. D. sq.


c See above, § 11. note o.


n The letters inserted in the Act. iii. Conc. Chalced. (A.D. 451), ap. Labb., Conc., tom. iv. pp. 385. A, &c., address the pope as "ἀγωνιζόμενον καὶ θεοφιλήτατον πιστούμενον πατριάρχην" (or "αριστερὸν καὶ πατριάρχη") τῆς Ῥώπης," but certainly do not style him absolutely "the chief patriarch," although he is throughout placed first. — See however Cave, Anc. Ch. Gov., c. vi. § 4, for the degree of assent to papal pretensions shewn by the council of Chalcedon.

so Justinian calls the bishop of Rome Nov. cix.\(^p\); and the sixth council, Act. xviii.\(^a\), counts five seats of patriarchs; and if Gregory, Epist. xi. 54\(^a\), acknowledge Spain to have no patriarch, and Innocent III., c. grave De Præb. et Dignit.\(^a\), c. antiqua De Privil.\(^a\), count but four, it is because they would make the pope more than a patriarch): it will nevertheless be questionable, how far it enjoys the same rights throughout the west; or rather unquestionable, that he did not consecrate all the bishops of the west, as he of Alexandria did all the bishops of Egypt, and he of Antiochia all those of the eastern diocese. On the other side, it will be unquestionable, that all causes that concern the whole Church, are to resort to it. And if Innocent I. mean none but those, when he says, that they are excepted from the canon of Nicea, that forbids appeals, Epist. ad Victricium Rothom.\(^a\); he says nothing but that which the constitution of the Church justifies. But the cases produced before out of St. Cyprian\(^v\) shew, that there was much left for custom to determine. Nay, rules of discipline, which in my opinion the good of the whole Church then required that they should be common to all the west, are of this rank; nor could any of them ever oblige the west without the bishop of Rome. But that he


\(^r\) "Hujusmodi suspensionis sententia præter Romani pontificis auctoritate, aut proprii patriarchæ, minime relaxet, ut in hoc quoque quatuor patriarchales sedes specialiter honori


\(^x\) "Si quæ autem cause vel contensiones inter clericos... fuerint exorzæ, ut secundum synodum Nicœnam congregatæ ejusdem provinciæ episcopos jurgium terminetur. Nec alieci liceat, sine praedicto tamen Romanae ecclesiæ, cui in omnibus causis debet reverentia custodiri, ad alias convolare provincias." Innoc. I., Epist. ad Vict. Tric., § 3 (circ. A.D. 402); ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 1256. C, D. The epistle is considered spurious; see Cave.

\(^v\) See above, c. xix. § 9—13.
alone should give rules to tie all the west, may have had a
regular beginning from voluntary references; of Himerius
bishop of Tarragona in Spain to Syricius*, of Exuperius
bishop of Toulouse and Victricius of Rouen to Innocentius;:
but argues not, that it is the original right of that Church;
but that it hath increased by custom to that height, as to
help to make up a claim for that infinite power, which I
deny, instead of that regular power, which I acknowledge.

§ 17. Judge now by reason, supposing the obligation upon
all of holding unity in the Church, and the dependance of
Churches the mean to compass it. For this will oblige us
to part here with the parallel of the empire; which, having
a sovereign upon earth, will require the ministers thereof,
immediate or subordinate, to be of equal power in equal
rights, præfects, lieutenants, and governors: but, the Head
of the Church being in heaven, and His Body on earth being
to be maintained in unity by an aristocracy of superiors and
inferiors, whether was it according to the intent of those,
who ordered the pre-eminence of greater Churches, that the
Church of the greatest city should be equal in power to the
head Churches of other dioceses: or that the general reason
should take place between them all, an eminence of power
following their precedence in rank; so that, whenssoever it
become requisite to limit this generality by positive constitu-
tions, the pre-eminence of right to fall upon one, exclu-
sively to others? Surely, though we suppose that all Chris-
tendom of their free consent agreed in this order, yet must
we needs argue from the uniformity of it, that it must needs
come from the ground settled by the apostles. For [as] it is
manifest, that the rights of the head Churches of provinces
had a beginning beyond the memory of all records of the
Church; which testify the being of them at the time of all
business which they relate: [and] that the head Churches
of dioceses were not advanced in a moment by the act of
the empire, but moulded afore, as it were, and prepared to
receive that impression of regular eminence over inferior
Churches, which the act of the state should stamp the cities

* Epist. Siricii Papæ ad Himerium
1017. B, sq.

7 Epist. Innoc. I. ad Exuperium, ap.
with over inferior cities: [so it*] cannot be maintained, that the greatest respect was and is by the apostles' act to be given to the greatest Churches (that is, the Churches of greatest cities); and yet that the privileges, necessarily accruing by positive constitution, might as justly have been placed upon the head Church of any diocese as upon that of Rome. I know I have no thanks for this of the Romanists;—for, as St. Paul says, how shall I serve God and please men both in such a difference as this?—but, seeing the canon of Nicea doth necessarily confine the Church of Rome to a regular power, is it not a great sign of truth, that those things, which appear in the proceedings of the Church, do concur to evidence a ground for the rule of it; inferring that pre-eminence, which the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch are cannot have, but the beginning of the canon establishing ancient custom setteth? Let us see some of those proceedings.

§ 18. After the council of Nicea, the Arians (having Eusebius of Nicomedia for their head) desire to be heard at Rome by Pope Julius in council concerning their proceedings against Athanasius*. Here, shall I believe, as some learned men conjectureb, that Pope Julius is merely an arbiter named by one party, whom the other could not refuse; and that any bishop, or at least any primate, might have been named, and must have been admitted, as well as he? Truly I cannot: considering, that, their hope being to win themselves credit by his sentence, I must needs think, that they address themselves to him, by whose sentence they might hope to draw the greatest prejudice on their own side. It cannot be denied indeed, that, whereas in a case of that moment the last resort is necessarily to the whole Church, whether in council or by reference, by referring themselves, they brought upon their cause that prejudice, which necessarily lights upon all those, that renounce the award of the arbitrators whom they have referred themselves to, in case they stand not to the sentence. But though they had not been chargeable with this, had they not referred themselves; yet must they needs have been judged by the bishop of

---

* Corrected from M.S.; "yet," in orig. text.


b So e.g. Blondel, De la Primauté en l'Eglise, pp. 72, sq.
Rome, among the rest of the Church, and in the first place; and his sentence must needs weigh more towards the sentence of the whole Church, than the sentence of any other arbitrator could have done. For let me ask in the mean time, is this an appeal to Pope Julius, or to him and his council? Let the sequel judge. For he that condemns the Arians for not appearing at the council which they had occasioned,—he that condemns the council of Antiochia (at the dedication of the golden church, presently after, where they were present) for reversing the creed of Nicæa and condemning St. Athanasius, notwithstanding the sentence of Julius and his council,—necessarily shows us, that they were not quite out of their wits, to bestow so much pains for procuring a decree at the council of Antiochia, that must have been void ipso facto, because the matter had been sentenced at Rome, that is, in the last resort, afore. Therefore I conceive Julius had a right to complain, that they took upon them to regulate the Churches without him; nor can I much blame Socrates or Sozomenus in justifying his complaint: because Athanasius his cause, as well as the creed of Nicæa, concerned the whole Church; and for them to condemn him, whom Julius and his council held at the instance of the Arians had justified, was to make a breach in the Church; though at present we say nothing of the faith. Neither had they reason to allege the good they had done the Church of Rome by their compliance in the cause of Novatianus, or to expect the like from Julius in a cause of the like moment; because of the sentence of the Nicene council already past in the main ground of the cause, and because of the sentence of the synod of Rome past in the cause.


e "Ο Ισόλιος τοις ἐν Ἀρχιερείᾳ συνεχθείσι κατηγόρων ἐκείμητα, πρῶτον μὲν τὸ ἐνακθῆν τῆς αὐτῶν ἑκατοντῆς ἐπιτι πορι κανονίας ποιήσαν, διὸτι εἰς τὴν συνόδον αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐκκλησίαν, τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ κανόνου κελεύστων, μὴ διὰ τὴν γγραφήν τῆς ἑπισκόπου Ῥώμης κανονίζεται τὰς ἐκκλησίας," κ.τ.λ. Soc.-


f Sozomen, H. E., lib. iii. c. 6. p. 504. D; and c. 8. p. 507. D.

So the letter of the Eastern bishops to pope Julius, ap. Sozom., H. E., lib. iii. c. 8. p. 508. C.
§ 19. Now, when this difference comes afterwards to be tried by a general council at Sardica, shall this trial infer the infinite power of the pope, or the regular power of a general council? For surely the council of Sardica was intended for a general council (as the emperor Justinian reckons it); being summoned by both emperors, Constantius and Constans, out of the whole empire. When the breach fell out, and the eastern bishops withdrew themselves to Philippopolis; the whole power, in point of right, ought I conceive to remain on that side, which was not the cause of the breach. But the success sufficiently sheweth, that it did not so prevail. For many a council might then have been spared. The sovereign regard of peace in the Church suffered not those that were in the right to insist upon the acts of it, as I suppose.

§ 20. In the mean time, the canons thereof, whereby appeals to the pope in the causes of bishops are settled (whether for the west, which it represented, or for the whole, which it had right to conclude, not having caused the breach), shall I conceive to be forged, because they are so aspersed; having been acknowledged by Justinian.

---


1 Socrates, ibid., p. 102. B.

2 "Quod si aliquis episcoporum judicatus fuerit in aliqua causa, et putat se bonam concilium rei sancti Petri sancti Petri remus, ut scribatur ab his qui causam examinarunt, Julio Romano episcopo, et si judicaverit renovandum esse judicium, renovetur, et det judices. Si autem probaverit talem causam esse, ut non refringatur ea quae acta sunt; que decreverit, confirmata erunt." Conc. Sardic. can. iii.; ap. Labbi, Conc., tom. ii. p. 645. B: interprete Dion. Exiguus.

2 So Blondel, De la Primauté en l’Eglise, pp. 102, sq.; and see also Nicolaus de Cusa, De Concordantia Catholica, lib. ii. c. 25 (Op., tom. ii. p. 757. Basil. 1566), quoted by bishop Jewel; "Quare satis posset dubitari, an Sardicensis Concilii constitutio existat." And that there are various difficulties as to Greek and Latin copies, variety of numbering, &c., see Richer, as above in note 1.—Michael Geddes also, Essay on Canons of Counc. of Sardica, Miscell. Essays, vol. iii. In fin. Svo. Lond. 1714, alleges, that the canons in question are forged. —For the question raised between pope Zosimus and the African Church, see below, § 22.

3 See above, note j.
translated by Dionysius Exiguus, added by the eastern Church to their canon law. Or shall I not ask, what pretence there could be to settle appeals from other parts to Rome, rather than from Rome to other parts, had not a pre-eminence of power, and not only a precedence of rank, been acknowledged originally in the Church of Rome?

§ 21. But though I think myself bound to acknowledge, that such canons were made by the council at Sardica; yet not that they took effect by the act of it. The canons of councils had not effect, as I said afore, till received. The troubles, that succeeded, might well hinder the admitting of them into practice. And that this exception is not for nothing, I appeal to all that shall but consider, that the canons of the council of Antioch, which the eastern bishops at Sardica stood for, made part of the code of the whole Church, which the council of Chalcedon owned; the canon of Sardica being no part of it till after times.

§ 22. And this is the point, upon which the dispute between the pope and the Churches of Africk about appeals most depends. The case, that brought it to issue, was the case of Apiarius, a priest only, that appealed to Rome. The pope’s legates pretended, that appeals to Rome were settled by the council of Nicæa. The Churches of Africk, finding no such canon of Nicæa in their records, desire, that recourse might be had to Alexandria and Constantinople for the true copies. The true copies import no such thing. But it is alleged, and it is reason it should be alleged, that the appeals of bishops are settled by the canons of the council of Sardica; the very terms whereof are couched in

---


\[r\] The eastern bishops refused to join in the council unless S. Athanasius and his friends were excluded; alleging that sentence had already been passed upon them, seil. by the council held by themselves just before at Antioch. See the Epist. Pseudo-Synod. Sard. ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. pp. 699. E, sq.: and Fleury, xii. 34.


the instructions to the council of Africk*. The council of Sardica was not the council of Nicaea, but the acts of it were done by those who pretended to maintain it. Whether it were justly done, or imported an intent of imposture, to challenge the authority of the canons of Nicaea for the canons of it; I dispute not. But had the case in question been the case of a bishop, as it was only the case of a priest; what could the Churches of Africk have alleged, why they should not be tied by the canons of Sardica, who acknowledged themselves tied by the canons of Nicaea? For there was only the bishop of Carthage present at the council of Nicaea, but there [were] six and thirty African bishops at the council of Sardica; enow to represent all the diocese of Africk, and to tie those whom they represented. What could they allege, but the inexecution of the council of Sardica? Or what greater evidence could they allege for the inexecution of it, than that there was no copy of any such canon in the records of all their Churches? Or how could the pope desire a fairer pretence for the execution of it for the future, than the concurrence of the African Churches by so many bishops? For though the council of Sardica is quoted in that which is called the sixth council of Carthage, yet the whole issue of the business was only, whether they were Nicene canons that were alleged or not; and when it ap-


† So (to name but one) Calvin, Inst., IV. vii. 9.—The defence in Labbé (Conc. tom. ii. p. 626. B.) for the conduct of popes Innocent and Zosimus, is simply this—that "licet haec synodus altera fucrit a Nicæa, tamen quia non novas suscepit fidei vel ecclesiae causas sed Nicææ tantum fidei tuteam ac patrocinium; . . . et quia ipsorum Sardicæsium et Nicæanorum patrum una fuit sententia, una mens, unus spiritus: idcirco Sardicæs concilium Nicænæ nominem multis comprehendituir; quemadmodum urbis ac urbis propugnaculum una res censeri solet ac nominari."—So also M. A. Cappellus, De Appell. Eccles. Afric. ad Rom. Sedem, Paris. 1622: and Card. du Perron, Replique &c., liv. i. cc. lii., liii., pp. 456, sq.—But see Hussey, On Papal Supremacy, pp. 41—51.

* "Cecilius Carthaginensis" is the only signature for the province of Africa at the council of Nica (Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 54. C). At the council of Sardica the number of bishops present appears to be uncertain (Labb., ibid., p. 659. C, D), but the names of thirty-six from Africa are given in Labb., ibid., p. 679. A, B.

* Conc. Carthag. vi. (Cave, xv.) A.D. 419, can. 6; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 1591. E. In can. 7. (ibid., p. 1592. A, B) the council declare, that they will keep the Sardican canon, "salva diligentio inquisitione concilii Nicæi," that "omnia, quae in Nicæan concilio statuta sunt, nobis omnibus placant," and, "quod constitutum est in Nicæan concilio, violari a quoquam nullatenus potest."
peared that they were not, the dispute was at an end; and
the African synod, by the letter extant in the African code,
desires the pope to stand to terms of the Nicene canons.
Therefore it is clearly a fault in the copy, that the council of
Sardica is named; which could not be pleaded, because all
knew that it was not in force, as the council of Nicaea was,
in the Churches of Africa. So that the act of the council of
Sardica necessarily presupposeth, that the Church of Rome
was effectually acknowledged the prime Church of the west
(and by consequence of all Churches); because it setteth the
right of appeals upon it before other Churches in certain
causes: though it appear not what effect it took, unless you
allow the conjecture which I have to propose.

§ 23. Within a few years after this contest, there appears
a standing commission of the popes to the bishops of Thessalonica to be their standing lieutenants in Illyricum; men-
tioned in the letter of Pope Leo to Anastasius of Thessalo-
onica, as derived from their predecessors.

Had the bishop of Rome been no more than the bishop of Thessalonica, how came this to be his lieutenant rather than on the contrary?

And, truly, where those privileges of the Church of Rome
over the Churches of Illyricum began, whereby the popes
had made the bishops of Thessalonica their standing leg-
gates, appears not by the records of the Church; so that it
is as free for me to conjecture, that they come from the

---

* As quoted above in note x.
* So De Dominis, De Rep. Eccl., lib. iv. c. 8. § 84; tom. i. p. 668. D.
* "Et quia per omnes ecclesias cura nostra distenditur, exigente hoc a
nobilis Domino, Qui apostolice dignitatis beatissimo apostolo Petro primatum fidei suae remuneratione commissis, universalem Ecclesiam in fundamenti
ipsis soliditate constituant, necessitatem sollicitudinibus, quam habemus, cum
his, qui nobis collegii caritate juncti sunt, sociamus. Vicem itaque nostram
fratris et co-episcopo nostro Anastasio, securi eorum exemplum quorum nobis
recordatio est veneranda, commissimus; et ut sit in speculis, ne quid illicitum
a quoquam presumatur, injunximus: cui in his quod ecclesiasticam pertinent disciplinam, ut dielecto vestra
pareat, admonemus. Non enim tam
illii obtemperebitur quam nobis, qui
hoc illi pro nostra sollicitudine per illas
provincias cognoscamur commississe."--- Leon. M., Epist. v., Ad Episcopos Metrop. per Illyricum constitutos, c. ii.: Op., tom. i. pp. 617, 618.—See also Id., Epist. iv., Ad Anastasium Thessalonicensem Episc., c. i.; ibid., p. 683; beginning thus—"Quoniam sicut preconsori,
osti praecensoribus tuis, ita
etiam ego dilectioni tue, priorum se
necutum exemplum, vices me moder-
minis delegavi:" &c.—Pope Damasus,
circ. A.D. 380, is said to have appointed
Aacholius bishop of Thessalonica his
vicar in Illyricum (see l'Art de Veri-
ifier les Dates, art. Damase, tom. i. p.
872. Paris. 1818). And Innocent I.,
circ. A.D. 400, is said to have appointed
Rufus, also bishop of Thessalonica, to
the same office (Epist. Innoc. I. Papae
ad Rufum, ap. Labb., Conc., tom. iv.
531).—See the case at length in De
Marca, De Conc. Sacerd. et Imp., lib.
v. cc. 22—29.
council of Sardica, as for others to conjecture otherwise; for it is not unreasonable to think, that it might take effect upon the place where it was made, with fuller consent of the bishops of that diocese, present in greater numbers than strangers, though scarce known in Africk after some seventy years.

§ 24. But at such time as Rome disputed with Africk about appeals, and enjoyed regular privileges in Illyricum; can the Church of Milan, or any Church of Spain or Gaul or Britain, be thought parallel to it?

§ 25. From this time, the rescripts of the popes are extant, unforaged, and directed to divers prime Churches of Gaul and Spain. And the heads of them were added by Dionysius Exiguus, about [A.D.] 530, unto that collection of canons; which what force it had in the western Church, appears, in that Cresconius, abridging the canons which the African Church used, refers them to the heads which he follows, both beginning at Syricius, Cresconius ending at Gelasius. And the copies of Dionysius his collection, that now are extant in the libraries of France, have at the beginning a letter, whereby Pope Adrian I. directs it to Charles the Great: as you may see in Sirmondus his Councils, tomo ii. ad annum 787. This subordination, being nothing but the limiting of the pre-eminence of the Church of Rome in the common concernsments of the western Church, suffers not any terms of equality betwixt them; unless we


"Concordia Canonum Conciliorum infra scriptorum" (viz. the same as are given in Dion. Exiguus), "et Præsumul Romanorum" from Syricius to Gelasius (i.e. A.D. 385—496), was first published by Pitheaus in 1582. It is in the Biblioth. Jur. Can., as above pp. 456, sq. See also the preface of Veellus and Justellus, p. 21; and Cave, Art. Cresconius Afer, A.D. 690.—Dionysius Exiguus includes also the next pope to Gelasius, viz., Anastasius II., A.D. 496—8.

See the preface to the Code of Dion. Exiguus in the Biblioth. Juris Can., p. 95: from Sirmond as cited below in note l.

could think, that they who received such instructions from Rome did send the like to Rome in the like case: nor yet to attribute the inequity to the rescript of Valentinian the Third in favour of Pope Leo against the bishop of Arles; though that might be (and was without doubt) a goodly pre-
tence for the popes to enhance their privileges while the empire stood, and when it was fallen, to maintain them
upon the title of ancient custom.

§ 26. Besides the greatness of the city Rome, in compa-
rision of any city of Gaul or Spain or Britain; besides the
pre-eminence of St. Peter: it is to be considered, that In-
ocent I. pope affirmed all the Churches of Italy, Gaul,
Spain, Africk, Sicily, and the isles that lie between, to have
been founded by those who were ordained by St. Peter and
his successors; and, therefore, that they ought to follow the
order of the Church of Rome: Epist. ad Decentium. For
with him agreeeth herein, as for Africk, Tertullian, De Pra-
Epist. xxxii. Nor do I think, that Cyprian meant any
thing else, when he describes the Church of Rome to be the
Church, "unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est"—"from

Epist. ad Decentium, Epist. i.: ap. Labb., Conc., tom. ii. p. 1245. D.
§ "With Innocent the First affirming Africk planted from Rome." Add-
ed in margin in MS.

Tertullian merely says, that Rome
is the nearest apostolic Church to Africa.
"Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Ro-
man; unde nobis quoque authoritatis
praesto est." De Praescriptione, c. xxxvi. ; Op., p. 215. A. And again
(ibid., B.): "Videamus quid dicercerit,
quid docuerit!" (ac. Ecclesia Romana),
"cum Africae quoque ecclesiis con-
tesscrat." But see Dupin's Hist.
Donatism., p. 1, prefixed to his edition
of Optatus; and De Dominia, De Rep.
Eccl., i. c. ii. § 21. tom. i. p. 397.
§ "Scientes praeterea unde in Afri-
canis partibus sumerist ordinatio sacer-
dotalis exordium, laudabiler agit ac
quod Sedem Apostolicam diligendo, ad
officii vestri origine prudenti recorda-
tione recurritis," &c. S. Oreg. M.,
Epist. lib. viii. Indict. i. Epist. xxxii.
(olim lib. vii. Indict. i. Epist. xxxi.),
Ad Domini niantem Episcopum Cartha-
S. Cypr., Epist. lix., Ad Corne-
lium; Epist. p. 136.
whence the unity of the priesthood had the rise;" to wit, in Africk. Of Gaul and Spain I perceive no question is made.

And he, that will free the beginning of Christianity in Britain from fables, must acknowledge, that, as it is agreed among men of learning that it was first planted from Gaul, so from thence also it must have received Christianity.

§ 27. Of Illyricum the same cannot be said. Nor do I find any title for the jurisdiction of Rome over it more ancient, than the division of the empire among the sons of Constantine. For, the council of Sardica being assembled upon this account by both emperors, and parted in two, the eastern bishops of it plead, that it was a novelty, which the ancient custom of the Church abhors, that the east should be judged by the west; and Constantius writes to the western bishops in the council of Ariminum, that no reason would endure them to decree any thing of the eastern bishops: both in the fragments of St. Hilary. Which as it constitutes the regular but destroys the infinite power of the pope (because it concludes no man without the synod to which he belongs); so it shews no ancient custom, by which Illyricum should belong to the west. And Palladius, an Arian bishop, in the Council of Aquileia under St. Ambrose, excepting, that he was not to be sentenced without the

* Blondel, De la Primauté en l’Englishe, p. 48, commenting on pope Innocent’s words, admits the fact at length of Gaul and Spain; denying only that it infers subjection to Rome. He allows also (p. 624), that “la Gaule a servi de matrice a l’Espagne, et la meme chose est fort probable de la Bretagne.” Launoy maintains, that Gaul was Christianized by missionaries from Rome. For the other opinions on the subject, see the summary of the case in Mosheim’s Hist. of the Church, Bk. i. Cent. ii. Pt. i. c. i. § 5. in Soames’s edition.

† This is Mosheim’s conclusion: De Reb. Christian. ante Constant., pp. 213—216. The case is summed up in Soames’s Mosheim, as in last note. For the “fables” see Ussher and Stillingsfleet.

‡ “Addunt viri clarissimi post allegata illa Innocentii verba, quae supra allata sunt: ‘Solem desunt calculo nostro Illyricum dioeceses Ecclesiae, quorum hoc loco non meminit Innocentius.’ Sane nullam facit mentionem Illyrici ecclesiariun inter eas quas vult a Petro apostolorum principe in occidente esse constitutae... Eam ecclesiam non a Petro sed a Paulouisse institutam, inter omnes convenit.” Salmasius, De Prim. Papa, c. xxi. p. 396. 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1645: answering De Marca, De Concord. Sacerd. et Imp., lib. i. c. 5 § 3.


* See notes x, y.
eastern bishops, who had been writ to to come; St. Ambrose answers, that, knowing the custom, that the synod of the east should be held in the east, of the west in the west, they were not come: intimating, that Palladius in the mean time must look to be judged by the synod of the west, leaving those of the east to take their course in a cause of common concernment. Here is then a reason, why Illyricum should belong to the western Church.

§ 28. Whether or no the holding of the council of Sardica in Illyricum might occasion the canons thereof to take place in Illyricum, which came not to effect in Africk; let those who have the skill judge. I see, the act of pope Hormisda, making the bishops of Tarracona and Sevile his lieutenants, Epist. xxiv. and xxvi., is attributed to the canon of Sardica; which I have shewed was not known in Africk about a hundred years afore. Therefore, let those that have skill judge. I am willing to allow a better reason for the pre-eminence of the Church of Rome over Illyricum, when I shall see it rendered. In the mean time, the rescripts of the popes are extant, evidencing the resort from Illyricum to Rome, no otherwise than from Gaul or from Spain or from Africk.

§ 29. What shall we say of Britain? For all this while, I shew, that the Church of Rome cannot be reduced to the rank of the head-churches of dioceses, though the patri-

---


* Blondel, De la Primauté en l’Église, p. 1093, attributes the jurisdiction of pope Gregory (see above, § 18. note r) over Spain to "1 le recours d’Estienne" (the Spanish bishop) "selon le Concile de Sardique," and 2. the act of Hormisda himself.


archs of Alexandria and Antiochia were only heads of one diocese. [How could the British bishops answer Augustin the monk, that they knew not the pope? They knew pope Cælestin, when he joined with the synod of Gaul to send Germanus and Lupus to deliver them from Pelagianism: as well as Ireland, a British isle, knew him, when he sent first Palladius, and then St. Patrick, with effect to convert it; St. Hilary of Tours having sent St. Keby afore to no great purpose. They knew the pope, when they admitted that order for keeping of Easter, which afterwards they would not part with, when St. Augustin demanded it for a mark of subjection at their hands. For it appears by my lord primate's Antiquities, that the rule which they held was the same which the Church of Rome had first embraced. Only, whereas in process of time a fault of two days was discovered in it, which Severus Sulpitius in Gaul is said to have mended; they, having received it with this amendment, would not part with it, when Augustin demanded it of them for a mark of subjection to his bishopric. This you may see in those Collections, pp. 925, &c. They knew him, when St. David sent the synods, which he had held against the Pelagians, to Rome for the approbation of the pope: when St. Kentigern went to Rome, to purge the irregularity which he was under by being ordained bishop of Glasgow by one bishop. In fine, they knew him in all the correspondence, which they had with their fellow British Churches in France, who exercised daily communion with Rome.

* Added in MS.—See below, note o.


2 "Jam vero Britonum et Pictorum et Hybernorum eyclus paschalis, in hoc quidem cum Romana suppulatione congruet; quod octoginta quatuor es set annorum: in hoc vero diserepahat, quod non una decima sexta luna ad vigesimam secundam sed una decima quarta ad vigesimam paschales Dominicas numeraret. Sic enim de Britonibus Beda; 226.

4 Non enim Paschae dierum Dominicum suo tempore sed a decima quarta usque ad vigesimam lunam observabant; qua computatio octoginta quatuor annorum circulo continetur. . . . Britonium vero illum canonem paschalem a Sulpitio Severo acceptum fuisset, qui octoginta quatuor annorum cursum descripsit, ex Aldhelmio ad Geruntium Britanni-" Ussher, ibid., c. xvi. pp. 496, 497. And see also ibid., c. xi. vol. v. p. 368; and Smith, Append. ad Bed. Eccl., num. ix. a. pp. 694, sq.

SCILL. in the original edit. of 1639: the passage quoted in note k.

m Ussher, ibid., c. xiii. vol. v. p. 542.

And therefore, when they say, they "knew him not," we are to understand by a figure of speech, that they "knew him not" to the purpose that was demanded, so as to be subject to the new bishop of Britain: which the canon of the apostles, providing that every nation should have their own bishop, enabled them to refuse. And the just jealousy they had, that the admitting of him might be a snare to their civil freedom, obliged them to refuse. For when they say they are ready to acknowledge the pope as brotherly love requires, they may well be thought to acknowledge him with that canonical respect which ancient custom required; without which brotherly love subsisteth not among Christians.

§ 30. But I must come to the privileges of Constantinople, begun by the canon of the second general council, established by the fourth in the last canon, which the popes to this day acknowledge not, though the effect of it
hath suffered no interruption by their disowning of it. I know not how I should give a clearer evidence of the ground I propose for the pre-eminence of Churches, than the alteration which succeeded upon the erecting of Constantinople into the second head of the empire. For within fifty years the council of the east being held there makes it the second Church, and head-church of Thrace-diocese; which the Chalcedon council extends to the dioceses of Asia and Pontus, exalting it so far above Alexandria and Antiochia, as might seem afar off to call for a kind of subjection at their hands. If this be rightfully done, what shall hinder the whole Church to dispose of the superiority of Churches, when the greatness of their cities makes it appear, that the dependence of the Churches of less cities upon them is for the unity of the whole in the exercise of true Christianity? And what can be said, why it should not be right for the east to advance Constantinople to the next [place] to Rome; the same reason being visible in it, for which Rome had the first place from the beginning?

§ 31. It is true, whereas Rome was content to take no notice of the canon of Constantinople, the legates of pope Leo, present at Chalcedon, and enforced either to admit or disclaim it, protested against it. But upon what ground can he, who by being part of the council concludes himself by the vote of it, refuse his concurrence to that which he alone likes not? Or to what effect is that disowned, which takes place without him who protests against it? Unless it be to set up a monument of half the Church disowning the infinite power of the pope, the other half not pleading it, but only canonical pre-eminences by the council of Nicaea.

§ 32. I suppose, indeed, the pope had something else to fear. For, Illyricum being so much nearer Constantinople than Rome, there was always pretence of reason to subject

---


2 It is reckoned as a general council wholly approved, by Bellarmine, De Conc. et Eccles., lib. i. c. 5; Controv., tom. i. p. 1100. A—C. And see Richer, Hist. Conc. Gen., c. v. § 9. tom. i. pp. 102, 103.

---


* pp. 181—184 (both inclusive) are repeated by mistake in the folio edition.
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it, as Asia and Pontus, to Constantinople, to the prejudice of those pre-eminences which Rome enjoyed there: especially since Illyricum was surrendered by Valentinian III. upon the marriage of his sister to Theodosius the younger (as that learned gentleman John Marsham hath observed), and thenceforth become part of the eastern empire; for hereupon followed the law "Omni innovatione cessante," still extant in the code, requiring the bishops of Illyricum to give account to Constantinople of all matters that should pass. Besides, had the empire continued in force in Italy, why might not Constantinople in time have pretended to the first place, Rome being no more the prime city, and yet still of the empire? And therefore pope Leo (as wise for the privileges of his Church as stout for the faith) did his own business, when he pleaded the canon of Nicea, and the second place for Alexandria. And whatsoever contests passed afterwards between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, the privileges of Rome in Illyricum continued, till the time that Gregory the Second withdrew his city from the obedience of the empire, pretending his sovereign to be a heretic for destroying of images. I said afore in the first


"Omni innovatione cessante, vestitatem et canones pristinos ecclesiasticos, qui nunc usque tenuerunt, per omnes Illyrici provincias servari praecipimus. Tum, si quid dubieta est scribere, id oporteat non abesse scientias viri reverendissimi sacrosanctae legis antiquissimae urbis Constantinopolitanae, quae Romae vetera prae rogavit instaur, conventui sacerdotali sanctoque judicio reservari." Cod. Theod., lib. xvi. tit. ii. leg. 45. tom. vi. p. 89. Also in Cod. Justinian., lib. i. tit. ii. leg. 6. The law was passed A.D. 421 (therefore before the transfer of the civil jurisdiction), and is addressed to Philip PF. Illyrici. It was shortly repealed. See Gieseler, Second Period, Div. iv. c. iii. § 94. vol. i. p. 446: and De Marca, De Concord. Sac. et Imp., lib. iv. c. 2. § 1, with the Addit. of Balduinus.

Scil. in his letter to Anatolius, referred to above, § 30. note a.

See Thomassin, as quoted in note y, § 9: and authorities in Gieseler.
OF THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH.

Book 1, that others relate this otherwise 2. And Anastasius, in the lives of Gregory II. 3 and III. 4, owns no more but that they excommunicated the emperors; which, notwithstanding, occasioned the Italians to fall from the empire. But hereupon the emperor commands not only Ilyricum, but Sicily, and that part of Italy which continued subject to the empire, to resort to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Constantinople 5; and, as in case of such jealousy, was necessarily to be obeyed. Hereupon Pope Adrian, in his Apology for Images to Charles the Great 6, complains, that they deprived the Church of Rome of the diocese together with the patrimony which it held in it, when they put down images; and "had given no answer from that time." 7 And Nicolas I., Epist. i. 8, revives the claim. Which, with the reascripts of the popes between concerning Ilyricum 9 as well as the rest of the west (see also the life of Adrian II. in Anastasius 10), and much more

Period III. Div. i. Pt. ii. c. ii. § 6. note 2. How far the popes really rebelled, see Gieseler: and Buckeridge, De Postestate Papae, lib. ii. c. xli. pp. 944, sq. 11 Bk. i. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 30. 12 The Greeks affirmed, that the popes rebelled outright: the Latins denied their so doing. See Bk. i. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. xi. § 30. note t; and below, note f; and Gieseler as quoted in note c.

13 Anastasius (in Vita Greg. II. ap. Labb., tom. vi. p. 1436. A.) says no more, than that Gregory, having "deposed" the bishop of Constantinople as an Iconoclast, "imperatori quoque madens salutaria, ut a tali exercabili miseria declinaret scriptis communiquit." On which however Binius says (ibid., p. 1437. C.), on the authority of Theophanes, Cedrenus, and Zonaras, that Leo Isauricus not obeying "a pontificexcomunicatur et deponitur."

14 Id. in Vita Greg. III. (Labb., ibid., p. 1464. C.) merely records the sending to the emperor Leo "adorhitorias litteras."


16 Sed de dioecesi sanctae nostre Romanae ecclesie tam archiepiscoporum quam episcoporum seu de patrimonii iterum increpantes commoneus, ut si nonuerint ea sanctae nostrae Romanae ecclesiae restituere, hereticum cum... decernemus." Hadrian i. Epist. ad Carolum Regem, de Imaginibus, qua constituentur illi qui synodum Nicennam secundam oppugnant; in fin.: ap. Labb., Conc., tom. vii. p. 963. A. And a little before (ibid., p. 962. D, E): "De dioecesi tam archiepiscoporum quam et episcoporum, &c. ... quae tum cum patrimonii nostris abstulerunt, quando sacras imaginies deposuerunt, et nec responsum quodlibet exinde dederunt."


18 See De Marcis, De Concord. Sac. et Imper. lib. iv. c. 2, and lib. v. c. 19. § 3, and c. 20. and above, § 23. note d.

19 Anastas. in Vita Hadrianii. II. (ap. Labb., Conc., tom. viii. p. 893. C, D), relating the dispute between Rome and Constantinople respecting the Bulgarians, to which part they were to belong, east or west. Rome claimed them as part of the old province of Ilyricum.
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that might be added, shews, that this was the state of the Church till that time.

§ 33. During the time that Rome, on one side, stood upon these terms with Constantinople; on the other side, was continually harassed by the Lombards (who had no reason to confide in it, we see, because they were not long after destroyed by it): there is no marvel, if Milan, head of the Lombards, and Ravenna, head of the exarchate (that is, of the dominion that was governed by the emperor's lieutenant there resident), did, by the secular power of their cities, set up themselves to contest with the pope about several privileges of their Churches. For, alas! what can this signify of competition for the primacy with Rome, if we compare the respect of Milan or Ravenna with that which Rome hath found among other Churches in the concernments of the whole?

§ 34. Therefore I will mention here only one action more, carried through in so high a tune by Gelasius and other active popes, that it is much insisted upon by those, who would plead for the pope's infinite power if they durst, because they would not have it regular: which is the same; for what bounds can that power have, that acknowledges no rule to limit it? It is that troublesome business, that fell out in Egypt about the council of Chalcedon: when John of Alexandria, having fallen under the jealousy of the emperor and Acacius of Constantinople, goes to Rome with letters from Antioch, to complain of the intruding of Petrus Mngus into his see; who, being an enemy to the council of Chalcedon, but pretending fair to promote those means, by which the emperor Zeno and Acacius pretended to re-unite Egypt to the Church, having never received that council,

---

* Corrected from MS.; "which," in folio edition.
* Conquered by Charlemagne in alliance with Pope Adrian I., A.D. 774.
was thereupon received into communion by Acacius; the rule of the Church being undispensable—whosoever communicated with heretics, to stand for a heretic to the Church, whatsoever he believe otherwise*. This cause having bred a world of trouble for many years, the popes never condescended to be re-united in communion to the east, till it was granted, that all the bishops of Constantinople since Acacius, though they had professed the true faith, and some of them suffered for it, should be condemned as heretics, by razing [their*] names out of that list, in which the godly bishops were remembered at celebrating the eucharist*: though the is. reason why they had continued communion with heretics, was only for fear of making the breaches of the Church wider and more incurable.

§ 35. Here it may seem to have been the power of the pope, that brought even the second person of the Church to the justice of the canon; so much more evident, by how much there was less reason to insist upon the rigour of the canon, in comparison to the end to which it was subordinate, the unity of the whole. Yet to him, that reasons aright, it will easily appear, that it was no duty, that either the emperors or the bishops of Constantinople owed the popes, that made them submit to the canon; but the obligation they had to the unity of the Church, for the maintenance whereof the canon was provided: and that Zeno, taking the course that Constantius had done in the matter of Arius, to reconcile Egypt to the Church by waving the council of Chalcedon for an expedient of his own (for Constantius sought no more than to reconcile all by waving of the council of Nicaea?), and Acacius, by communicating with heretics, did necessarily, as all offenders do, make them their superiors,

* The authorities for all this are mainly the letters of popes Simplicius, Felix III., Gelasius (A.D. 467—495), and of Acacius himself and others; in Labb., Conc., tom. iv. pp. 1068, sq.:—the lives of these popes by Anastasius, ap. Labb., ibid., pp. 1065, sq.:—Evagrius, H. E., lib. iii. cc. 11, sq. And see the summary of the case, with the authorities, in Gieseler, Period II. Div. ii. c. ii. § 110: and Cave, Anc. Ch. Gov. c. vi. § 6, 7.

† Added from MS.

* See authorities for the razing of the names of Acacius and Peter Fullo from the diptychs, in Mosheim, Bk. II. Cent. v. Pt. ii. c. v. § 21. vol. i. p. 488. note 3. ed. Soames.

‡ Sei. by maintaining Peter Mon- gius, on no other condition than that he should accept the ‘Epist.: Evagrius, H. E., lib. iii. c. 13, p. 345. ed. Reading. See Gieseler, as in note s.

§ Soxom., H. E., lib. iv. c. 8; &c. And see Gieseler, Period II. Div. i. c. ii. § 83.
who maintain the laws for the good of the whole: in fine, that whatsoever the popes did by virtue of the canon, can be no ground for any irregular power in themselves, the canon as justly maintaining the poor Britons against the pope, as the pope against Zeno and Acacius.

§ 36. But the fifth general council makes full remoncense for all the Church of Rome may pretend to have gained by the business of Acacius. Pope Vigilius being in Constanti-nople, and refusing at the summons of the emperor and council to sit, it proceeds, and condemns three articles which he had declared for: and so prevails, that he himself thought best at length to concur to the act; and, all this being done, is disowned by the bishops of Africk (Facundus by name, whom he had set on work to write for the three articles) and Istria, till all was reconciled.

§ 37. I question not the point of heresy, either in this case, or that of Honorius; whose constitution, whereby he thought to silence the dispute concerning the two wills in our Lord Christ, made him to be condemned for a heretic in the sixth general council. Only I count it a pitiful excuse.

See above, § 29.


b Conc. Constant. II. Collat. i. and ii.; ap. Labb., ibid., pp. 428, 430.—And see Collat. viii.; ibid., p. 562. D, E: "Et quia contingit Vigilius religionis assisium, in hac regia turbe degentem, omnibus interesse," &c.—The Constitution of Vigilius defending the Tria Capitula, and sent to the emperor Justinian after the council had commenced its sittings, is in Labb., ibid., pp. 337. D, sq.

c The letter of Vigilius confirming the decrees of the council, is in Labb., ibid., pp. 595. D, sq. The defences of Romanist controversialists may be seen collected in the Prolegomena to Gallandius, Biblioth. PP. tom. xi. c. xiii.: § 3, sq.


to imagine, that the synod is falsified in this point; the seventh synod in the last session bidding anathema to Hon-rius, and so many records testifying the same. And where it is said, that the synod might err in point of fact—that Honorius held heresy, though not in point of right—in condemning that for heresy which is not (as the Jansenists at this day, admitting the condemnation of five propositions by the late pope, admit not, that they are contained in Jansenius his book) to be disputed of that, it will appear, that the pope may be judged by the Church in other cases besides that of heresy, if Honorius, being no heretic, is by the council condemned for a heretic. Indeed there is no cause that concerns the whole Church but the whole Church

So Baronius, AnnaL, in an. 681; tom. viii. pp. 551, sq.: whose account is, that Theodorus throughout the acts of the council erased his own name and inserted that of Honorius instead. And see the Admonitio ad Lectorum, prefixed to the canons of this council in Labbè, ibid., p. 1123. And for the various evasions adopted by Pighius, Bellarmine, and others, with the replies, the authorities quoted in Giesler, Period II. Div. iii. c. ii. § 128. vol. ii. p. 177: and below in note i.


3 "Quod si aliquis adhuc non posset adduci, ut credit corruptum esse sextam synodum; is accipiat alteram solutionem, que est Ioannis a Turre-Cremata, lib. ii. De Ecclesia, cap. 93; qui docet, patres sextae synodi damnasse quidem Honorium, sed ex falsa informatione, ac proinde in eo judicio errasse. Quamvis enim generale concilium legitimum non posset errare, ut neque erravit hoc sextum, in dogmatibus idem definiebant; tamen errare potest in questionibus de facto." Bellarmine, as in last note, pp. 994. D, 995. E.

The five propositions were condemned by Innocent X. in a bull dated May 31, 1653 (Bullar. Rom., tom. vi. P. iii. pp. 248 b. 249. a. Rom. 1760). For the history, see authorities in the notes to Mosheim, Bk. IV. Cent. xvii. sect. ii. Pt. i. c. 1. § 42-44.
may judge it. Nor can any cause lightly concern a pope, that concerns not the whole Church. The reason why popes have been so seldom judged, is not for want of right; but for fear of division in the Church, which makes it not expedient to use that right.

§ 38. There are many particulars of less consequence pleaded for the pope’s power, which I will not examine; admitting a regular pre-eminence for him above all other bishops (which is seen in the recourse had to him before others in matters concerning the whole Church), but denying that infinite power, which nothing can be alleged to prove.

§ 39. I acknowledge indeed, that this regular pre-eminence not only might, but, supposing the Church to continue in unity, must needs be further and further determined by canon or by custom, whether enlarging or restraining it; as by the canons of Sardica, allowing appeals to him in the causes of bishops. For the causes of bishops do not all necessarily concern the whole Church, unless the subject of them be matter of faith; or, otherwise, that which calleth in question the unity of the Church: and then laymen’s causes are no less. So an appeal to Rome, so constituted, is properly an appeal there to be sentenced in the last resort. But when recourse is had to the pope in the first place, that is no appeal, but a course to bring the cause to the sentence of the whole Church; whereof his sentence is the first part, and a great prejudice to that which follows, because of the respect which all that depend upon that Church owe to his sentence.

§ 40. And this increase of the pope’s power, I do think to be always a just cause of excluding from the unity of the Church for refusing obedience to it. For the unity of the Church being of God’s law, and so enabling to limit the terms upon which the power of the Church is held and exercised by canonical right; it cannot be in the power of any part to cast off those laws, by which it is bounded within the compass of God’s law, at pleasure: because they are the conditions, upon which the unity of the whole stands; which no part can say they will renounce, unless they may hold it upon such terms as they please.

= See above, § 20. note m.
§ 41. But whether these limitations may not be so excessively abusive to the liberty of the whole, so prejudicial to the service of God in the truth of Christianity, for which they and the whole Church stands, that parts of the Church may and ought to provide for themselves and their Christianity against the oppression of them; that I refer to the last consideration*, when I shall have shewed, how matters in difference are to be valued by the principles that are settled.

§ 42. In the meantime I must observe, that from the time that the pope was re-imbursed of his loss of jurisdiction and possessions in those provinces, which upon his rebellion the emperor withdrew from his obedience, by the liberality of Pepin and Charlemagne, bestowing upon him the exarchate⁰, which with the kingdom of the Lombards they had taken from the Greekish empire: though I cannot say, that from that time regular proceedings were laid aside in the western Churches; yet I must say, that from thence the popes had a ground to reduce the regular proceedings of councils to their own will and interest, and to introduce their own rescripts instead of all canons for law to the western Church. And this, though I must not prove here?, yet here I may allege, why I go no further here in this dispute.

§ 43. It remains, that I gather up some fragments of instances, that have been produced⁰ to shew, that episcopacy is not of Divine right, because from the beginning either all or some Churches have had none.

§ 44. Of the authors whereof I must first demand, whether the unity of the Church be of Divine right or not. For unless they will put the whole cause upon a new issue—that there is no law of God, that the Church should be one; I demand of them, how this unity could have been preserved by the equality of all presbyters, which by the hierarchy I have shewed was maintained. Till they shew me this, I think myself secure of all their little objections. For if the

* Below, at the end of c. xxxiii.
Scil. by Blondel, Walo Messalinus (or Salmasius), &c. See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 53, sq.
° See Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x.
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hierarchy cannot be imputed to chance, or to the voluntary agreement of all Christians, as uncertain as chance; certainly episcopacy, the first ingredient of it, can be imputed to nothing but the provision of the apostles.

§ 45. And therefore I must here renew my answer to the question that is made*:—supposing the superiority of bishops to consist in the power of doing some act which a priest cannot do, what act is it, that a bishop by his order can do, a priest cannot. For all priests have by their order the power of the keys: and, by virtue of the same, of baptizing, and giving the eucharist to those, whom the laws of the Church, not their private judgment, admits; unless it be in cases which their private judgment stands charged with. And that, which they shall do upon such terms, is to as good effect towards God in the inward court of conscience, as if a bishop had done it. But because there be cases that concern the unity and good estate of that particular Church whereof each man is a member; others, that may concern the whole; others, some part of the whole Church: the constitution of the Church necessarily requires in every Church a power, without which nothing of moment to the state thereof shall be of force in the outward court, as to the body of the Church. This, the chief power of the apostles; this, St. Paul’s instructions to Timothy and Titus; this, the epistle[s] to the seven Churches; this, the practice of all Churches before the Reformation: settles upon the bishop. And therefore I should think, that I shewed you a peculiar act, which bishops can do and priests cannot; if I could only shew you, that according to this rule nothing is to be done without the bishop’s consent. For whatsoever either law or unreprouvable custom may enable a priest to do, that he doth by the consent of his bishop, involved in passing that law or admitting that custom. And hereof the bishop’s peculiar right of sitting in council is full evidence; which, if the practice of the Church could justify nothing else, would be an act peculiar to the order of bishops, according to the pre-13th.

[ Ancient authorities for the su-

§ 46. It was an ancient rule in the Church, that a priest should not baptize in the presence of a bishop, nor give a

* See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 44. note b.
bishop the eucharist; to shew, that it is by his leave that he acts: as Tertullian saith of the right of baptizing, De Bapt. cap. xvii. a So the canons, which allow not a priest to restore him to the communion that had done public penance in the face of the Church, require the consent of the bishop to acts that concern the body of it. That ancient author that writ De Septem Ordinibus Ecclesiae, among St. Jerome's works; reckons divers particulars; some whereof he com- plains, that the bishops where he lived did not suffer the priests to do. Doth he therefore make bishops and priests all one? Certainly he speaks my sense and my terms, when he says, "The bishop is the priest's law." b that bishops in council give law to the clergy as well as the people; out of council, that which is not otherwise determined, nothing but his order can determine.

§ 47. And this is the ground of the difference between the power of order and the power of jurisdiction; comparing the bishop and presbyters of one and the same Church one with another. For the order of priesthood importing the power of the keys in baptizing, in binding and loosing in the inward court, in giving the eucharist; it is plain there is a power of order common to both. But the use of it without limiting any due bounds at the discretion of every priest, would be destructive to the unity of the Church, which I suppose. That power therefore, which provideth those limi-

---

1 See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. x. § 1—3; Review of Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. x. § 2, 3; Rt. of Ch. in Chr, St., c. iii. § 52. note b; Review of Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 19, 20; and Van Espen, Jus Eccles., tom. vi. p. 105. Venet. 1781, from the canons of Neo-Cassarea. The tract De Septem Ordinibus, as quoted below in note x, p. 103, severely condemns bishops who think "se accipere non debere eucharistiam quam presbyter benedixit:" but adding, "Nec ego dico præsentibus episcopis atque sacerdotibus aliarum presbyteros posse sacramenta conficiere" (ibid., p. 104).

2 Quoted above, c. xvi. § 17. note a.

3 See above, c. x. § 38.

4 Judged spurious by the Benedictine editors, but not assigned by them to any other writer. Inserted in some copies. "Ad Damasum;" in others, "Ad Rusticum Naboranensem episco-

---


6 "Nemo tunc episcoporum invidia diabolicæ tentationis infatus irascatur in templo, si presbyteri interedium exhortentur plebeam, si in ecclesias prædicanter, si plebibus, ut scriptum est, benedicanter... Juventibus vobis injustissime sacerdotibus, non recte presbyter Dei benedictionis perdit officium, amittit linguæ opus, non habet convenientiam prædicandi." &c. Ibid., p. 104. in art. de Sexto Gradu Ecclesiae qui sacerdotum ordo est. The tract begins with the minor orders.

7 "Nec legem a me opponendam esse ei" (sc. the bishop), "qui lex est presbyteri." Id., ibid. The article on the order of bishops, which follows in the same tract (ibid. pp. 108, sq.), certainly leaves nothing to be desired in affirning their superiority.
tations according to which the common power of the keys is lawfully exercised, whether it be properly called jurisdiction or not, is necessary to the being of every Church; even by the common power of the keys, upon which the foundation of the Church standeth.

§ 48. I can therefore allow the said author to complain, that priests in his parts were not suffered to do those acts, which in the east, in Illyricum, in Africk, they did do. For all those parts were governed by synods of bishops. But I allow not his argument:—because a priest can celebrate the eucharist, which is more. It is more to the salvation of those, that receive; toward which the eucharist immediately worketh, no less if a priest than if a bishop give it. But it is not so much to the body of the Church, as to excommunicate, or to restore him that is excommunicate. That, therefore, some offices may be done by both; and that, according to the order of the ancient Church: is no argument that both are one, but that it is no prejudice to the chief power of the bishop, that they are done by a priest.

§ 49. Let confirmation be the instance, for our author instances in it. Certainly there was never so great necessity for it, as since all are baptized infants. For it expressly reneweth the covenant of baptism, not only in the conscience, between God and the soul, but as to the body of the Church; implying an acknowledgment of the obligation then contracted, and of the Church, to which this acknowledgment is tendered. For he, that desires baptism of the Church at years of discretion, desireth it upon those terms which the Church tendereth. And therefore he, who is baptized an in-

---

*Prædicare eos (presbyteros) decret, utile est benedicere, congruum confirmare, conventi reddere communionem, necesse est visitare infirmos, orare pro invalidis, atque omnia Dei sacramenta complevere; praestitit cum in oriente cæ sedissent, et in Illyrico, et in Italia, atque in Africa omnibus in locis, temporibus apostolorum fuisset manifestum est." Id., ibid.

4 "Si presbyter Christum consecrat, cum in altario Dei sacramenta beneficet; benedicere populo non debet, qui Christum etiam meruit consecrare?" Id., ibid.—"Quæ?" (sc. Corpus et San-

*cum offerre licet, etiam reliqua quæ in eo sunt consecrare, quia in Christo omnis plenitudine Divinitatis corporaliter habitat. Presbyteri ergo, si necesse est, possunt chriisma consecrare, quia in Corpore Ejus chriisma est. Siquidem hæc regula etiam nunc servatur a plurimis, atque in Ecclesiis multis sic ista faciunt. Tamen mem hoc scito esse sentientia, nulli episcopo super hanc injuriam esse faciendum, nec legem a me opponendum esse," Sc., as in § 46. note b above. Id., ibid.

---

*See note d.
fant and afterwards confirmed, submitteth to the same terms in his own person which he could not do when he was baptized. It is not therefore said, that none can be saved that is not confirmed. For let him observe the rule of Christianity, and that within the unity of the Church; and he wants nothing necessary to the common salvation of Christians. But how effectual a means the solemnity of this profession might be, to oblige a man to his Christianity and to the unity of the Church, let reason judge. Now St. Hierome\(^\text{f}\) saith most truly, that this office is reserved to the bishop for the preserving of unity in the Church by maintaining him in his prerogative. But is that an argument, that his prerogative is not original but usurped? To me it is not; who acknowledge the eucharist of a priest as effectual to the inward man as that of a bishop, the difference between them standing in reference to the visible body of the Church. Our author acknowledgeth the same\(^\text{g}\) that St. Hierome (Advers. Luciferianos\(^\text{h}\)) teacheth: demanding only, that it may be lawful for priests to consecrate the chris which they confirmed with, in case of necessity, which he saith was done in many Churches\(^\text{i}\); and protesting not to impose law on the bishop, who, saith he, “is law to the priest\(^\text{k}\).”

The supposed St. Ambrose says, that in Egypt priests did confirm in the bishop’s absence\(^\text{l}\). It is no news, that Gregory the Great alloweth priests to confirm in Sardinia, Epist. iii. 26\(^\text{m}\): for Durandus hath made him a heretic for it, In IV. [Sent.] Dist. vii. Quest. 4\(^\text{n}\); and Adrian, himself after-

\(^{\text{f}}\) Adv. Luciferianos: quoted above, c. xvi. § 17. note e.
\(^{\text{g}}\) See note d.
\(^{\text{h}}\) See note f.
\(^{\text{i}}\) See note d.
\(^{\text{k}}\) See above, § 46. note b.
\(^{\text{l}}\) Quoted in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 63. note q.—And see Hooker, E. P., VII. vi. 4.

\(^{\text{n}}\) Durandus’ conclusion is, that “Si omnis sacerdos minister est (confirmationis), sed ex ordinatione ecclesie reservatur solum episcopis, tunc quilibet sacerdos vere potest confirmare et minores ordines conferre, licet pecet conferendo faciens contra statutum ecclesem: et si hoc est verum, tunc Gregorius potuit conferre sacerdotibus quod confirmarent, qui alias peccasset confirmingo licet vere confirmasset. Si
wards pope, *Quest. de Confirm. in IV. [Sent.], art. ult.*, yields thereupon, that a pope may err in determining matter of faith. And the Instruction of the Armenians by Eugenius IV. in the council of Florence, acknowledges it had been done by priests, the chrism being consecrated by the bishop afore. The limitations of necessity, of the bishop’s absence, of chrism consecrated by the bishop, import his allowance; and that, his prerogative: though, as the case is now that all are baptized infants, the recognizance of our Christianity then received cannot be made to so good purpose as limiting the solemnity thereof to the bishop’s own hands.

§ 50. I could say the same of ordination; and would say the same, if I did find any irreprovable custom for priests to ordain. The canon of Ancyra I have expounded otherwise; and Eutychius his relation hath been rejected for a fable elsewhere.

§ 51. I find by unanswerable arguments, that the consent of the Church made ordinations good, which for the act of those, by whom they were solemnized, were utterly void. The case of Ischyras and the Meletians is famous. Pretending to have been made priest by Coluthus, a schismatic bishop under Meletius; by the council which Hosius was at.


§ 54, 60. ibid., § 54, 57, sq.: and see Pearson’s Vindic. Ignatianæ, P. i. c. xi. § 11. vol. i. pp. 282, sq. Oxf. 1852.

he is made a layman with the rest of the Meletians. And upon this account Athanasius (Apolo. ii.) insists, that there could be no sacrilege committed in breaking his chalice, because there is neither consecration nor Church among schismatics. Yet were these ordinations admitted for good by the council of Nicea, provided they stood to the order of it. Therefore Athanasius excepts further, that Meletius did not give up Ischyras his name in the list of his clergy. The same had been the case of the Donatists, had they been admitted by the Church, every one in his order; as I said Melchiades pope was content they should be. The same is the case, which Leo I. resolves Rusticus bishop of Narbonne in, Epist. xcii. cap. ii.; allowing those ordinations to stand good upon certain terms, which of themselves were void. If it could appear, that the Church did at the first accept for bishops of Alexandria, whomsoever twelve presbyters of his Church should instal; I would conclude him no less bishop by the consent of his suffragans, whom the priests, advancing to the higher throne, had set over themselves, than had three of them consecrated him by imposition of hands. But, finding that a fable, and no other instances alleged upon any good ground, I conclude St. Jerome and St. Chry-

---

1 S. Athanas., ibid.
2 "οτι γε εντολή ευχετήρας ἐστι τῇ καθολικῇ εὐχετήρᾳ, ὡστε εὐχετήριαν ἔχει, ὡστε πολὺ πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλὰ πάντα φεῦται καὶ πλῆθος." Id., ibid., C. But it would seem from the earlier part of the chapter, and from § 94, p. 181, F, as if the fact of the chalice having been broken at all or of his having had a "Church," was also denied by S. Athanasius.
3 See in Bk. I. Of the Pr. of Chr. Tr., c. x. § 41. note m: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 62. note 1: and above, c. x. § 32. note o.
4 Τόνων Μελετίου καὶ παρόντας παρίσκαν Ἀλέξανδρος τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦ δημοκρίτου ἄρχαρα ὧν ἔμμενον, ὡστε ἔν τῷ Μαρτυρίῳ ἐπικαλεῖται πάντα ἐμμελητῆρος." S. Athan., Apol. c. Arian., § 72; Op., tom. i. p. 188. B, C.
5 See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 62. note m: and above, c. x. § 32. note p.
6 "Si qui autem clerici ab istis pseudo-episcopis in eis ecclesiis ordinati sunt, quae ad propria episcopos pertinebant, et ordinatorum eorum cum consensu et judicio presidentium facta est, potest rata haberi," &c. S. Leo M., Epist. clxii. (olim xciii.), Ad Rusticianum. Episc. Narbon., Respons. ad Inquina. I; Op., tom. i. p. 1420; cited by Blondel, Apol. pro Sent. Hieron., Sect. iii. P. ii. § De Ordinationibus, pp. 166, 167.—Bingham, II. iii. 7, argues, that the "pseudo-episcopi" were merely bishops "who had no legal or canonical right to their places."
8 See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 58—60.
9 "Quid enim facit excepta ordi.
sostom's credit unquestionable; witnessing no more than they might see, and affirming the power of ordaining to be the bishop's peculiar, as indeed most concerning the state of his Church.

§ 52. It is said, that Novatus, presbyter of the Church of Carthage, made Felicissimus deacon of that Church (St. Cyprian, Epist. xli. 1); but it is said also, that he made Novatianus bishop of Rome: both by the hands of his faction, whose names you have there, Epist. lv. It is said, that Eustathius being removed from the see of Antiochia in the year 328, Paulinus, who was not made bishop there till 362, governed the Church there with his fellow presbyters; as also, when Meletius was set aside a while after, did Flavianus and Diodorus: Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. i. 21, ii. 28, iv. 12, 14. Surely, having Catholic bishops on all sides, they might govern the widowhood of the Church without meddling with the bishop's peculiar. It is said, that Apollinaris was made bishop of Laodicea by a part of the clergy and people; and by him Vitalis, bishop of the party which he had gained at Antiochia (Theodoret, v. 3): that the Novatians

"Id., ibid., lib. ii. c. 28. p. 114. C. speaks of the expulsion of some bishops from their sees for not joining in the condemnation of Aetius: but says nothing of either the case of Eustathius or that of Meletius. Thorudike was exiled by Blondel (as in last note); the passage cited by the latter with a wrong Ordinatio, p. 167, from ibid., ii. c. 31. p. 121. A, B:—"Τρακαταντα μην γαρ ἡτη μετά της κατ' Ἕσοντας τοῦ πανθηρίου γεγενημένα ἐπιβουλας, διεικληλας τῆς Ἀρειαναῖς ἀνεφκομην βελευρης."


"Id., ibid., lib. iv. c. 14. p. 166. C. D. treats of Eusebius of Samosata, expelled at the same time with Meletius. —See Blondel as in last note.

had their churches in Constantinople and the adjacent provinces, yet never were headed by any bishop that fell from the Church, and therefore made themselves all ministers. As if Apollinaris could not as well find bishops to ordain him, bearing up the party that chose him; as Audius, in Epiphanius Her. lxx. 3, found a bishop as ready as himself to fall from the Church, and to make him a bishop. As if the Novatians, being in likelihood planted from Rome, could not have their bishops ordained by their party there. Certainly it is a desperate attempt to persuade us, that in the time of Gregory of Tours any priest should ordain, as bishop of Clermont in Auvergne; because he reporteth (Hist. v. 5 1), that one of them, being chosen by a party of the clergy and people, kept possession for above twenty years. For, pretending that the neighbour bishops did him wrong in not consecrating him, he might by favour at court hold the possession which he had got, not meddling with imposition of hands.

§ 53. But the Christianity of Scotland 2 makes a great noise; even during those times, when it cannot be made to appear, that any Scots dwelt in Scotland 4. Which makes me marvel, that this objection should be found in the Preface to the X English Histories 5. For that the relations

---

2 So Blondel, as in note 1, p. 387: affirming, that "Consimilis Novatiorum per Thraciam, Bithyniam, Phrygiam, aliasque Orientalia imperii provincias sparsorum conditio suaesse videatur: cum enim nulla seminiti factioni Ecclesia addixterit, nullus ei cum adjuncto clero Episcopos nomen (quod sciamus) dederit, sola ubique in partes cleri plebisque ab unitate descessisset, quae postea sibi metum Episcopos constituerint, transiisse necesse est: quorum postea longius deducta successio ad posteros dimanasset." He carefully restricts his statement to the eastern Church. The Novatians certainly had a bishop (so called) at Constantinople; as appears (among other numberless authorities) from Sosomen, H. E., lib. vi. c. 24. p. 670, B; and Socrates, ib. ii. c. 33. and lib. v. c. 21. pp. 142, B, 280. C. And the only hint of their wanting bishops seems an inference in Tillemont (Mem. Eccl., tom. iii. art. Novatiens, note ii. pp. 747, 748) from an interpretation put by Morinus upon an expression of Pacian's.


5 Greg. Turonensis, Hist. Francorum, lib. iv. (v. in the text is a mistake) cc. 6, sq., pp. 144, sq., ed. Ruinart.

6 Blondel, as in note 4, q. 367, sq.: and Presbyterian controversialists generally.


2 Historiæ Anglicanæ Scriptores X, . . ex vetustis MSS. nunc primum in lucem editi, fol. Londo. 1652. Sir Roger Twysden was the author of the preface.
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of Hector Boise, or John Maire, or Buchanan (as ignorant as his predecessors, though in better Latin) should be swallowed by those that could not judge, though it had been against their interest, it had not been strange. But that a man of such skill in all antiquities should repeat an ungrounded relation of certain priests called Culdei, that made their own bishops, without any mark of historical truth upon it; is an argument of more will than skill to do mischief in the Church. But after Christianity was planted as well among the Picts as the Scots in Scotland by St. Columb, it is argued, that the bishops of Duresme and others in England, that sprung from that plantation, were made by priests only, of St. Columb's monastery in his island. Which men of learning would not do, if common sense could persuade them not to employ their learning to make men believe that it is not light at noon. St. Columb himself is condemned by the bishops of Ireland of St. Patrick's plantation to penance, for having a hand in blood; as you may see by the Collections already quoted. A bishop's see is planted in the island where he builds his monastery. Shall we imagine St. Columb made him a bishop, who lived and died a priest and an abbot; or the bishops that sent St. Columb upon this worthy employment for an abatement or commutation of his penance? It was the time when St. Kentigern, his good friend, went to Rome to clear himself that he was made but by one bishop; as his life relateth. Is there any age, in which it can be said that there was Christianity among the Scots and not bishops, unless it be the time of Buchanan's fables? And therefore, though (as Bede saith) that monastery ruled even the bishops, for the reverence of their learning and holiness; yet, for the authority of ecclesiastical proceedings, there is no doubt to be made, that such things

7 See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 53. note f.
* Buchan, Rel. Scot., lib. iv. Reg. 35; Works, tom. i. p. 69. ed. Ruddiman: quoted by Twysden, Pref. in X. Script. p. vi.: as is also Boethius. Major (or Mair) is cited by Blondel.
* Twysden, Pref. in X. Script., pp. vi., sq.

b Id., ibid., pp. viii., sq.
d See above, § 29. note n.
must come from the bishops: though there is no mention of Chap.
them, because neither Bede nor any soul could think there
would ever be any man so extravagant as to question it.

§ 54. Yet that learned Preface argueth, that certainly the
Culdei in Scotland had the power of making their bishop,
or bishops from this beginning\(^1\); and that they held it till
Turgot was made bishop of St. Andrews 1108\(^2\): that Nini-
anus bishop of Galloway was no otherwise made, because
Plethelm was ordained upon a new account afterwards,
which certainly can be imputed to no other reason than this\(^3\):
that Wine, bishop of Winchester, in Bede iii. 28\(^4\),
was the only regularly ordained bishop of his time\(^5\); which
cannot be true otherwise. A thing to be wondered at, that
so knowing a man should look so far for a reason evidently
false, having a true one in the text of Bede before his eyes.
For what is more evident, than that the English bishops of
Augustin’s plantation had their ordination from him, not
from any priests?\(^6\) But if from him, then from one bishop:
which was not regular; the Nicene canon requiring the
representatives of the province\(^7\), the apostles’ canon two
at least if not three\(^8\). Whether St. Gregory and his suc-
cessors intended, that their power, giving Augustin his com-
mission, should supply the formality of the canon; or sup-
posed, that the Welsh bishops should join with him\(^9\) (which
afterwards, upon the difference that fell out between them,
either they would not grant, or he would not desire): the
consecration of the bishops of that plantation must needs be
irregular, because it came from Augustin alone. Nor need

---

\(^1\) Twysden, Pref. in X. Script., pp. vi., sq.
\(^2\) Id., ibid., pp. vii., xiv., &c.
\(^3\) Id., ibid., pp. xi., xii.
\(^4\) “Non enim erat tune ulus, ex-
cepto illo Wine, in tota Britannia cano-
nice ordinatus episcopus.” Bede, H. E.
\(^5\) Twysd., Pref. in X. Script., p. x.
\(^6\) See S. Greg. M., Epist. ad Augus-
xiv., Respons. ad Interrog. viii.; Op.,
him leave to consecrate bishops by
himself, if other bishops were not to
be had.
\(^7\) “Ἐπίσκοπος προσήκει μάλιστα μὲν
ὅπω πάντων τῶν ἔν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καθι-

---

\(^8\) He seems to have expected the
bishops of Gaul to join with S. August-
in in consecrating: see his letter as
quoted in note i.
we any other reason, why Wilfrid went for his consecration into France; as the same Bede relateth. For that there was the same irregularity also among the Welsh bishops, appears by St. Kentigern; who went to Rome to purge it, as his life relateth. And therefore, though Wine, having been regularly ordained in France (as Malmesbury saith, De Gesti Pontif. ii.), joined with him two Welsh bishops, to consecrate regularly; yet the irregularity, which might be in the consecrating of the said bishops, might also move Wilfrid rather to go into France, than to rest content with the same. But that Ninian, being a Welsh bishop, at such time as the Welsh had other bishops, should be ordained by priests; because a written copy (Hist. Dunelm. in Biblioth. Cotton.) says, after his time, that Galloway had yet no bishop: is a conjecture too slight for a man of that knowledge. For there is appearance enough, that under the Welsh the see was translated to Glasgow, for Kentigern, after Ninian; and that Plechelthelm was first bishop of Galloway under the Saxons, after that the kingdom of Cumberland was become English.

§ 55. Of the Culdei in Scotland, whatsoever is said before the plantation of St. Columb, I challenge for a mere fable. After it, though Bede saith, that his monastery “after an unusual way” ruled even the bishops: yet, where there were bishops, no reason can presume that their authority did not ordain; though they thought fit, that the knowledge of the monastery whence they came should direct whom. And therefore, whatsoever the rights of these Culdei in Scotland might afterwards be, it cannot weigh a straw towards the cause of episcopacy, because never extant in the Church of Scotland but under it. They, that shall peruse what the late

"Bede, H. E. Angl., lib. iii. c. 28. p. 137."
"See above, § 29. note n."
"Scil. the stories alleged by Twy- den, Blondel, &c."
"See above, § 53. note a."
lord primate hath written in his Antiquities of the British Churches, and from his information Sir H. Spelman in his Glossary, will not allow them to be any other than canons, that were to attend upon the service of God in the Church. Which whether or no (before the division of dioceses in Scotland) they might have that right in advancing of bishops to all sees, which the clergy of every Church had in respect to their own Church; I leave to their antiquaries to determine.

§ 56. The extracts of Philostorgius I give more credit to than to any thing that hath been said of the Scottish Culdei. And they I admit relate (ii. 5 c), that the Goths, who dwelt on the north of the Black Sea, had Christianity some seventy years before Ulphilas was made their bishop. For, having carried some of the clergy captives in an inroad, they were by them taught Christianity; saith Philostorgius. But they might have priests ordained by the next bishops, all having that power in that case; or they might have other bishops before Theophilus, whom the ecclesiastical histories reckon at the council of Nicæa before Ulphilas. The want of records will not evidence, that those clergy did all acts of ecclesiastical power before; or made themselves bishops to do what themselves could not do, that is, give them the power which they had not themselves.

§ 57. I am secure of all that can be said from the state of rural bishops, called Chorepiscopi in the ancient Church; not doubting, that any bishop may communicate any part of his power within his own Church, the rule and custom of the whole Church enabling him to do it. Socrates and Sozo-

---

* See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 55.
* Quoted before in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., ibid., note d.
* See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., ibid., note i.
* See ibid., § 54—61.
* Socrates does not mention this in the parallel chapter to that of Sozomen.
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menus testify, that, whereas generally there were no bishops but in cities, in Cyprus they were settled in boroughs. I have elsewhere observed the same in Africk and Ireland. Either cities were something else there, than in other countries; or else the number of cities could not be so great as the number of Churches in the numerous African synods, and when St. Patrick founded as many Churches in Ireland as there are days in the year. Was this any breach upon St. Paul’s rule or practice, settling Churches in cities? Divide a province or sovereignty into more or fewer Churches, it weighs the same to the whole Church; not according to the number of those, that vote in their own synods: unless the council of Trent could oblige Christendom by a plurality of them that voted there. One diocese of Lincoln will better allow half a dozen rural bishops to be cut out of it, than many cities in some parts can have bishops. In a word, the rule of the Church supposeth the act of some state, which it cannot regulate. And is it then strange, supposing the superiority of bishops, so much differing in jurisdiction though for order the same, as I have said, that some of them should have a bishop under him (that is, answerable to him immediately, and to the synod of the province by him, though according to the canons of the same), with power to ordain priests, according as the said synods should allow or withdraw it?

§ 58. I will say further, that, supposing all that I have said (of the hierarchy to be an ordinance of the apostles, because received by all) to be a mere imagination of mine own, but granting the unity of the Church to be of God’s law, and the means of maintaining itself to be the consent of the Church, and this consent executed by the establishment of episcopacy through the whole Church, I can by no means excuse those that go about to put it down from being schis-

[Schismatical to reject episcopacy, whether an apostolical ordinance or not, as being the mean to the unity of the Church.]


—Quoted in Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 18. note a.


—See Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. ii. § 15, sq.

k Above, § 47.

Above, c. xvi. § 7, sq.
matics: whether, upon an erroneous conscience, they imagine that to be a transgression of God’s law, which the whole Church for so many ages embracing maketh evident to be according to God’s law; or whether, God having commanded the unity of His Church, and His Church having introduced it for a mean to preserve that unity, they think it lawful for themselves to refuse it, not believing it to be against God’s law, and therefore within the power of the Church to appoint it. For whatsoever can be said of the several customs which several Churches allowed, cannot take place in that, which is supposed to be settled and received in all Churches. Nor is it possible, that the Church should continue one, as a visible society and body in the visible communion of the same offices of Christianity; if it be free for the parts of it to withdraw themselves from the laws, which have been received by the whole, to limit the circumstances of their communion though not the conditions of it.

§ 59. I have but one point more to mention, before I leave this subject; concerning what offices every degree is, by God’s law, or by canon law, able to minister in the Church: necessary here to be mentioned, where I have shewed, what persons are enabled to give law to the Church, and to do by consequence those acts wherein the execution of law consists. For by the premisses, the truth of that, which I have proposed in the Right of the Church, more clearly appears than it could appear there;—that the offices of Christianity, which several degrees are enabled to minister, do argue the interest of those respective degrees in the government of the Church.

§ 60. Ordinations therefore [are] wholly reserved to the bishop, as not to be made without his consent; saving such ordinations of inferior ministers, as, not much concerning the state of his Church, he may by way of delegation refer to his presbyters, or rural bishops. Excommunications like-

—Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 13, sq.

"Χωριστικότερον μὴ ἔχοντα πρεσβύτερον ἡ διάκονον χειροτονεῖ· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον πρεσβύτερον πάλιν· χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτράπηκα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ." Conc. Ancyran. (A.D. 314), can. xiii.; ap. Labb., Conc., tom. i. p. 1461. A.—"Τοῦτο... χωριστικότερον... ἔχει τῇ ἐντλ. συνεδρίᾳ ἐκδέκει τὰ ἱερατικὰ μέταρ... καθιστά τὸ ἱερατικόν καὶ ἱεραρχικόν καὶ τὸ τέλον ἱερον ἐκθέτει προαγώγη; καὶ τὸ πρεσβύτερον μᾶλλον διάκονον χειροτονεῖ τολμᾶτιν, ὡς τοῦ ἐν τῇ πάλαι ἐκπολεύειν." Conc.
wise, as concerning the being of every Christian as a member of the Church.

§ 61. As for the assistance, concurrence, and consent of the presbyters of each cathedral Church, in and to the ordination of presbyters and deacons, I refer myself to that which I have said elsewhere; seeing it were a thing ridiculous to require, that all the presbyters of each diocese should concur to all such ordinations.

§ 62. As for the ordaining of bishops, the rule is plain;—that, being a part of the provincial synod, no mere bishop is to be ordained without the consent of the synod, the bishop of the mother city always concurring; though, all reason requiring that he who is to govern be taken out of the bosom of those whom he is to govern, there is a right and privilege of nomination due to the clergy, and of approbation or suffrage to the people of the Church. For it is a thing most certain, that the interest of the people in the elections of bishops in the ancient Church (which is still more clear in the election of presbyters) was grounded only upon the knowledge, which they must needs have, of persons proposed, either to approve them (which was called their suffrage) or otherwise; not that they had any right to go before their leaders, the clergy, in nomination, or to oblige the consent of the synod of the province: though it is true, that many times they did prevent both, and prevail; and might without inconvenience so do, when the eminence of some person was so discernable, that their grosser judgments could not mistake in the choice; though transgressing their rank, in demanding even the worthiest before their turn came. The same rule holds in the ordaining of superior bishops, seeing they have all their Church, their people, their clergy, and their synod. The difference that St. Augustin


* See Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xi. § 11—13: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 52.

* Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 9—11, 19.

* Corrected from MS.; "ordinances," in folio edition.

* Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 5, 6, 21:—Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 75, 76.

* Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 12—18: Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 71—76.

* As in the celebrated instances of S. Ambrose and S. Augustin: see Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii. § 17. notes m, n.
(Brevicula Collationis, iii. diei) observes in the consecrating of the pope—that it is done by the bishop of Ostia, not by any metropolitan,—is an exception to a rule. So 189 was Dionysius ordained in the year 259, if we believe the acts of St. Laurence. And, therefore, that Pelagius I. was ordained by two bishops and a priest of Ostia (as his life in Anastasius relates), by the strictness of the Nicene canon voids it. For how can he have carried the greater part of the bishops? The condescension of the apostles’ canon, and consent ex post facto, might make it good and valid; by the same reason as afore. The state of particular Christians is not of such consequence to the Church, that it should be regularly the business of a synod; though for the assistance, concurrence, and consent of the clergy of each Church, I refer myself to that which I have said elsewhere, and which would be too particular to be debated in this abridgement.

§ 63. As for the matter of penance in things that come not to the knowledge of the Church, I have no cause to repent me of that which I have said in the Right of the Church: where I have shewed, that penance and absolution in the inward court of the conscience, extends as far as the communion of the eucharist, from which penance excludes, and to which absolution restores; that all priests, and none but priests, receive by their ordination power of celebrating the eucharist, that is to say, of consecrating and communicating the same; and that it cannot be done by any other without very great sacrilege; and that, for an argument of the power of the keys in the hand of every priest, though limitable by the rule and custom of the Church to the inward court of the conscience: that the offices of preaching

---


† See above, § 54. note n.

‡ See above, § 64. note n.

§ See above, § 63.

Prim. Gov. of Ch., c. xii.: Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii.

Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii.
and baptizing are regularly communicable to deacons, but in case of necessity even to those of the people, always by delegation from their superiors the bishops: in sign whereof, neither was it the custom that any man should consecrate the eucharist, preach, or baptize, in the bishop’s presence, but himself, or by his appointment.

§ 64. As for the reading of the Scriptures, and the singing of psalms in the church; it is so well known to have been the deacon’s office in the ancient Church, that there were several ranks of deacons appointed for those several works, Lectores et Psaltera (which now, like those in the Church of Rome, help to make the inferior orders): the rule of the Church being grounded upon undeniable wisdom, and the authority of St. Paul, forbidding novices to be promoted; that exercise in the inferior offices of the clergy might be a condition requisite to advance unto superior degrees in the clergy.

§ 65. Now, for the celebrating and blessing of marriage by priests only, I must go no further at present; because, having shewed that it is to be allowed by the Church, I have not yet shewed, that it is to be solemnized by the blessing of the Church.

---

4 See in folio edition.
* See above, § 46, note t: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 52, note b: Prim. Gov., c. x. § 1 — 3: Review of Prim. Gov., c. x. § 2, 3.
† See Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 11, sq.: and Rt. of Ch. in Chr. St., c. iii. § 70.—Whether, in the first two centuries of the Church, the readers were deacons or presbyters or what else, being first known as a distinct order from both in the time of Tertullian; see Bingham, III. v. 1, 2. That the Psalmistae or ψαλται were a distinct order from the Lectores after the latter had become a distinct order themselves (although they are, while the ψαλται are not, among the minor orders of the present Church of Rome): see Bingham, III. vii. 1. In the Apostolic Canons (can. xlii. and lxviii., ap. Labb., Conc., tom. i. pp. 36, B, 40. E) the minor orders mentioned are the ἱεροδικονοι, the ἀρχιερευτης, and the ψαλτης; and none besides: to which the Apostolic Constitutions (lib. viii. cc. 16—31; ap. Coteler., PP. Apost., tom. i. pp. 411—417) add the deaconess, making however no provision for the ordination of the ψαλτης as of the others. Thomasin (Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl., P. i. lib. ii. c. xxx. § 1—4. tom. i. pp. 319, 320) determines, precisely in Thorn-dike’s sense, that “nihil probabilius quam veluti quadratum portiones (mi-nores ordinis) esse diaconatua, alia alliaque temporibus et necessitatis ab eo discertas;” and that “fuisse in minoribus ordinibus veluti tyrocinium quoddam, ubi diutius ad sacras literas et ad pietatem exercitati, ad diaconatum deinde et ad superiores ordinis perveni ment.”

5 Above, in c. xiii.
† Below in c. xxx. § 17.
CORRIGENDA.

P. 51, line 29. Add note to the words "thine own,"—So Estius, as quoted in Review of Serv. of God at Rel. Assembl., c. x. § 3. note o.

P. 77, note i. Add—Unless it be only the old-fashioned way of spelling the word: as in Chaucer, Parson's Tale (Poetical Works, vol. iii. p. 260. Lond. 1845), "The spices of penance ben three."

P. 388. At the beginning of note e, insert—So Johannis Marshami Πρωτολωπων, signature a. 1; prefixed to Dugdale's Monasticon, first published in 1655: from whence also comes the incorrect reference to St. Jerom below, in § 9. text to note h.

P. 390, note m. For "has not been traced," read—is to the Πρωτολωπων Johannis Marshami, signature a. 1: who also quotes the passages of Scripture above in the text.

— note o. Instead of the present note, read—See Marsham as in note m.